

4

**“A LIBERATING BREEZE OF WESTERN  
CIVILISATION”?**

**A Political History of Fundamental Pedagogics as an Expression of  
Dutch-Afrikaner Relationships**

**Caroline Suransky-Dekker**

4 ✓

# “A LIBERATING BREEZE OF WESTERN CIVILISATION”?

A Political History of Fundamental Pedagogics as an Expression of Dutch-  
Afrikaner Relationships

Caroline Suransky-Dekker

Dissertation Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for a Doctoral Degree in  
Education (D.Ed.) in the Department of Curriculum Studies, Faculty of Education at the  
University of Durban-Westville (UDW), South Africa

Supervisors:

Prof. J.D. Jansen (University of Durban-Westville, South Africa)

Dr B. Levering (University of Utrecht, The Netherlands)

April 1998

## Abstract

Fundamental pedagogics was the only education theory that was taught to the vast majority of student teachers during the apartheid era. This exclusivity was consciously created and maintained in the context of Christian National Education. The proponents of fundamental pedagogics attempted to legitimise their theory by invoking the work of the Dutch educator, M.J. Langeveld.

At first glance, there is indeed a remarkable resemblance between Langeveld's pedagogy and fundamental pedagogics. This thesis investigates why similar-sounding statements of the two pedagogies turn out to mean something quite different in their distinctive contexts.

Previously, critics have analysed fundamental pedagogics as if it were a South African invention. Its Dutch origins, diffusion and reinterpretation were lost in these analyses. This study emphasises and investigates the Dutch roots of fundamental pedagogics and traces its historical journey from Holland to South Africa. This journey, set between 1881 and 1963, is presented in two historical narratives, both constructed around unique data sources.

This thesis presents fundamental pedagogics as an adaptation, arguably a distortion, of Dutch education theory, mediated largely by politically conservative and racist forces.

The largely indiscriminate adoption of the rhetoric of Dutch social thought showed a disrespect for the complexity of the relationship between pedagogical theories and their site of production. Langeveld's education theory was developed in the context of post Second World War Holland on a modernist and social democracy ticket. Fundamental pedagogics emerged in apartheid South Africa in an ethnic-nationalist and racist environment. These divergent meanings clearly expose pedagogy as a political as well as an educational project.

This study concludes that the attempt to legitimise fundamental pedagogics by invoking its Dutch roots failed. Some of the central claims and assumptions of the original theory were abandoned to accommodate apartheid conditions.

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this thesis to my father, Jan Dekker, who never had an opportunity to study at a university, but whose life-long interest in history has been a major source of inspiration to me.



## A Liberating Breeze...

‘...I personally believe that, without an ongoing transfusion ... (of Dutch culture) ... the Afrikaner culture is doomed to disappear as an independent culture, only to become an Afrikaner (version of a) superficial British-colonial or American culture. This has actually already started to happen.... (This process can be reversed if Holland is acknowledged as) the root through which the life juices can be absorbed ... (and) ... the open window through which the liberating breeze of Western civilisation can freely flow ....’

(Professor D. Pont or the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, dated 27 December 1948, to Dutch Calvinist pedagogue Professor J. Waterink. See page 160 of this thesis.)

## Acknowledgements

There were many times when I thought that I would never write this section. Any woman with two young children and a full-time job, particularly – dare I say it – with a full-time job at the University of Durban-Westville, must be either very foolish or have an amazing family and circle of friends on whom she can rely when taking on the seemingly impossible task of writing a doctoral dissertation. While I prefer to leave the question of foolishness unanswered, I do admit that there are a great number of people without whose help, interest and encouragement this study would never have been completed.

I start by thanking my two supervisors. Firstly, Jonathan D. Jansen for his relentless but judicious critique, usually cushioned by his preface, ‘As a friend...’: I owe him a great deal in terms of my professional growth, and I thank him for his committed friendship and for never believing me when I said I wanted to stop working on this thesis. As a colleague in the Faculty, Jonathan also stepped in at times to teach my evening classes while I was working on this thesis.

Secondly, I thank Bas Levering for his meticulous guidance and for generously sharing his office, computer and many other resources with me in 1994 and again in 1996 while I was in Holland in search of data for this study. After my return to South Africa, he perfected the art of supervision by e-mail, with his fast and skillfully-worded commentary.

Another very special thank you goes to my friend Karin Pampallis who, with her characteristic gentle stamina, did an amazing editing job at the cost of her Christmas holidays. In addition, I am much indebted for the times when she looked after my girls when she still lived in Durban.

This thesis would never have come about if it wasn't for my loyal friend Brigitte Keck-Bräuninger who was just always there when I needed her most, be it for the numerous cups of coffee and talks around her kitchen table, or her generous offers for outings and sleepovers for my two daughters. I also want to thank Jürgen Bräuninger for all his computer-related help.

I am lucky to have many other friends and colleagues who helped me along the way, each in their own unique manner: June Webber, Leanne Browning, Michael Samuel, Heather Hughes, Rob McCallum, Teboho Moja, Grace Jansen, John Pampallis, Prem Naidoo, David Brookes, Renuka Vithal, Daisy Pillay, Labby Ramrathan, Shakila Thakupersad, Lucky Khumalo, Rubby Dunpath, Betty Govinden and Rookaya Bawa.

As this thesis spanned the gulf between Holland and South Africa, so too do these acknowledgments. First I turn to my Dutch family: I want to thank my parents Jan and Inge Dekker, my wonderful sister Sigrid Dekker, and my aunt and friend Kitty Dekker,

who all provided such warm hospitality, love and encouragement during both my stays in Holland.

In addition, I thank Anne Marieke Steeman and Dirk Jan Veldman for their friendship, for sharing their best Cape wines with me in both Durban and Amsterdam, and for being such incredible supporters-in-the-background in many ways. Then there is my loyal friend Liz Rouw-Riemens, who, as no other, has observed and supported me both professionally and personally for half my life-time!

While still in Holland, I also want to thank Erik van den Bergh who showed such interest and kept sending me articles long after my return to South Africa. I also want to acknowledge and thank the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Education for their financial assistance in 1994. I appreciate the assistance of the staff at the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut in Amsterdam, and for granting me access to so much incredible historical data. Whilst this thesis shows that I am critical of their role in Dutch-Afrikaner politics, I commend them for their wonderful archives which store a unique wealth of data.

Next, I turn to my Suransky family: I thank Shael and Sasha Polakow-Suransky for their insightful comments on earlier drafts of this thesis. Then there are my wonderful parents-in-law – firstly my late mother-in-law, Eva Suransky, who sadly is no longer there to witness the completion of this study and Kurt Suransky who at 90 years of age, still shows such tremendous interest in all the varied activities of his family. Kurt also provided me with his typical warm hospitality while I needed to be in Gauteng during my search for data.

I am deeply grateful to Nester Luthuli for her warm presence, her interest in this research and all she did to enable me to complete this thesis.

Lastly, I turn to my immediate family. First to my husband Leonard Suransky who at some point in the life of this thesis must have been the only one left with an unshakeable belief in its completion. I thank him for his loving support and for living through all the ups and downs with me and for his critique of endless drafts. I also need to thank him for his household skills – although seriously flawed, they kept the ship afloat at times.... A last thank you goes to my great daughters Sarafina and Sonya who, at the ages of 7 and 6, have already vowed never to write a thesis! I can't blame them. I am so glad that we will now get to spend more time together again.

A final acknowledgement goes to the Centre for Science Development (CSD): The financial assistance of the Centre for Science Development (HSRC, South Africa) towards the publication of this work is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed in this publication and conclusions arrived at are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the Centre for Science Development.

Caroline Suransky-Dekker  
Durban, April 1998

## **Declaration of Originality**

I, Caroline Suransky-Dekker, declare that this dissertation is my own work, and has not been submitted previously for any degree in any university.

A.C. Suransky-Dekker

## Table of Contents

|   | Page      |
|---|-----------|
| Abstract .....  | iii       |
| Dedication .....  | iv        |
| A Liberating Breeze.....  | v         |
| Acknowledgements .....  | vi        |
| Declaration of Originality .....  | viii      |
| List of Abbreviations .....   | xii       |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>Chapter One</b>  |           |
| <b>Fundamental Pedagogics: Similar Sign Posts –<br/>Different Destinations?</b> ..... | <b>1</b>  |
| 1.1 Setting the Stage .....   | 1         |
| 1.2 The South African Landscape .....   | 5         |
| 1.3 Dutch Connection .....  | 8         |
| 1.4 Re-searching the Roots of Fundamental Pedagogics .....                            | 9         |
| 1.4.1 Research focus .....  | 9         |
| 1.4.2 Rationale for the research .....  | 10        |
| 1.4.3 Research as an interpretive enterprise .....                                    | 12        |
| 1.4.4 The Limitations of this study .....   | 14        |
| 1.4.5 Overview of the chapters .....  | 16        |
| <br>  |           |
| <b>Chapter Two</b>  |           |
| <b>An Anglo-Boer War in the Arena of Pedagogy?</b> .....                              | <b>19</b> |
| 2.1 Introduction .....  | 19        |
| 2.2 The Framework of this Chapter .....   | 20        |
| 2.3 Surveying the Battlefield .....   | 22        |
| 2.4 The Proponents of Fundamental Pedagogics .....                                    | 25        |
| 2.4.1 Fundamental pedagogics in the educational landscape of South Africa ..          | 25        |
| 2.4.2 Fundamental pedagogics: a synopsis .....  | 29        |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| 2.4.3 Fundamental pedagogics, Calvinism and Christian National Education .. | 37 |
| 2.4.4 Fundamental pedagogics and the image of the teacher .....             | 45 |
| 2.5 The Critics of Fundamental Pedagogics .....                             | 50 |
| 2.5.1 Introduction .....  | 50 |
| 2.5.2 Say what? .....   | 51 |
| 2.5.3 Says who? ‘slegs vir ingewydenes’ .....                               | 52 |
| 2.5.4 ‘Unexplained, if not inexplicable?’ .....                             | 53 |
| 2.5.5 An outgrowth of ideology? .....                                       | 57 |
| 2.5.6 A paradigm for change? .....  | 61 |
| 2.6 A Gap in the Literature .....   | 63 |
| 2.7 Striking and Puzzling: Similarities and Contrasts .....                 | 66 |

### **Chapter Three**

#### **Travelling Companion or Tour Conductor?**

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Researching the Journey of Pedagogics .....</b>                     | <b>78</b> |
| 3.1 Planning the Itinerary .....                                       | 78        |
| 3.2 A Multifaceted Approach .....                                      | 81        |
| 3.3 Mirrored Journeys: Personal Biography and Research Interests ..... | 83        |
| 3.4 Inquiry and the ‘Fabric of Context’ .....                          | 85        |
| 3.5 (Re)searching the Literature .....                                 | 89        |
| 3.6 The Selection and Treatment of Data Sources .....                  | 91        |
| 3.6.1 Subsidiary question 1 .....                                      | 91        |
| 3.6.2 Subsidiary question 2 .....                                      | 96        |
| 3.7 Research as Emplotment .....                                       | 99        |
| 3.8 Methodological Limitations .....                                   | 100       |

### **Chapter Four**

#### **Transfer and Transformation:**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>The Journey of Christian National Education (1881-1939) .....</b> | <b>103</b> |
| 4.1 An Orientation to the Chapter .....                              | 103        |
| 4.2 The Dutch Origins of Christian National Education .....          | 104        |
| 4.3 A Boer Victory Awakens Dutch Kinship .....                       | 109        |
| 4.4 Transplanting Christian National Education .....                 | 113        |
| 4.5 Christian National Education as Resistance .....                 | 123        |
| 4.6 Nazism as a New Source of Inspiration .....                      | 130        |
| 4.7 Synthesis and Discussion of Research Question .....              | 136        |

### **Chapter Five**

#### **Transfer and Transformation:**

|  |            |
|--|------------|
| <b>The Journey of Fundamental Pedagogics (1939-1963) .....</b>                                       | <b>139</b> |
| 5.1 An Orientation to the Chapter .....  | 139        |
| 5.2 A War-time Shift: from ‘Sovereignty in own Sphere’ to<br>‘Totalitarianism in each Sphere’? ..... | 141        |
| 5.3 Dutch-Afrikaner Rapprochement Politics after the War .....                                       | 148        |
| 5.4 Waterink rather than Langeveld: The Politics of Invitation .....                                 | 154        |

|  |  |            |
|--|--|------------|
| 5.5  | Waterink Prepares to Visit a South Africa in Political Turmoil .....         | 158        |
| 5.6  | Broederbond Politics enter the Negotiations around the Cultural Accord ..... | 161        |
| 5.7  | An Ambiguous Accord as an Expression of an Ambiguous Relationship .....      | 164        |
| 5.8  | Fundamental Pedagogics' Critical Dilemma .....                               | 168        |
| 5.9  | Fundamental Pedagogics: Don't Interfere with our Internal Affairs? .....     | 172        |
| 5.10   | Synthesis and Discussion of the Research Question .....                      | 181        |
| <br>   |  |            |
| <b>Chapter Six</b>                             |  |            |
| <b>Fundamental Pedagogics as an Expression</b> |  |            |
| <b>of Dutch-Afrikaner Relationships .....</b>  |  |            |
|  |  | <b>185</b> |
| <br>   |  |            |
| 6.1  | An Orientation to the Chapter .....  | 185        |
| 6.2  | Christian National Education sets the Stage .....                            | 186        |
| 6.3  | The Infusion of Nazi Tenets .....  | 190        |
| 6.4  | Suit Your Self? .....  | 195        |
| 6.5  | Implications for Contemporary Debates in (Teacher) Education .....           | 203        |
| 6.6  | Implications for Further Research .....                                      | 208        |
| <br>   |  |            |
|  | References .....   | 211        |

## List of Abbreviations

|        |  |
|--------|--|
| ANS    | Afrikaner National Student Union   |
| ASAI   | Archives Suid Afrikaans Instituut  |
| CA     | Comité ter Bevordering van de Culturele Betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Zuid Afrika                           |
| CENESA | Co-operation in Education between the Netherlands and South Africa   |
| CNBC   | Christeljk Nationaal Boeren Comité   |
| CNE    | Christian National Education   |
| COTEP  | Committee on Teacher Education Policy  |
| CSD    | Centre for Science Development   |
| FHO    | Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika (Fund in Aid of Dutch Education in South Africa) |
| HNP    | Herenigde Nasionale Party (Reunited National Party)  |
| HSRC   | Human Sciences Research Council  |
| INSET  | In-Service (Teacher) Training  |
| ISS    | Institute for Social Studies   |
| KZA    | Komitee Zuidelijk Afrika (Committee on Southern Africa)  |
| NGK    | Nederlands Gereformeerde Kerk  |
| NGO    | Non-Governmental Organisation  |
| NIZA   | Nederlands Instituut Zuidelijk Afrika (Netherlands Institute of Southern Africa)                               |
| NQF    | National Qualifications Framework  |



|       |  |
|-------|--|
| NZASM | Nederlands Zuid Afrikaanse Spoorweg Maatschappij (Netherlands South African Railway Company) |
| NZAV  | Nederlandse Zuid-Afrikaanse Vereniging (Dutch-South African Association)                     |
| OBE   | Outcomes-Based Education   |
| PvdA  | Partij van de Arbeid   |
| SADTU | South African Democratic Teachers Union  |
| SAIDE | South African Institute of Distance Education  |
| UDW   | University of Durban-Westville   |
| UNISA | University of South Africa   |
| ZASM  | Zuid Afrikaanse Stichting Moederland (South African Motherland Foundation)                   |

## Chapter One

### Fundamental Pedagogics: Similar Sign Posts – Different Destinations?

*'When I use a word,' Humpty Dumpty said, in a rather scornful tone, 'it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.' 'The question is,' said Alice, 'whether you can make words mean so many different things'. 'The question is,' said Humpty Dumpty, 'who is to be master, that's all.'*

*Lewis Carroll, Alice Through the Looking Glass, 1865*

#### 1.1 Setting the Stage

There is consensus among South African educators that fundamental pedagogics can be traced historically to the work of the Dutch educator M.J. Langeveld (C.K. Oberholzer, 1954; Kilian & Viljoen, 1974; Fouché, 1982; Enslin, 1990). Particularly influential was Langeveld's book *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek* ('Concise Theoretical Pedagogy'),<sup>1</sup> of which no less than fifteen editions appeared in the Netherlands (Levering, 1991:147).

This thesis presents an inquiry into the Dutch origins of fundamental pedagogics, by exploring its roots within the Dutch political and educational context. In addition, it examines the historical ties between the Afrikaners and the Dutch, particularly in the field of education.

---

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this thesis I quote from Langeveld's 1979 edition of *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*. Although this is the second revised edition of the work, the quoted passages are either very similar or identical to those in the original 1946 edition.

This study was motivated by a set of personal and intellectual puzzles. I will briefly discuss some of these puzzles, since they formed the impetus for this research.

I was a child in primary (1960s) and high school (1970s) in Holland at a time when Dutch schools were heavily influenced by Langeveld's educational ideas. Whole generations of teachers were brought up on Langeveld's works. Many of his publications were standard texts in pre-service teacher education institutes and in most education faculties at universities in the Netherlands. Langeveld was a very prolific writer. He published no less than 40 articles and dozens of books (Klinkers & Levering, 1985:451), many of which were translated into German, English and even Japanese. Apart from his *Theoretische Pedagogiek*, his countless other publications reveal a broad spectrum of interest in the field of education. Langeveld is said to have been the predominant figure in Dutch education for several decades following the Second World War (Weijers, 1994:189).

In the 1980s I studied for my primary school teaching diploma at the State College for Teacher Education in Utrecht and later became a graduate student at the University of Utrecht, in the department that Langeveld had founded and where he was succeeded by A.J. Beekman. In both institutions, Langeveld's works were central to the study of education, both in theory and practice.

When I first came to South Africa (1988) and came across fundamental pedagogics, I felt confused. When I would mention to my colleagues in the Faculty of Education at the University of Durban-Westville, that I had studied phenomenology and pedagogy, (at best) their response was evasive. When I read fundamental pedagogics, it felt like reading Langeveld – the same Langeveld, yet a very different one. Consider, for example, the following two translated quotes. The first quote originates from Langeveld's famous *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*:

Why is education a phenomenon that implies authority? It is because in trust-given authority, the possibility emerges to help the child, the not-

yet-adult. This authority points at particular forms of behaviour and prevents others (Langeveld, 1979:68).<sup>2</sup>

Compare this to the second quote, translated from the work of the South African educator, M.O. Oberholzer:

Education implies authority, because encapsulated in authority there is trust; trust in the educator creates the possibility to show the not-yet-adult certain acceptable behavioural norms and prevent others (M.O. Oberholzer, 1983:107).<sup>3</sup>

At first glance, these two excerpts contain remarkably similar statements. They both say that education (*Opvoeding*<sup>4</sup>) implies authority, and that through authority (which implies trust) an educator can promote or prevent certain forms of behaviour. What we cannot derive from these quotes are answers to questions such as: (1) How does an educator acquire such authority? and (2) What is considered acceptable behaviour? To consider such questions, we need to assess both statements in their wider social, historical and political context. Since one may assume significant contextual differences between Holland and South Africa, one may also assume that the above statements could actually mean quite different things despite their apparent similarity.

The kind of disorientation I feel when reading fundamental pedagogics in South Africa is not unlike the feeling I experience when going to the center of Durban. I follow the sign that says STAD, which is the Dutch as well as the Afrikaans word for town. As a Dutch first-language speaker, that sign reminds me of home. However, when I get to town it

---

<sup>2</sup> My translation of: 'Waarom is de opvoeding een werk dat gezag impliceert? Omdat het in het gezag geschonken vertrouwen de mogelijkheid scheidt het kind, de onvolwassene, te helpen. Het gezag wijst zekere gedragsvormen aan; voorkomt andere.'

<sup>3</sup> My translation of: 'Opvoeding impliseer gezag omdat in die gesag 'n gawe van vertrouwe opgesluit is; die vertrouwe in die opvoeder skep die moontlikheid om vir die nog-nie-volwassene sekere aanvaardbare gedragsnorme aan te dui of voor te hou en andere minder aanvaarbares te voorkom.'

<sup>4</sup> *Opvoeding*, a term used in Dutch as well as in Afrikaans, is usually translated as 'education' in English. A more appropriate translation, however, would be 'upbringing', referring to the process of raising children. In Dutch and Afrikaans, there is a significant difference between *Opvoeding* and *Onderwijs*. The latter means 'schooling'.

doesn't look or feel like the *stad* I knew whilst still living in Holland. The South African *stad* is so different – complicated but also interesting in a very South African way.

When I follow the ‘signposts’ of fundamental pedagogics, I also end up in a very different place than I expected – a place that is also shaped by its particular South African social, historical and political context.

Unlike in Germany or Japan, where Langeveld's works were translated into the local languages, there are no direct translations of Langeveld's works into Afrikaans. Instead, his ideas were either considered and described, for instance in *Die Teoretiese Pedagogiek van M.J. Langeveld* (de Vries, 1977), or implied, as I demonstrated earlier in the quote from Oberholzer.

Most South African texts in the field of fundamental pedagogics contain a reference to Langeveld's works as either the main or an important source of inspiration. (See, for example, C.K. Oberholzer, 1954:3; de Vries, 1978:13, Du Plooy, 1983:3; Griessel & Oberholzer, 1994:11.) However, after this global acknowledgement, these books present themselves as generic works, not even once considering the implications of the fact that many of their concepts and claims originated in the completely different context of Holland. It is my thesis that in the transfer of Langeveld's work from Holland to South Africa, his theories have been re-interpreted and shaped, to suit the context of education in apartheid South Africa.

It was puzzling to me how Langeveld's work could be instrumental in such a repressive educational landscape, as I had known it to inspire and encourage liberal and humanist educational theory and practice. This ‘discrepancy’ raised a number of questions for me: Why was Langeveld's theory of interest in South Africa? Who was instrumental in its transfer? In whose interest had this transfer occurred? How and where was his theory practised? How did the proponents of fundamental pedagogics legitimise the re-shaping that had occurred? Questions such as these formed the basis of my personal interest in the topic.

It was with this background that I decided to trace some of the complicated historical roots of fundamental pedagogics which emerged in the Netherlands and was shaped through historic ties between the Dutch and the Afrikaners.

## **1.2 The South African Landscape**

In post-apartheid South Africa, we are left with a legacy of fundamental pedagogics, particularly in teacher education where for decades it was the only education theory that was made available to student teachers. Enslin (1990:79) states that this theoretical approach to the study of education was used

in the Afrikaans-language universities and colleges of education, and at the bilingual University of South Africa. More importantly, it is also the dominant approach to education at the ethnic or black universities established in accordance with the Extension of University Act (1959), as well as the black colleges of education.

A deliberate exclusion of alternative theories of education gave the proponents of fundamental pedagogics a powerful tool in effective control of the educational discourse. Salmon and Woods (1991:105) argue that:

The extent to which the state ensured that teacher training was forcibly wrested from the mission influence indicated a recognition of the pivotal importance of the training of teachers in the implementation of any educational initiative.

This dominance of fundamental pedagogics was consciously created and maintained in the context of the policy of Christian National Education, which changed teacher education substantially in the 1950s. As Hartshorne (1992) claims:

...because of the predominance of Afrikaans-speaking staff, the ruling influences in the professional subjects and in the general ethos of the colleges were those of the dogma's of Christian National Education and fundamental pedagogics, as taught in the Afrikaans and black State universities.

In this way, the state gained a considerable measure of curriculum control in teacher education institutions. Although one cannot assume a direct correlation between learned theory and enacted practice, it seems probable that fundamental pedagogics also had an impact on teaching and learning in the schools in which teachers found work. Hartshorne (1992) concludes that:

In an increasingly difficult social and political environment... (teachers) were trained to become loyal and obedient employees of the State, who would follow the instructions and regulations of the departments that employed them.

It is clear that fundamental pedagogics was introduced in the racist and highly authoritative context of apartheid education. Therefore, fundamental pedagogics and Christian National Education have become closely associated with one another historically. In post-apartheid South Africa, fundamental pedagogics is challenged from many perspectives, ranging from public debates in the media to the policy-making sector to South African and even international academia.

The ongoing inclusion of fundamental pedagogics in the teacher education curriculum at the University of South Africa (UNISA), caused a public debate in the media in 1995, with headlines such as 'Verwoerd resurrected at UNISA' (*Weekly Mail and Guardian*, 3 February 1995) and 'Fundamental Flaws in UNISA Training' (*Weekly Mail and Guardian*, 24 February 1995). These reports cited unhappy Unisa staff as saying

...one can lay much of the blame for the poor quality of black education at the feet of the education faculty, its links to the Broederbond (now the Afrikaner Bond) and the faculty's lack of desire to change.

Apart from ideological grounds, there were financial reasons for a reluctance to change, as 30,000 students annually were required to buy fundamental pedagogics textbooks, largely written by UNISA Education Faculty academics who themselves were educated in this tradition.

In the policy-making realm, the Director of Teacher Education in the National Department of Education, Andre le Roux (1996), reported that we are currently in an

...exciting, demanding and indeed historic time in the development of teacher education in South Africa. Vigorous efforts are made to counter the inequities of the past as we strive towards the values of democracy, liberty, justice and peace.

Le Roux's statement followed the 1995 National Teacher Education Audit's synthesis report, which mentioned:

The dominant approach to teacher education has been authoritarian and teacher-centered as a result of the historical influences of Christian National Education and Fundamental Pedagogics. This is becoming more eclectic especially in the universities, but in many institutions lecturers and students are so steeped in the dominant approach that they find it difficult to change (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1995:60).

In spelling out 'The Way Forward', the report recommends that 'inappropriate philosophies of education' – and fundamental pedagogics is mentioned here specifically – must be replaced by new philosophies and theories of education, which are consonant with the 'values, goals and principles of education reconstruction and a democratic society' (Hofmeyr & Hall, 1995:91).

More recently, the South African Institute of Distance Education (SAIDE) piloted a new education theory series called 'Becoming Competent' (Lubisi *et al.*, 1997). These texts are said to 'assist and prepare teacher-educators and interested teachers in methods more appropriate to a democratic and non-racial South Africa than the often racist and irrelevant theories of the "fundamental pedagogics" approach to teacher education which dominated most apartheid-era colleges of education' (*The Mercury*, 24 March 1997:6).

A criticism of fundamental pedagogics has emerged in South African scholarship as well, questioning its legacy. Located both outside the fundamental pedagogics discourse (e.g. Beard & Morrow, 1981) and – more recently – closer to the discourse (Higgs, 1994), arguments have been put forward to challenge fundamental pedagogics. International



critiques have appeared in academic journals in Great Britain and the United States of America.

Enslin (1990) questions the philosophical foundations of fundamental pedagogics, and Segal (1993) challenges its claim to universality and objectivity by deconstructing its epistemological word-games. Higgs (1994, 1995) put forward a set of proposals in which he suggests a much broader phenomenologically inspired Human Science approach, arguably a kind of 'post-apartheid fundamental pedagogics'.

The problem with existing critiques, however, is that they analyse fundamental pedagogics as if it were a South African invention. Its foreign origins, diffusion and reinterpretation are lost in analyses which challenge only the claims but do not interrogate the contexts within which such claims were made possible.

I believe that we can broaden our understanding of the history as well as the legacy of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa, by beginning to grasp (a) its earlier European roots within the Dutch political and educational context, (b) its links to Afrikaner intellectual thought and religious beliefs, (c) its transcontinental journey from Holland to South Africa, and (d) the transformation of Langeveld's 'theoretical pedagogy' into South African 'fundamental pedagogics' following the 1948 whites-only election victory of the National Party on a Christian Nationalist and apartheid platform.

### **1.3 The Dutch Connection**

Two months prior to the April 1994 democratic general elections in South Africa, the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs (1994) published a document in which the Dutch government expressed its intent to change its foreign policy towards South Africa and establish full bilateral ties between the two nations.

The report stated that 'in Holland there has always been a widespread interest in South Africa', based on 'many and divergent motives'. It cited a very dynamic NGO sector, particularly active in the anti-apartheid movement. The report also acknowledged the

historical linkages between the two countries, based on what it typifies as ‘historic and linguistic ties’. Perhaps rather euphemistically, it continues:

...there is no reason to deny these specific ties between Holland and South Africa that have played a major role in shaping the intensive relationship between the two countries up to the end of the 1950s (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994:11 - my translation).

The Dutch government suggests that these historic connections should be ‘used constructively’ in a Dutch contribution to a ‘successful transformation process’ in South Africa.

The Dutch Government also stated that the field of education would be a first priority in their exploration of possible areas of cooperation. It recognised that ‘fundamental changes in the education system are crucial to the development of a future democratic South Africa’ (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994:32). In 1996, a formal agreement was signed, entitled ‘Cooperation in Education between the Netherlands and South Africa (CENESA)’. One identified field of cooperation was that of curriculum development in teacher education.

Given this stated Dutch policy objective – using the bilateral ‘historic links’ in a ‘constructive’ way – I suggest that research into the Dutch roots of fundamental pedagogics is an appropriate way to re-examine the nature and effects of such ‘historic links’ in the education policy legacy of South Africa.

## **1.4 Re-Searching the Roots of Fundamental Pedagogics**

### **1.4.1 Research focus**

This study will trace the historical roots of fundamental pedagogics. The particular focus of this inquiry will be on the historical and socio-political context that shaped the linkages in the field of education between the Afrikaners and the Dutch. The purpose of the research is to explore the significance of this particular context in understanding the

legacy of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa. The assumption in this approach is that an analysis of the historical linkages between the Dutch and the Afrikaners can throw new light on our interpretation of the legacy of fundamental pedagogics. Put simply, the analysis aims to help us interpret why Langeveld's Dutch pedagogy *sounds* so similar to South African fundamental pedagogics, but – in all likelihood – *means* something quite different.

The main research question posed in this study is:

How did the historical and socio-political context of Dutch-Afrikaner relationships in the field of education shape the meaning that fundamental pedagogics took on in South Africa?

Two questions spell out the focus of the study:

1. How did the early history<sup>5</sup> (1881-1939) of converging Dutch-Afrikaner politics express itself in the developing education policy context in South Africa?
2. How does the later diverging history (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics explain the differences in the evolving education theories of Holland and South Africa?

#### 1.4.2 Rationale for the research

In the previous sections of this first chapter several reasons were introduced to explain both *how* I developed an interest in the topic and *why* I believe that this topic is worth pursuing. Summarised, they provide the rationale for embarking on this study:

---

<sup>5</sup> For the purpose of clarity, I acknowledge Erik van den Bergh's criticism (personal communication) of the use of the terms 'early' and 'later' history of Dutch-Afrikaner politics in this thesis. 'Early' in the context of this study does not suggest that Dutch-Afrikaner politics started in 1881. The arrival of Jan van Riebeeck and the Dutch East India Company in 1652 signaled the start of the colonial era in South Africa and the beginnings of an ongoing dialectic between the Dutch in Holland and Dutch (and other European) settlers in South Africa. However, for my purposes in the time frame of this thesis 'early' implies the period between 1881 and the start of the Second World War in 1939. 'Later' history in this thesis implies the period between 1939 and 1963.

- Since fundamental pedagogics can be traced to the work of the Dutch professor, M.J. Langeveld, there appears to be a puzzling contradiction between the meaning Langeveld's work took on in Holland (framed in a liberal and humanist education context) and South African fundamental pedagogics (framed in a racist apartheid education context). The research will explore possible reasons for this discrepancy.
- In a post-apartheid context, South African education is left with the legacy of fundamental pedagogics; which is deeply embedded, particularly in the field of teacher education. Any effort to transform Teacher Education should recognise the prevailing continuities that exist in the current transitional stage of South African education. The research aims to examine a particular historic focus on fundamental pedagogics which has previously been neglected. The research will broaden our understanding of the legacy of fundamental pedagogics.
- Existing critiques of fundamental pedagogics focus predominantly on its philosophical (ontological, epistemological or methodological) claims and assumptions. This research complements those existing critiques by focusing on the historical and socio-political context that gave rise to the transfer of Langeveld's theories to apartheid South Africa.
- The Dutch government has stated that its foreign policy towards South Africa is to be (partially) founded on a recognition that there are long-standing ties between the two nations (Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1994). They argue that these ties should be used constructively in forging new post-apartheid bilateral ties. This research describes and critically assesses aspects of these historic ties.

The findings of this research could be useful to teacher educators and teachers who want to understand the legacy of fundamental pedagogics in their efforts to transform the nature and role of education theory, in the preparation of teachers in a new South Africa.

As a case study, the findings could also be helpful to education policy makers, who need to question what can happen when theories and policies are transferred from one country to another.

As a case study, the findings could also be helpful to education policy makers, who need to question what can happen when theories and policies are transferred from one country to another. As such, this study may also advance current education policy research in South Africa. Since its political transition, South African education has seen the introduction of various imported education concepts and policy frameworks, such as the National Qualifications Framework (NQF) and Outcomes-Based Education (OBE). The hidden philosophical, political and economic assumptions which are imported alongside these policy frameworks are often ignored. This study provides an historical example that suggests that policy researchers should study and acknowledge contextual differences between South Africa and the countries where these education policies originated, because such differences may significantly alter the meaning of the original policy intentions.

#### **1.4.3 Research as an interpretive enterprise**

This inquiry is presented as an historical-comparative study on the convoluted origins of fundamental pedagogics and its transfer to apartheid South Africa. My thesis is simple: In order to understand the meaning and impact of fundamental pedagogics in contemporary South Africa, it is not enough to assess this educational philosophy on its own terms and turf; it is critical to understand the historical conditions which shaped Langeveld's education theory in Holland and its subsequent transfer to South Africa, where it was reshaped into fundamental pedagogics.

The main data collection occurred between 1994 and 1996. It involved archival research in Holland, focusing on bilateral relations between Holland and South Africa. The way in which the relationship between these two countries was reflected in their linkages in the field of education was particularly investigated. Extensive archival research was undertaken in several non-governmental Dutch-South African organisations. These

NGOs included one organisation that historically has promoted kinship ties between the Dutch and Afrikaners. It also included two outspoken anti-apartheid groups which influenced Dutch public opinion during the apartheid era. In addition, historical data from the African Studies Center at the University of Leiden was examined.

Through interviews, I also elicited the perspectives of several Dutch scholars familiar with Langeveld's work. I examined most of Langeveld's published and unpublished work, in consultation with Langeveld scholar, Dr Bas Levering, of the Department of Philosophy and History of Education at the University of Utrecht. I further examined significant secondary texts on Langeveld (1935 to the present). To contrast my understanding of Langeveld with fundamental pedagogics, I further studied multiple sources in South Africa, such as conference proceedings, textbooks, and academic publications, to further acquaint myself with the theory in this field.

My inquiry starts from a recognition that 'research is an interpretive enterprise' (Tuchman, 1994:315). I adopt this point of view which rejects the notion that history is purely referential or that historical 'facts' speak for themselves. Historical inquiry implies making choices that impact on the picture that the researcher creates when she chooses to foreground some events and ignore others. Any phenomenon has an historical context that harbours multifaceted meanings. Historical inquiry thus involves a process of selection and interpretation.

In the pursuit of my research questions, I chose to trace a number of historical events that seem relevant to the research questions that I have posed. These events will be presented in a narrative configuration that will address the historical conditions that I have set out to explore.

I will argue that a convergence of these historical narratives provided a platform for the development of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa.

#### 1.4.4 The limitations of this study

While limiting myself to the ‘Dutch connection’, with a particular focus on Langeveld, I do not wish to suggest that no other connections were significant in the historic development of fundamental pedagogics. The following points indicate some of the limitations of this study.

Firstly, I do not wish to suggest that M.J. Langeveld was the only Dutch scholar who had an influence on South African education theory in general and fundamental pedagogics in particular. The impact of J. Waterink, based at the Free University of Amsterdam, was notable. Waterink can be seen as a major proponent of Calvinist pedagogy in the Netherlands (Turkstra, 1978). Waterink and Langeveld were professionally vehemently opposed to each other's epistemological basis. They also differed radically in terms of their philosophy of science and their assumptions with regard to the place of religion in (a theory of) education. There is some irony in the fact that in South Africa fundamental pedagogics appears to have attempted to combine both Langeveld's phenomenological approach with a Calvinist doctrine that was very comparable to Waterink's major presuppositions.

Secondly, while this thesis focuses predominantly on ties that were fostered in a climate of Dutch economic, linguistic and religious (Calvinist) expansionism, there are a number of other factors and perspectives that are of great interest in an historical study of the socio-political context of fundamental pedagogics.

O'Meara (1983), for example, examines a political economy perspective, and explores the class base of Christian Nationalism. He acknowledges the Dutch theological influence of Abraham Kuyper, but argues:

Whatever the contorted discussions of *sowereiniteit in eie kring*,<sup>6</sup>  
*kultuur*,<sup>7</sup> *volk*,<sup>8</sup> nation, etc., these were concepts through which the

---

<sup>6</sup> Literally, ‘sovereignty in one's own circle’, a Kuyperian notion that refers to the autonomy of various (religious) groupings in the Netherlands. This point is further examined in Chapter Four.

<sup>7</sup> culture

ideology posed problems such as, *inter alia*, the developing crisis in agriculture, the proletarianisation of small farmers, the acute poverty of 'poor whites', the continuing imperialist domination of the economy and economic discrimination against Afrikaans-speakers (O'Meara, 1983:68).

Thirdly, in setting the boundaries of the topic under investigation for this thesis, I want to state that in my (re)search for historical data I followed a trail that I pieced together over two separate periods (June to December 1994 and August to September 1996), while I was on sabbatical leave in Holland. Although this does not mean that the material consists only of Dutch data (there is a collection of very well-preserved South African sources in various archives and libraries in Holland), it does result in a Dutch bias, as it was there that the material was collected and stored. (Primary source material does exist in South Africa, but time constraints precluded their use. South African data collection was limited to secondary sources and selected interviews.)

If my data collection had taken place mainly in South Africa, another consequential bias would have to be recognised. This point will be further dealt with in Chapter Three, when I discuss the qualitative historiographical methods employed in this research project.

Fourthly, as a consequence of the above-mentioned limitation of the research, the reader needs to keep in mind that this thesis covers the internal political configurations of Afrikanerdom in a relatively broad sweep. In painting with such a broad brush, the inevitable divisions and fission within Afrikanerdom – and by extension Afrikaner educational thinking, particularly as expressed in Christian National Education and fundamental pedagogics – could not be adequately addressed. The political divisions in Afrikanerdom have been extensively researched (see Giliomee & Elphick, 1989; O'Meara, 1983, 1996; Hexham, 1981; Moodie, 1975; Bunting, 1964). The 'inner dynamics' of fundamental pedagogics, however, present a fruitful area for further research (see also 6.6).

---

<sup>8</sup> (the) people



Lastly, I wish to acknowledge that my focus is placed on the Dutch role in facilitating the road to apartheid education and the part that fundamental pedagogics was to play in that process. This does not suggest that I think that Dutch public opinion, or even Dutch foreign policy towards South Africa, should be typified as pro-apartheid. I believe that Holland has played a significant role in the global anti-apartheid movement and the international economic sanctions debates. However, I also believe there has been great ambivalence amongst the Dutch, many of whom had grown up with the notion that the Afrikaners were their distant cousins towards whom they should show a kind of ‘family allegiance’. It does seem indisputable that for many centuries the events in South Africa have evoked strong emotions in the Netherlands.

#### **1.4.5 Overview of the chapters**

This introductory first chapter has set out the background of this study, provided a rationale, briefly introduced the methodological strategy, and set out the research questions that guide this inquiry. The key question that has arisen is: How did it come about that fundamental pedagogics *sounds* so similar to Langeveld's theoretical pedagogy, but *meant* something quite different in the context of apartheid education?

Chapter Two offers a critical synthesis of the literature on fundamental pedagogics in South Africa and beyond. It explores what the advocates as well as the critics of fundamental pedagogics have published. The literature review reveals a gap in educational research, a gap which prevents us from adequately examining the historical context in which fundamental pedagogics was introduced in South Africa. My claim that fundamental pedagogics sounds so similar but means something different is also demonstrated in Chapter Two, when – although briefly – I examine the post-Second World War context in which Langeveld introduced his education theory in Holland. In short, the second chapter sets out to demonstrate that the historical contexts in which both the theories of fundamental pedagogics and theoretical pedagogics were introduced were very different.

Chapter Three discusses the research design and the qualitative research methodology that I have used in the pursuit of my research questions. A significant assumption in the methodology is that there is not one historic reality, that historic research cannot capture the 'true' state of affairs. The chapter explores the assumption that pedagogy, as a form of cultural production, manifests contested relations of power. This supposition assumes the inseparability of education and politics, a notion central to this inquiry. The chapter further explains how I went about collecting data for the two historical narratives that are presented in this thesis.

In Chapter Four, I present the first historical narrative of this thesis, addressing the first subsidiary research question. The focus of this chapter is on early Dutch-South African relations during the period 1881-1939. This period is sandwiched between two wars – the First Anglo-Boer War and the Second World War – both of which impacted significantly on Dutch-South African relations. The main narrative is prefaced by an exploration of the Dutch political context between 1800 and 1917, with a special focus on the emergence of Christian National Education in Holland. The narrative traces the development of Dutch-Afrikaner connections during the period, specifically in the field of education. This chapter demonstrates how the initial Dutch imperial attitudes towards South Africa gradually altered to accommodate the emergence of Afrikaner Nationalism, and explores the effects of this development on their mutual attempts to forge meaningful linkages in education. It was a time of political convergence which saw the transfer and transformation of Christian National Education from Holland to South Africa. The narrative will show that the developments in this period established some important foundations which impacted on education and which could help to explain the later divergence of Dutch and South African political contexts.

Chapter Five presents the second historical narrative and addresses the second subsidiary research question of this study. The focus of this chapter is on the later context of Dutch-South African relations, during the period 1939-1963. The second narrative continues where the first one left off – that is, at the beginning of the Second World War – and ends when the so-called 'Cultural Accord' between Holland and South Africa had been in existence for a decade. This chapter demonstrates that the different attitudes

towards Nazism and Fascism in mainstream Dutch and Afrikaner opinion, followed by the start of the apartheid era in South Africa, caused further alienation and a growing political divergence between the Dutch and the Afrikaners. The chapter establishes that (i) fundamental pedagogics was not a South African invention; but that nonetheless (ii) Langeveld's theory was used to legitimise it as it took on a different political, philosophical and educational meaning in the South African context; and that (iii) the increasingly divergent political context of ethnic-nationalist imperatives in South Africa led fundamental pedagogics to assume a meaning much at odds with its Dutch roots. Langeveld's own visit to South Africa in 1959 demonstrates that attempts to encourage dialogue were too limited in scope to facilitate a critical exchange in which cultural and academic relations could be meaningfully discussed.

The final chapter draws on all previous chapter to discuss the main research question of this inquiry. Chapter Six aims to show how we can see fundamental pedagogics as an expression of Dutch-South African relationships. After an analysis of the historical narratives in Chapters Four and Five, a diagram is presented that sketches the thematic threads that have been developed in this study, starting with Kuyper's social theory and ending with the parallel emergence of Langeveld's theory in Holland and fundamental pedagogics. Using this interpretative framework, the chapter then compares some of fundamental pedagogics' main claims and assumptions with those of its Dutch origins. This comparison suggests that fundamental pedagogics is an adaptation (arguably a distortion) of Langeveld's theory that has been mediated by politically conservative and racist interests in a convoluted and multilayered context of international relations between South Africa and Holland.

Finally, this chapter discusses some implications of the research for contemporary debates in South African (teacher) education and also makes suggestions for further research.

This study as a whole throws new light on our understanding of the meaning of fundamental pedagogics as we try to comprehend its legacy in a new post-apartheid South Africa.

## Chapter Two

### An Anglo-Boer War in the Arena of Pedagogy?

#### *Preface*

*I found my way down to the education section, in the basement of the library of the University of Pretoria. I decided that no e-mail, internet or Eric search could possibly offer as good a start as the smell of old books in the heart of 'fundamental pedagogics land.*

*I approached one of the subject specialists, to whom I explained my reasons for being there. When she looked up, she responded in a huff coated with a heavy Afrikaans accent and with a studied dignity, 'Oh, but they don't do that anymore; they are only doing English and American things these days.'*

*When I expressed a supportive but determined surprise, she pointed to the left half of the basement floor: 'That's where the old books are.' And then, slightly puzzled but pleased, she showed me shelf after shelf after shelf. This chapter had begun....*

#### **2.1 Introduction**

This chapter examines the existing literature on fundamental pedagogics. As an education theory with a corresponding practice, fundamental pedagogics has evoked strong sentiments in South African academia and the broader educational field. The perspectives of its advocates as well as its critics will be explored. In addition, the theory of fundamental pedagogics will be – albeit briefly – contrasted with Langeveld's education theory in its post Second World War Dutch context. This final part of the chapter draws from some of the main works of Langeveld himself, as well as publications from a number of Dutch Langeveld scholars.

The purpose of this chapter is three-fold. Firstly, it provides a synthesis of the main concepts of fundamental pedagogics as projected by its proponents. Later in the

dissertation, these main concepts will be compared to Langeveld's theory (the final part of Chapter Two) and related to their historical, social and political context (Chapters Four, Five and Six).

Secondly, this chapter explores the critique that has been leveled against fundamental pedagogics. A review of this critique is significant for my research in that it reveals a gap in the literature on fundamental pedagogics. This gap prevents us from fully examining the historical role that Dutch-South African linkages in the field of education, as well as in the broader political arena, played in the development of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa

Thirdly, the chapter discusses Langeveld's education theory, and how his work was contextualised in post Second World War Holland. This in turn provides the basis for a comparison with fundamental pedagogics as well as a discussion of the research questions of this study in the final chapter of this thesis.

## **2.2 The Framework of this Chapter**

The literature review starts by locating the debate on fundamental pedagogics in the landscape of education in South Africa (section 2.3).

Section 2.4, on the proponents of fundamental pedagogics focuses on four areas of literature review:

- 2.4.1 – An outline of who its advocates were (or are), and where they were located in the educational landscape of South Africa.
- 2.4.2 – A discussion of the main concepts of fundamental pedagogics and its ontological, epistemological and methodological orientations.

- 2.4.3 – An exploration of fundamental pedagogics' link with Calvinism, Christian National Education and apartheid in the South African context. Special attention has been given to this link because relationships between religion, culture, nationalism and education are central to fundamental pedagogics, but have been deeply contested in the debate in South Africa. Part of this debate has centered around the fact that the advocates of fundamental pedagogics (e.g. Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988) claim that their essential findings are 'universally valid' and that one must distinguish between the 'scientifically derived value-neutral essences of education' and the particular meaning given to them by different 'philosophies of life'. Responding to Reagan (1990), who alleged that fundamental pedagogics is a philosophy of education in the service of apartheid, Yonge (1991:95) explains:

A phenomenological (fundamental pedagogic) investigation of ... education is possible for anyone to pursue irrespective of political and religious beliefs or country of origin. Fundamental pedagogics as an approach to the study of education knows no citizenship ... it is not fundamental pedagogics that has religious, political-social commitments and convictions, but rather the individuals who take this approach.

The link between fundamental pedagogics and Christian National Education is particularly significant in this study, because (as will become evident in Chapter Four) not only fundamental pedagogics but Christian National Education, too, had its origins in Holland. Historically, Christian National Education played an important role in Dutch-South African bilateral relations in both the educational and political spheres.

- 2.4.4 – A special focus on the role of the teacher as professional educator in the framework of fundamental pedagogics. Fundamental pedagogics has been the dominant approach in teacher education for decades, and it is in this particular field of education where it has evolved as a key domain of influence.

The section on the critics of fundamental pedagogics (2.5) presents a synthesis of five key areas of critique. Fundamental pedagogics has been accused of being:

- inaccessible and mystifying (2.5.1);

- unamenable to rational challenges (2.5.2);
- inarticulate, conceptually confused and contradictory (2.5.3);
- symbiotically related to Christian National Education and apartheid ideology (2.5.4);
- unable to play a role in a changing South Africa (2.5.5).

The main focus of section 2.5 is on the connection between fundamental pedagogics and Christian Nationalism in the context of apartheid education in South Africa.

The gap in the literature on fundamental pedagogics is examined in section 2.6. Both proponents and critics underestimate or even ignore the foreign origins, diffusion and reinterpretation of fundamental pedagogics. Although both frequently mention Langeveld as an important point of reference, they do not adequately explore the implications of these foreign roots. They analyse fundamental pedagogics as if it were a South African invention, and their analyses and critiques do not sufficiently interrogate the context within which it was conceived and developed.

The degree of similarity between fundamental pedagogics and Langeveld's theory indicates the significance of this gap in the literature. The final part of this chapter (2.7) discusses the main concepts of Langeveld's theory and how these concepts resonated in the context of post Second World War Holland.

The findings of the literature survey will serve as a basis for analysis in the discussion of the research questions of this study in the final chapter of this thesis.

### **2.3 Surveying the Battlefield**

In the midst of their disputes, proponents and critics probably agree on one thing only: fundamental pedagogics could not be ignored. Both sides acknowledge that fundamental pedagogics had a considerable influence on education in South Africa. The two sides radically disagree, however, on its value. Its advocates have heralded it, for example, as the 'elucidat(ion) of the fundamental concepts of human nature on which education is

based' (Botha, 1988:2), and they have claimed that it is capable of 'serving the cause of education (...by...) safeguarding human values' (Higgs, 1994:56). On the other hand, the critics have declared it to be 'a parasitic ideology' (Fouché, 1982:159) and suggested that it is 'arbitrary and contradictory' and 'unable to submit educational institutions or anything else to critical scrutiny and review' (Segal, 1993:181).

Fundamental pedagogics constitutes a 'part-discipline' of pedagogics and forms the 'theoretical underpinning for pedagogics in general' (Morrow, 1981:214). The other components are: psycho-pedagogics, socio-pedagogics, didactical-pedagogics, comparative pedagogics, jistorico-pedagogics and ortho-pedagogics. Together, they claim to be a 'unified and independent view of what education is and how it is to be practised' (Margetson, 1981:188). The list of part-disciplines compares to the different areas of education taught at English-medium universities as follows: 'philosophy of education, psychology of education, sociology of education, methods of teaching, comparative education, history of education and remedial/special education' (Margetson, 1981:188-189).

Berndine Nel's inaugural address as Professor of Philosophy and Sociology at the University of Durban-Westville on 17 June 1983 sets out a brief history of education as a science in South Africa. She demonstrates that the Afrikaans-speaking academic sector is influenced mainly by German-Dutch traditions and that the English-speaking sector is predominantly linked to academic developments in the Anglo-American countries. She notes that

Educationists in South Africa seem to be divided: in itself, of course, this is not necessarily an unhealthy position in the academic sense, except for the fact that the division is reinforced by language and cultural factors. Many Afrikaans-speaking educationalists are pro-fundamental pedagogics and most English-speaking educationists are anti (Nel, 1983:14).

Nel (1983:14) concludes that the pro- and anti fundamental pedagogics debate seems 'more deep-seated than just a difference in philosophical assumptions', that in fact the debate is 'bordering on an ideological struggle'. Consequently, the divide between the



proponents and the critics of fundamental pedagogics has philosophical as well as political qualities.

The nature of the debate between the proponents and critics is often cynical and fraught with skepticism. For example, Kilian and Viljoen (1974:vii) seem piqued about ‘the English student's inability to read scientific language in Afrikaans or other Germanic languages’.<sup>1</sup> They imply that this is a big disadvantage, because students are thus only exposed to ‘English literature (...which...) to a great extent lacks authentic pedagogical thought’. Critics have questioned the terms or even the possibility of a real debate. Parker (1981:27) is of the opinion that

The Fundamental pedagogician often claims that he wishes to enter into a debate with his English-speaking colleagues, but for those who reject the presuppositions of Fundamental Pedagogics there can be no debate, since they are, by definition, mistaken about the nature of education.

The pro- and anti-fundamental pedagogics debate evokes echoes of the Anglo-Boer wars, shifted to the arena of pedagogy. These military wars have been re-named ‘South African Wars’ by historians, to acknowledge the fact that it was not only the English and the Boers whose lives were transformed by them. Similar to the military wars, the ‘pedagogics war’ seems an ideological struggle, fought almost exclusively between English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking white people who battle it out over the heads of the black majority of South Africans – the same majority whose lives were deeply affected by the terms and outcomes of the military wars.

In a related analogy, black teachers, as the ‘foot soldiers of pedagogics’ were forced to participate in the conflict but received no or little official recognition. The same is true for black academics. Although there were (a few) black proponents of fundamental

---

<sup>1</sup> Kilian and Viljoen's bilingual (Afrikaans and English) book is organised in an interesting manner. Throughout the book, the Afrikaans and English translation feature side by side. The authors claim to ‘want to start the ball rolling as regards co-ordination of pedagogical concepts in the two official languages of South Africa’. Rather than ‘co-ordinating concepts’, I believe that they simply translate from Afrikaans to English, ignoring any conceptual differences between the Afrikaans and English versions.

pedagogics (for example, P.C. Luthuli at the University of Zululand, who had been a Doctoral student of Professor Landman), their names are absent in bibliographies of textbooks and listings that read like Who's Who in the field (e.g. Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988).<sup>2</sup>

## **2.4 The Proponents of Fundamental Pedagogics**

### **2.4.1 Fundamental pedagogics in the educational landscape of South Africa**

From what has been said in the previous section in this chapter, it should be clear that the proponents of fundamental pedagogics can be found predominantly in the white Afrikaans-speaking academic sector of South Africa. Other proponents include a small number of black academics who worked in black universities which (with the exception of Fort Hare) had their origins in the Extension of Universities Act of 1959. The most notable black proponent of fundamental pedagogics was P.C. Luthuli, who was based at the University of Zululand.

The black universities – such as the University of the North, the University of Zululand and the University of Durban-Westville – facilitated higher education in apartheid style. They catered exclusively for black students of one particular ethnic or language group and were ‘heavily populated with Afrikaner academics and their corresponding conservative world-views’ (Jansen, 1991:25).<sup>3</sup> The education faculties of these universities were accredited by UNISA, which also prescribed their teacher education curriculum (Rajah, 1992). Hence, they taught fundamental pedagogics.

---

<sup>2</sup> I have not come across one reference to the work of Prof. Luthuli in the textbooks on fundamental pedagogics that I have studied for this thesis. Any references to him appear in the work of the critics of fundamental pedagogics. The most explicit account of the exclusion of blacks in this area first appeared in a 1982 in article by Wally Morrow, which appeared in edited form as a chapter in Morrow's book *Chains of Thought* (1989:13-35).

<sup>3</sup> Jansen (1991) offers a concise analysis of the ‘Structures of Domination’ in South African academia.

Apart from the universities, there were the colleges of education. The majority of such colleges were governed by the Pretoria-based Department of Education and Training (DET), or by one of the so-called 'homeland' authorities, who in turn leaned heavily on Pretoria curriculum directives.

Salmon and Woods (1991:54) state that the curriculum originating from the DET was essentially 'a highly prescriptive package of course structures, compulsory subjects and period allocations' from which 'nothing could be removed and little added'. Fundamental pedagogics was central to the prescribed curriculum in the colleges of education.

From the above, it is clear that, apart from the white English-medium universities and colleges of education, all other academic or professional (teacher) education programmes in South Africa were permeated with fundamental pedagogics.

Prior to the establishment of fundamental pedagogics, there were, according to Nel (1983:12), 'two early pioneers in the development of education as a science in South Africa' – J. Chr. Coetzee from Potchefstroom and (her father) Beyers Nel from Pretoria – who 'under the influence of German and Dutch education ... (set out to) ... establish education as an autonomous science at their respective universities'.

Beyers Nel had studied at the University of Amsterdam in the 1930s with Kohnstamm, who had also been Langeveld's mentor and teacher. At the University of Pretoria, which Nel (1983:13) believes set the tone for the educational developments which permeated most other Afrikaans-speaking universities until the 1970s, a Faculty of Education was established in 1937. Its main aim was to eliminate the traditional ideas of education as an applied science and to establish it as an autonomous science. This paralleled Langeveld's similar efforts in the Netherlands.

After the 1950s, the influence of phenomenology on education grew in the white Afrikaans-speaking universities, and was 'especially promoted by the publications of Langeveld in the Netherlands' (Beyers Nel, cited in Nel, 1983:13). Beyers Nel played a

'major part in spreading the phenomenological approach in South African education, notably supported by Oberholzer on the philosophical side' (Nel, 1983:13). In the 1970s, he became 'disillusioned with the way the phenomenological school of thought developed in South African universities'.<sup>4</sup>

Textbooks on fundamental pedagogics (e.g. Du Plooy *et al*, 1974; Schoeman, 1975; Kilian & Viljoen, 1985) generally do not refer to Beyers Nel as one of the founders of fundamental pedagogics. In fact, his name is conspicuously absent from most fundamental pedagogics texts. Instead, these textbooks and articles (e.g. Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:13; Roos, 1980:101; Du Plooy, 1983:304) recognise the work of C.K. Oberholzer, who in 1954 published his book named *Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde* (Introduction to the Principles of Education), as the first South African publication in the tradition of fundamental pedagogics. Oberholzer's second major work *Prolegomena van 'n prinsipiele pedagogiek* (1968) also became a leading text in the development of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa.

Oberholzer studied at the University of Potchefstroom and the University of Pretoria where he later became a professor in educational philosophy (*opvoedkundige wijsbegeerte*). After his retirement in 1969, he continued to teach fundamental pedagogics at UNISA. (Turkstra,<sup>5</sup> 1978:166). C.K. Oberholzer has been described as

---

<sup>4</sup> According to Berndine Nel, the only publication which reflects this disillusionment was co-authored by Beyers Nel and herself. It was written shortly before his death and appeared in the March 1975 edition of *Fokus*. Beyers Nel was not the only disappointed one. In an interview that I conducted with Prof. P. Higgs at UNISA (28 October 1997), he recalled spending a morning with C.K. Oberholzer shortly before he died. Higgs said that one of the most powerful images that remained with him from that morning was Oberholzer's remark, 'Ek was by 'n stryd betrokke wat ek verloor het' (I was involved in a struggle that I lost). Oberholzer referred to the dominant role which Landman played in the development of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa. Landman's brand of fundamental pedagogics resonated well with Christian National Education and apartheid policies in education, a point that was confirmed in an interview with Prof. M.O. Oberholzer from UNISA (29 October 1997), although I should also mention that he believes that this was never the original intention.

<sup>5</sup> Turkstra was a Doctoral student of Prof. J.C.G. Janse van Vuuren at UNISA, graduating in 1978. He wrote his thesis in Dutch, his first language. The title of his thesis is *Een onderzoek naar de invloed van Waterink en Langeveld op het Pedagogiek-denken in Zuid Afrika* (An investigation into the influence of Waterink and Langeveld on Pedagogics in South Africa). Turkstra argues that the Dutch influence on South African education manifested in two quite distinct directions: Waterink influenced a Calvinist orientation and Langeveld a phenomenological orientation to education in South Africa. By taking this position, Turkstra affirms the idea that phenomenology in fundamental pedagogics is divorced from Calvinism. Turkstra provides a thesis that is rich in detail, dissecting the language of a significant

"the pivot on which fundamental pedagogics hinges in South Africa" (Killian, 1977 cited in Turkstra, 1978:164 ).

In 1968, Oberholzer was succeeded at the University of Pretoria by a former student, W.A. Landman. It was Landman who named his department at the University of Pretoria the Department of Fundamental Pedagogics in 1968 (Roos, 1980:103). Other notable proponents included:

- University of South Africa (UNISA): C.J.G. Killian, T.A. Viljoen, M.O. Oberholzer and G.A.J Griessel ;
- University of Pretoria: J.C.G. van Vuuren and F.van der Stoep;
- initially at UNISA and later (1968) at the Rand Afrikaans Universiteit (RAU): Prof. van Zyl (who had studied with C.K.Oberholzer);
- University of Stellenbosch: C.G. de Vries;
- University of Port Elizabeth: J.J. Pienaar;
- Potchefstroom University for Christian Higher Education: J.L.Van Der Walt and P.G. Schoeman (who was initially at the University of the Orange Free State);
- University of Zululand: P.C. Luthuli.

The main journals in which proponents of fundamental pedagogics published academic articles were: the *Journal of Pedagogics*, based at the University of Pretoria; the *South African Journal of Higher Education*, based at UNISA; and the *South African Journal of Education*, edited by a number of academics at UNISA and Rand Afrikaans University.

In addition, there were many other publications that were aimed at teachers. These publications contained mainly practically-oriented school or classroom advice, opinions and announcements. They included: the *Journal of Bantu Education* (later *Educamus*), which also provided notes for teachers who studied fundamental pedagogics through UNISA, and *Die Unie*, which was published by 'die Suid-Afrikaanse Onderwysersunie'.

---

number of fundamental pedagogicians. Paradigmatically, his work is located in the tradition of

A survey of the 'landscape' of fundamental pedagogics, indicates that this education theory was more just an idea or a philosophical approach that was confined to books and academic theorising. An overview of its main proponents, institutions and significant texts shows that fundamental pedagogics was almost exclusively controlled by the Afrikaner section of the South African population, and moreover, that these dominant voices were all male. This accurately reflected the dominant political power in apartheid South Africa. Enslin (1990:79-80) concludes

... the Afrikaans-medium universities exert a political influence out of all proportion to the population of Afrikaners. Fundamental pedagogics is one medium for its influence ... most teachers in South Africa – and almost all black teachers – are educated within this approach. Through fundamental pedagogics, this dominant group controls the production of educational discourse.

#### **2.4.2 Fundamental pedagogics: a synopsis**

This following section presents the main claims of fundamental pedagogics, as voiced by its prominent advocates. These ideas will be presented with a minimum of editorial interruption, as I want to catch their original claims in order to contrast them with their Dutch origins in the subsequent parts of this thesis.

Following Nel and Coetzee (see 2.4.1), the proponents of fundamental pedagogics consistently presented their field of interest as an autonomous science (C.K. Oberholzer, 1954:3-4; Landman & Gouws, 1969:15; Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:13; De Vries, 1978:113; Du Plooy, 1983:37; Griessel & M.O. Oberholzer, 1994:6). Langeveld is widely and consistently acknowledged as the person who initiated, developed and established the idea of autonomy (C.K. Oberholzer, 1954:3; De Vries, 1978:13; Du Plooy, 1983:3; Griessel & M.O. Oberholzer, 1994:11).

Fundamental pedagogics claims that education is a scientific field of study which is distinct from other sciences and that it therefore offers its own 'educational'

---

fundamental pedagogics.

perspective. Its supporters claim that one can speak of autonomy when a science ‘determines its own direction, development, methods and aims’ (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:292). According to Kruger (1979:29-30):

Pedagogics is no longer regarded as a science collecting from other sciences and piecing them together to form a new unity. Similarly, it is no longer regarded as applied psychology, sociology, philosophy, theology or any other science. As an autonomous science, pedagogics also has its own concepts.

Fundamental pedagogics is presented as a human science, stating that education is uniquely a human concern: ‘Only man educates, is dependent on education and susceptible to education’ (C.K. Oberholzer, 1954). It was established that

pedagogics belongs to the humanities – its theme is essentially a human theme. Pedagogics is linked with other humanities (human sciences) ... but it does not allow itself to be absorbed by any of these sciences, because it has its own perspective on human reality ... (the other human sciences act)... as auxiliary sciences for pedagogics (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:369).

Scientists of ‘the pedagogic’ study the ‘original educative occurrence’ (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:425) which is summarised as the

... deliberate, purposeful, normative intervention by an adult in the life of a child with the aim of guiding him towards proper adulthood (Botha, 1988:4).

Thus, the ultimate aim of education is adulthood. As Luthuli (1981:12) states, ‘there is one central and universal aim in all education, viz. Adulthood’. Griessel (cited in Botha, 1988:1-2) describes the main goals of fundamental pedagogics as follows:

As a science, it is concerned with the essential, lasting and universal facets of education. Fundamental pedagogics describes the philosophical basis of education – what education is and why it is indispensable, the education relation, the course (or progression) of education and its aim. Fundamental pedagogics elucidates the fundamental concepts of human nature on which education is based.

C.K.Oberholzer (cited in Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:15) typified fundamental pedagogics as ‘significance pedagogics’ or the ‘pedagogics of meaning’. The task of pedagogics was to search for fundamental structures as pre-conditions for the actualisation of education, or the ‘description and elucidation of the fundamental of the pedagogic situation’ (Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:71). The aim was to disclose the ‘essences’ of the phenomenon of education. Landman (cited in Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:17), therefore, calls fundamental pedagogics a ‘pedagogics of essences’ where the scientist enunciates, proclaims and reveals the meaningfulness of these ‘real pedagogic. These essences can be revealed when the ordinary lived experience of education in everyday life is scientifically studied.

Fundamental pedagogics captures the totality of the phenomenon of education in three distinct phases or levels: pre-scientific, scientific and post-scientific.

Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:xxxvi) outline some of the major differences between these levels. Their analysis includes a comparison of the source of knowledge, the nature of knowledge, the role of a ‘philosophy of life’ and the ‘nature of activities’ at each of these levels. Their comparisons are captured in Figure 2.

**Figure 2.1**

| <b>PRE-SCIENTIFIC</b>   | <b>SCIENTIFIC</b>  | <b>POST-SCIENTIFIC</b>  |
|---|--|---|
| SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>experience, intuition, tuition   | SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>empirical research, observation<br>of primary and secondary educa-<br>tion situations | SOURCE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>experience, philosophy of life,<br>scientific studies  |
| NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>unsystematised, unreliable, un-<br>verifiable, subjective, particular      | NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>systematised, reliable, verifiable,<br>objective, universally valid                   | NATURE OF KNOWLEDGE<br>scientifically refined and system-<br>atised experiential knowledge,<br>applied scientific knowledge |
| PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE<br>determines educative activities<br>and the interpretation of adult-<br>hood | PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE<br>suspended for the duration of the<br>scientific study                                  | PHILOSOPHY OF LIFE<br>affects and renders specific (par-<br>ticularises) the universal es-<br>sences revealed by science    |
| NATURE OF ACTIVITIES<br>prescriptive  | NATURE OF ACTIVITIES<br>descriptive  | NATURE OF ACTIVITIES<br>prescriptive  |

Source: Botha, 1988:17

The pre-scientific phase is the everyday situation in which parents raise and educate their children. The knowledge through which this process unfolds is characterised as



‘unscientific, unsystematised and uncontrolled, to a great extent unreliable and subjective’ (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:457). These same authors claim that ‘...for the sake of more effective, justifiable conduct, man seeks ways of reaching universal and generally valid judgments’.

Methodologically, the proponents of fundamental pedagogics claim that the status of knowledge can be elevated from a pre-scientific to a scientific level through phenomenological analysis. The point of departure in such an analysis is everyday life, which is the pre-scientific reality in which the phenomenon of education manifests itself. The essences can subsequently be revealed through a process of ‘bracketing’, which involves the implementation of a set of phenomenological reductions. This process is based on Husserl's famous notion of *zu den Sachen selbst*.

Griessel (1983:238) notes that a phenomenological approach means that the scientist may not ‘approach the phenomenon with preconceived theories or hypotheses’. Instead, one should approach it ‘without prejudice so that the phenomenon can reveal itself as is really is’. These paradigmatic assumptions about the ontology and epistemology of fundamental pedagogics are also clearly stated by Kilian and Viljoen (1974:17):

Authentic science practice requires that the practitioner of science should strive towards the establishment of an open, unbiased encounter between himself (...and the phenomenon under investigation...). This means that science should be practiced without prejudice.

The proponents of fundamental pedagogics thus claim that it is possible to apprehend and comprehend an objective reality, but they do make an explicit distinction between prejudices and presuppositions.

Conditional for the acknowledgment of education as an autonomous science are a number of such presuppositions. Kilian and Viljoen (1974:23) state that ‘in order to be able to think pedagogically, the pedagogic must be presupposed, otherwise pedagogical thinking would be a meaningless activity’. They explain (1974:29) that a fundamental pedagogist has to accept a number of presuppositions on the pedagogic, namely: (1) the

ontic fact of the pedagogic, (2) its fundamental coherence, (3) its invariable, supra-temporal and essential structure, (4) its fundamental knowability, (5) the act of its fundamental description, and (6) its fundamental pedagogical categories as descriptive media.

In the next step of the process of phenomenological reduction, the phenomenologist

wants to penetrate the ...fundamental facts of education reality. (His) opinions and philosophy of life must first be bracketed ...(and) should leave out all ... scientific insights.... He brackets everything and starts from the beginning (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:447).

Lastly, and emanating from this process, comes a final reduction, where the empirical is exceeded and brought to a level where experience is transformed into knowledge that is 'supra-sensory, out of this world'. This level is said to truly reflect the universally valid essences of the phenomenon. The phenomenologist has to

fathom, describe and elucidate the essential features (...of the phenomenon under investigation, which...) boils down to revelatory thinking regarding the essential features (... as constituted ...) in the pedagogician's mind or consciousness (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:337).

The essences of the pedagogic are subsumed in what is philosophically typified with Heidegger's term: 'being-in-the-world' (*dasein*), which is referred to in fundamental pedagogics as the 'only ontological category of (human) reality' (Roos, 1980:121). Being-in-the-world is the ontological foundation for the many pedagogic-anthropological categories that are described by fundamental pedagogists.

The essences of education are summarised and simplified by Botha (1988:5-6) who states:

The three essences of or preconditions for education are:

- a child in need of assistance (support),
- an adult who is prepared to assist (or support) the child,

- the educational aim or goal.

If any of these essences is lacking, the association between adult and child cannot be referred to as education.

Similarly, Du Plooy and Kilian (1982:64-65) state that pedagogics is ‘the science of the pedagogic situation and its own structures’. The structures they suggest are threefold: ‘an educator (adult), a not yet adult (child) and a goal (adulthood)’. In order for education to occur, the child and the adult must be in a ‘pedagogic relationship’ (Botha, 1988:20-21). This relationship is structured and qualified as one of understanding, trust and authority (Griessel, 1985:60-62; Yonge, 1991:89-91).

Fundamental pedagogists claim that after the true essences of the pedagogic are revealed, they can be implemented or given meaning in everyday life at a post-scientific level. At this level, the ‘universally valid criteria then become directing principles (... and ...) his philosophy of life aids the pedagogue here’ (Kilian & Viljoen, 1974).

Luthuli (1982:122) points out that ‘particular education goals and ideals will ... of necessity differ according to a people's philosophy of life’. In this context, Kruger (1979) explains:

The scientist may choose to implant the new knowledge he has gained back into the lifeworld of everyday, and by so doing enrich the culture of the group to which he belongs as well as that of society as a whole. This aspect of the scientists' work is called post-scientific labour which has to do with the particular view of life to which the scientist adheres. Post-scientific labour concerns prescription, with the result that the universal validity becomes difficult, if not impossible ... because the meaning the scientist gives to the findings ... will reveal the order of values recognised within that community.

Fundamental pedagogics, as a system of knowledge, makes an explicit distinction between an education doctrine (*opvoedingsleer*) and pedagogics, or science of education (*opvoedkunde*). An education doctrine is said to be ‘embedded in a philosophy of life, e.g. a Christian education doctrine, a Communistic education doctrine ... or ... a Muslim education doctrine’ (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:331). Education doctrine is

posed as ‘particular, demanding, historical, non-hereditary, stabilising, idealist, meta-scientific and answerable to the demands of pure humanness’ (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:xxx). In contrast, the science of education – or pedagogics – seeks, reveals and describes the universal essences of the human act of education. These essences are said to be existent regardless of the particular meaning that is attributed and developed in the context of the particular philosophy of life to which the adult and the child find themselves.

Kilian and Viljoen (1974:61-67) maintain that ‘scientific insights produced by pedagogics ... are universally valid and invariant’. On the other hand, ‘dogmatic insights produced in a study of a particular philosophy of life are particularly valid and variable’. Pedagogics as a science ‘evades any form of absolutism’ whereas ‘an education doctrine must necessarily absolutise’.

It is at this post-scientific level that the notion of pedagogics as a normative science becomes meaningful. In Van Rensburg and Landman's table (see Figure 1) it is stated that the nature of activities at the post-scientific level becomes prescriptive. C.K. Oberholzer (1954) claimed that pedagogics, unlike other human sciences, is not only concerned with how people are, but also how they ought to be. As Landman *et al.* (1971:36-37) explain:

the adult and the child collaborate in the pedagogic situation to actualise his human potentialities (Landman) because the child wants to be someone himself (Langeveld) ... (this collaboration has) ... evidence of normativity, because actualising human potential is related to the act of choosing (... therefore fundamental pedagogics is ...) not only descriptive, but also normative (and therefore prescriptive) of responsible choices.

This reference to ‘responsible choices’ resonates with Botha (1988:4), who said that there had to be an ‘educational aim or goal’ in a pedagogic relationship, and moreover, that this goal is not just any kind of adulthood, but ‘proper’ adulthood. In order to achieve a state of proper adulthood, a child needs moral guidance. As Oberholzer and Griessel (1994:39) explain:

When the child moves towards the world of the adult, he must get to know the order and systems of adulthood. Because the world of the adult is poly-morphous, man has to choose between ways of doing things that are either good or bad, advantageous or disadvantageous, proper or improper. This requires a sense of responsibility. In order to make a choice in a responsible manner, all humans must acquire an attitude based on reliable knowledge and the acceptance of moral norms whereby they will be able to distinguish between good and bad.

Kruger (1979:30-31) affirms the claim that the child is not a passive target in the 'educative relationship' but participates actively in the process of moving towards adulthood. He states:

the child is someone who wants to be someone himself (Langeveld), and what is more: he doesn't just grow up (develop), he is brought up (Oberholzer) ... as one who wants to become someone himself, he participates in his own moulding or becoming.

By 'moulding', the proponents of fundamental pedagogics mean 'the designing of an always more expansive world of being' (Kruger, 1979:30-31). This 'world of being' demands that people give it meaning in the establishment of four hierarchical levels of relationships, viz:

- relationships with things (nature),
- relationships with others (children and adults),
- relationships with himself, and
- his relationship with God.

The link between Christian National Education, Calvinism and fundamental pedagogics begins to clearly take shape at what the proponents of fundamental pedagogics call the post-scientific stage in the phenomenon of education. Roos (1988:31) sums it up:

It is precisely at the post-scientific level where it is possible to establish a synthesis between Pedagogics (Science) and a particular educational doctrine.

The relationship between education theory and ideological doctrine has been most controversial. In the next section of this chapter, I will elaborate on the way in which the proponents of fundamental pedagogics see this connection.

### **2.4.3 Fundamental pedagogics, Calvinism and Christian National Education**

Having examined the generic issues in the theory of fundamental pedagogics, I will now look specifically at the complex web of relationships between religion, culture, nationalism and education. As in the previous section, I want to capture the proponents' original claims and I will therefore generally withhold – for the moment – my own voice of critique.

As the main architect of the three-phased framework for pedagogics (see 2.4.2), Landman obviously has to deal with a set of ontological and epistemological dilemmas. One such dilemma concerns the need to reconcile the scientific with the post-scientific sphere. He seeks a solution through his phenomenological methodology, by claiming that there are 'two fundamental acts present in phenomenological analysis'. These two acts are the 'philosophy of life permissibility' (*Lewensopvatlike toelaatbaarheid*) and 'scientific necessity' (*Wetenskaplike noodwendigheid*) (Landman, 1979:29-30). According to this view, a phenomenologist will not implement a reflective step which is contrary to his particular philosophy of life. He is of the opinion that 'no human being should be prepared to do anything which is contrary to his philosophy of life; this also applies to science'. He adds, 'A human being (also the scientist) always remains a religious being and a particular manner of realising religiousness is life philosophy'. (Landman, 1988:451).

When the 'scientific phase' of fundamental pedagogics converges with what is termed as 'a philosophy of life', we start to recognise how this theory of education became part of the legitimisation of apartheid and Christian National Education. For the proponents of fundamental pedagogics, the 'philosophy of life' that seems best suited to pass the 'philosophy of life permissibility test' is Christianity, more particularly Calvinism. We

can now say that for them, bringing up children (pre-scientific) or theorising about it (scientific) is a form of 'realizing religiousness' as is the post-scientific phase.

Griessel and Oberholzer (1994:68) claim that 'nobody is born with a preformed set of values', but that these are 'instilled in the child through identification with his educators'. Adulthood is reached only when 'man identifies himself completely with a specific way of life'. They also claim that, as an adult, one is capable 'of maintaining a consistent obedience to his philosophy of life and the demands of propriety which result from it'.<sup>6</sup>

The proponents of fundamental pedagogics believe that there are different cultural heritages for different (ethnic, race) groups, and that in their opinion these groups themselves do not only naturally consider themselves different but also superior. Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:450) maintain that:

When we look for the meaning (deeper significance), goal and value of life, different groups of people give different answers. Any particular group always considers its own outlook ... as the best.

The proponents of fundamental pedagogics (Kilian & Viljoen, 1974:231-237; Griessel & Oberholzer, 1994:65-69) all agree that a state of adulthood is reached when an individual satisfies a number of criteria and conditions. In their terminology, they call these the 'pedagogic aim structures', the goals of education:

- an awareness of life as a meaningful existence;
- self-judgment and self-understanding;
- worthiness of being human;
- morally independent choosing and acting;
- responsibility;
- norm identification; and
- the attainment of a philosophy of life.

---

<sup>6</sup> Margetson (1981:121) points at the irony that the achievement of Protestantism itself was an act of disobedience against the established church at that time. He suggests that acknowledging this would refute such a statement about obedience in adulthood.

Fundamental pedagogics acknowledges that there are many different ways of giving meaning to these 'pedagogic aim structures' in the actualisation of adulthood, but they are quite clear about what is suitable in the context of the 'cultural heritage' of the Afrikaners. Landman (1979:179) outlines:

Just like any other people (*volk*), the Afrikaners can claim their own national character (*volkskarakter*) of which they can rightfully be proud. Some of the essences of the Afrikaner National principles are: religion, fatherland, community, blood-ideology, history and tradition, mother tongue and education policy.

I will now elaborate on the religious and the nationalist aspects of this self-proclaimed 'cultural heritage'. When it comes to religion, , Landman (1979:179) claims that 'the Afrikaner is pre-eminently a Church-being, who accepts the Bible as the infallible and guiding word of God'. This would explain why the academic focus of fundamental pedagogics at a post-scientific stage concentrates predominantly (in some texts even exclusively) on how education can be founded on Calvinist doctrine and religion (Schoeman, 1975, 1979; Landman & Roos, 1973; Landman, 1979; M.O. Oberholzer, 1983).

The proponents of fundamental pedagogics hold differing opinions about how one explains or justifies the place of religion in a scientific study of education. Landman set the dominant tone of the three-staged phenomenon, and he is followed by most fundamental pedagogists. Schoeman (1975) disagrees; he is of the opinion that the distinction between different scientific phases is superficial and that it distracts from the 'Absolutism of the Creator'. For the same reason, he rejects the idea of education as an autonomous science. He believes that for the Calvinist there is only one truth, namely Christ. Schoeman (1975:52) believes that

for the Calvinist, scientific neutrality does not exist: nothing and nobody can be neutral in relationship to God ... (and therefore) ... science or the scientist cannot be neutral towards the Word of God.

He rejects the premise of phenomenological reduction that one has to suspend one's belief in God in order to be able to reveal universal truth.



Turkstra (1978) believes that Schoeman is influenced by the work of the Dutch Calvinist educator Waterink, rather than the education phenomenology of Langeveld.<sup>7</sup> In spite of their ontological and methodological differences, both Schoeman and Landman focus on 'the Christian educator' and how a scientific study of education will affirm education in the service of God.

On the issue of nationalism, Roos (1973:94), later reinforced by Landman (1979:179), is of the opinion that

The Christian-Afrikaner knows that he works best in the place where God meant him to be, and if he works with his own people. (... In such circumstances ..) he can – through a bond of mutual love, care and understanding – achieve voluntary and willing co-operation . Because an Afrikaner realises that he can best serve God and his fellow human beings in his own community, he does not begrudge others their own communities and space, so that all people can live peacefully together in their own ethnic groups or nations.

Roos (1973) and Landman (1979:179-180) believe that differences between people are not only culturally based but also physically embedded in race groups. Roos (1973:94) adds that 'an Afrikaner attaches special value to the purity of the blood of the White race' and that they have a 'deep rooted aversion against mixing blood with non-White races'.

There is an assumption not only that 'white blood' should remain 'pure', but that any form of ethnic mixing should be discouraged. Van der Walt (1983:156), for instance, explains that 'one of the dangers lurking in a pluralistic or multiracial society' is the possibility that 'one of the cultural or ethnic groups may feel it is busy losing its identity'. He illustrates his point by suggesting that 'the Swazi people', living next door to the 'culturally powerful Zulu Nation' run the risk of 'having their cultural identity impaired' unless they take 'deliberate measures to counteract the Zulu influence'.

Griessel (1983:168) suggests that in order 'to arouse the national sentiment in the child, we must make sure that he is familiar with the religion, traditions, customs and history of his people'. He is of the opinion that

To be a South African neither the Afrikaner, nor his English compatriot has to become someone other than he already is. However, the English and Afrikaners alike have to give meaning to national coexistence.

In 1994 (the year of the first democratic elections in South Africa), Griessel repeats this idea, but accommodates the new political dispensation when he writes with M.O. Oberholzer (1994:75):

To become a South African neither the Afrikaner, English-speaking South African, Jew, Indian nor Black need become something other than what he is, yet they must all give meaning and significance to their national coexistence.

It becomes clear that the advocates of fundamental pedagogics believe that the phenomenon of education is best enacted in separate cultural, racial and ethnic groups. While the universals of education are not context specific, education as it occurs in every day life (in the pre-scientific stage), or the way it is given particular meaning (in the post-scientific stage) should occur in separate groups. This view can be scientifically justified, according to fundamental pedagogists, because conditional to a well-functioning pedagogic relation are trust, understanding and authority (see 2.4.2). Clearly implied here is that such a relationship would not be possible or desirable between people of different race or ethnic groups, since they do not share a common value system.

Griessel and M.O. Oberholzer's (1994) concession to Jewish, non-Christian Indian and black people of South Africa indicates something of a willingness to recognise religious pluralism. This recognition was absent in earlier texts which dealt with fundamental pedagogics and its link to Christian Nationalism. Prior to this concession they may have

---

<sup>7</sup> For a detailed account of Schoeman's suppositions and Calvinist Education in South Africa in general, see Turkstra (1987:68-99).

sanctioned the practice of diverse cultural manifestations but responded less tolerantly towards religious differences. As Landman (1979:179) explains,

(because the ...) Christen-Afrikaner knows that civilisation ought to be Christian-National, they accept their calling to bring other people the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

This belief had been long communicated to teachers. There is one such example in the December 1960 issue of the *Bantu Education Journal*, which was directed at teachers who worked in African primary and secondary schools. Greyling (1960:608) motivates the Christian character of 'Bantu schools' by quoting from Dr. D.W.T. Shropshire's *The Church and Primitive Peoples*:

It is shown that in Bantu society ... religion permeates, penetrates and forms the basis and the mainstay of the whole social order ... that it is the concern not so much of the individual (...but..) of the group. It becomes necessary to deal with institutions as religious, which in a civilised society are sometimes differentiated as secular, such as: government, economics, education, marriage and the practice of medicine.

Greyling deduces from this that 'when one speaks of self-development' (as in own affairs), one has to take into consideration the 'spiritual tendencies (*inslag*) of the Bantu's', and he believes that 'if Bantu Education really wants to educate, education will have to be founded on a (...religious...) basis'. In his article, he recognises that there has been resistance against what he names 'the development schemes' but explains that 'this is due to the false content of (the Bantu's) spiritual tendencies' and he suggests that these tendencies must be replaced by 'true and healthy' ones. Greyling (1960:609) justifies this spirit of proselytism by saying:

Separate development is, in essence, right and it deserves our full support, as long as we can distinguish between true and false meanings that are attached to concepts which are peculiar to particular (ethnic) groups.<sup>8</sup>

Landman (1979:180) proudly announces that South Africa is 'the only country in the world that bases its official education system on Christianity'. Roos (1973:95) refers to the 1967 law on Christian National Education as the final outcome of 'the deepest convictions that have guided our people' and states that without these 'educational aspirations the Afrikaners would have ceased to be a nation a long time ago'. In this way, education comes to be seen not only as vital to the individual, but also to the survival of (ethnic) groups or nations.

The Christian aspect, it is believed, should encompass national thought and aspirations. Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:307) state explicitly it is 'not merely arbitrary where one puts Christian and National'; there is a specific order which reflects that the 'Christian ideal must be first and foremost and must also first be realised and materialised'. The reverse order (National Christian) was rejected because it would mean that 'the nation's aspirations and national heritage (would) come first and therefore supersede the Christian ideal' (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:307).

Van der Walt (1983:156-157) outlines five basic principles that underpin Christian National Education:

- (1) The Afrikaner life-concept is Christian (more specifically: Calvinistic).
- (2) The Afrikaner culture ... should be preserved at all cost. In the school, this means that a child should be taught in the Afrikaans language until he has reached the age where he can decide for himself in which language he wishes to be instructed.
- (3) Christian religious instruction should be included in the school curriculum for Afrikaner children.
- (4) Parents should have a direct say in the spirit and the non-professional affairs of the school.
- (5) That what the Christian Afrikaner demands for himself, for his children and for the education of his children in schools, should be granted to the same extent to all other South Africans, irrespective of religion, age, sex, colour, race or culture.

Van der Walt believes that 'historic circumstances' forced the Afrikaner to lay a 'deliberate emphasis on the first four elements' of these Christian National Education

---

<sup>8</sup> My translation of: 'Eiensoortige ontwikkeling is wesenlik reg en verdien ons hartlike ondersteuning

principles. At the time of writing his article (1983) Van der Walt believed that the Afrikaner community has 'succeeded in consolidating its position' and 'can today afford to lay the necessary stress' on the last principle (Van der Walt, 1983:157). He believes that Christian National Education is misunderstood for a number of reasons, one of them being the 'Englishman's inclination not to think in neat structures, but to adopt a policy of *ad hoc*' (Van der Walt, 1983:164). He is convinced that the English have 'no regard for tradition, culture or group identity' and that, by contrast, an Afrikaner is typified as a 'monolithic thinker, whereby his religion, politics, education and identity are all of one piece'.

Like Van Rensburg and Landman earlier, Van der Walt (1983:166) explains that religion encompasses all other aspects of life: 'One's religion determines the way one sees the aims, content and method of education, ... (and)... it determines the way one sees discipline and authority (essential in a pedagogic relation – my insertion) in an educational setting'. By evoking religion, he justifies the idea that parents should, by extension, also have a say in the ethnic character of a school:

...one's religion tells one what kind of school one wants for one's children. It would also tell something of the ethnic character and the cultural aspect of the school one wants one's children to attend (Van der Walt, 1983:166).

This belief, affirmed by Christian National Education principles, means that one not only differentiates between Christians and non-Christians but also recognises ethnicity as a dividing point. This apartheid perspective is justified in biblical terms by quoting passages which, according to Van der Walt (1983:166), prove that there are 'sound Biblical grounds for distinguishing between Christians who are Zulu's, who are Afrikaners, who are English or whatever'. Notwithstanding Griessel and Oberholzer's (1994) attempt to accommodate some religious pluralism, the official policy of Christian National Education framed state-provided education clearly in a Christian mode.

---

solank ons egter ook onderskei tussen ware en valse inhoude van begrippe wat eiensoortig is'.

The professional teacher's role was seen as crucial in transferring the spirit of Christian National Education to the youth of South Africa through formal schooling. It was therefore important that student teachers were taught the theory of fundamental pedagogics as a conceptual basis for their practice. Teachers already in service were given the opportunity to improve their academic qualifications through a system of grants for every recognised university course successfully completed at UNISA.<sup>9</sup>

In the next section of this chapter, I will investigate how the image of the teacher as a professional educator is constructed by the proponents of fundamental pedagogics.

#### **2.4.4 Fundamental pedagogics and the image of the teacher**

Fundamental pedagogics distinguishes between teaching (*onderwys*), by professionals who work in schools, and education (*opvoeding*), as practised by any adult who is in an 'education relation' with a child (see 2.4.2). A good teacher is both a teacher and an educator. According to Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:496), teachers are 'educators *par excellence*, by virtue of the opportunities afforded them to educate through teaching'. The teacher's responsibilities at school are a continuation of the parents' responsibilities at home, as Landman (1972:103-104) stresses:

There are no fundamental differences between the pedagogic tasks at home and at school ... the teacher replaces the parent as educator in school and is thus accountable for the responsibilities that were accepted at the time of baptism of the child. The acceptance of baptism presupposes and enforces the unity between home and school.

In order to really get to know the children in his or her class and to ensure a smooth transition between home and school, Duminy (1968:21) suggests that 'a teacher should mix with them off duty and try to know as much as possible about them, their parents and their background'. In the context of apartheid it would be considered highly undesirable to forge such relations between parents and teachers of different racial backgrounds.

---

<sup>9</sup> An announcement to that effect appeared in a special newsletter directed at teachers in the October

De Vries (1978:38) also believes that the essentials of the 'educative occurrence' – an adult (with the intention to lead or guide the child), a child (who is in need of such guidance) and a goal (adulthood) – also apply in the relationship between teachers and children at school. A teacher and a child are thus in a pedagogic relationship. A teacher's primary task is to educate children, not only in the sense of simply instructing them, which would solely deal with the intellectual side of children, but to educate them in a much broader sense. According to Griessel (1983:187) a teacher is

a conveyer of knowledge as well as a moral guide ... (to children, and) ... the authority of a teacher is primarily determined not by what he says, but rather by who he is, what he believes in, and by his radiating power. <sup>10</sup>

De Vries (1978:39) states that a child is 'unified in body, soul and spirit' and that it would be artificial to address these three parts separately in the process of education'.<sup>11</sup> Good education involves 'educative teaching' which is concerned with 'considerably more than the child's intellectual activities; it penetrates its inner, spiritual existence (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:496)'. Teachers have to be taught the 'science of educative teaching', or 'didactics', as one of the part-disciplines of pedagogics (Griessel & Oberholzer, 1994:6).

The teacher is expected to play an important role in the life of a child who, according to the theory of fundamental pedagogics, is in need of moral guidance. An educator's (and therefore also a teacher's) job is only completed when a child can demonstrate a capacity for moral self-determination (*sedelike selfbepaling*) (Griessel, 1984:192). Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:402) warn us that '...the youthful conscience relies strongly on support from adult counsel...', and a teacher must imbue an 'integrity of

---

1980 issue of *Educamus* (formerly: *The Bantu Education Journal*).

<sup>10</sup> My translation of: 'Die onderwyser se invloed hang nie primêr af van wat hy sê nie, maar van sowel wat hy is en glo as van wat uit hom uitstraal'.

<sup>11</sup> My translation of: 'Die kind is en bly 'n eenheid van liggaam, siel en gees en daarom kan daar van die aparte opvoeding van een of ander aspek van die kind geen sprake wees nie'.

conscience, which is realised through a sense of inner morality'. Moral development has special significance in the light of the belief that:

Because of the Fall (the original sin) it is impossible for human beings to observe complete obedience to the Word of God, but this doesn't mean that our mission to uplift the child (*opvoedeling*) is obsolete. Moral education is possible because human beings, in spite of the original sin, are conscious of good and evil (M.O. Oberholzer, 1983:364).

The nature of the responsibilities of teachers, and of course particularly principals, demand that they are of impeccable behaviour. Olivier (1964:190), the then Inspector of Bantu Education in Tzaneen, warns teachers and principals to take their duties seriously:

The Teacher and especially the Principal have a special responsibility towards their community ... if teachers are of good Christian persuasion, they will instill the right virtues in their pupils: honesty, obedience, industriousness, tolerance, a willingness to help and unselfishness. A teacher must not only have knowledge, but also a virtuous personality: he has to subscribe to a Christian way of life. A teacher must never forget that he is and always will be an educator (*opvoeder*).

Although Griessel (1983:187) states that a teacher cannot be expected to be infallible, he feels that one must 'formulate certain prerequisites to which a teacher should adhere'. The list of virtues seems daunting. A good teacher should be

a strong, pleasant, dynamic personality, of impeccable behaviour, honest, responsible, respectful of authority, forgiving, trustworthy, sober, unselfish and dedicated, frank, willing to sacrifice, accurate, punctual, patient and hard-working, enduring, capable of showing solidarity and especially empathetic.

A teacher is not only concerned with the development of individual children. Griessel (1983:188) mentions that a teacher's primary task is to preserve and reproduce the particular culture of the group (nation, *etc.*) that the teacher and child belong to. It seems self-evident that the teacher and the children should belong to the same culture, in order to be able to capture and transfer the salient norms and values embedded in



particular cultural practices (see also 2.4.3). A child's gradual moral growth will eventually result in 'responsible emancipation', though this is only possible if a child shows an increasing capacity to understand the content of the curriculum such as 'Science, History, Mathematics *etc.*' as

formations of a particular cultural group (such as: Afrikaans-speaking white South Africans or Sotho-speaking black South Africans).<sup>12</sup>

Landman (1972:188) strongly believes that it is better to keep racial and ethnic groups separate, and he points out that 'forced fraternisation', such as forced racially-integrated schooling, has led to racial clashes in the United States. Separate schooling can foster good race relations if a teacher instills the 'right attitude' towards other race groups in his pupils.

Landman (1979:181-188) contrasts three possible attitudes towards other race groups: (1) authoritarian, (2) liberal and (3) scientifically-based. The authoritarian attitude is characterised by hatred and discourteous behaviour. The liberal attitude leads to confusion: it falsely denies the existence of cultural differences and thus endangers the preservation of a nation's history (*volksgeschiedenis*). The scientifically-based attitude acknowledges that each child is 'someone who wants to be someone himself'.

Landman (1979:188) resolutely rejects the first two options in favour of the third attitude, which is one of the basic premises of fundamental pedagogics. According to Landman, a good teacher is an anti-authoritarian and anti-liberal teacher who will:

(i) wipe out all authoritarian attitudes in his pupils; (ii) destroy the sickly liberal attitude and (iii) actively encourages an understanding and trusting attitude.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> My translation of: 'Dit word dan slegs moontlik wanneer die kind al meer en meer die vermoë openbaar om die leerstof vir homself toe te eien ... as vormingstelsels van 'n besondere kultuurgroep (byvoorbeeld Afrikaanssprekende blanke Suid-Afrikaners of Sothosprekende swart Suid-Afrikaners.'

<sup>13</sup> The idea of trust towards other races poses something of a dilemma to Landman. Although he is clear that trust here means 'trust-at-a-distance' (*Vertroue op 'n afstand*), he asks: 'Should we deliberately organise opportunities to gain trust in the actual presence of people of colour, or are the ordinary everyday encounters enough to establish trust?' (my translation of: 'Moet daar nou op georganiseerde

Greater than the threat of 'authoritarian' or 'liberal' attitudes is the threat of communism. Basson (1982:91) warns teachers in the journal *Die Unie* of the 'Communist Neo-Marxist and Liberal alliance' which he believes threatens the youth of South Africa. He suggests that on scrutinising this alliance it will become clear that

it is the communist who is really in command, where there is so called 'co-operation', even though it may not seem like that. If you lift up his mask, you will find an intriguer and a spoiler *par excellence*, a thick-skinned fighter who plays the game only by his own rules.

According to Van Rensburg and Landman (1988: 310), communism denies the individuality of a child and the need to 'become someone', because it 'absolutises and conceals the education relation by over-emphasising one mode of being' (a common or collective identity). Under communism, education becomes indoctrination. Oberholzer and Griessel (1994:19-20) warn us that the boundary between these two concepts is easily crossed when:

the dignity of the child is violated in an effort to promote purely political goals. (In the school system) ... the design of the syllabus and prescribed textbooks are carefully planned, so that there ... can be political socialisation. Every school subject is bound by the principles of Communism. All youth movements are directly controlled by political commissioners: the child must be conditioned (...to...) accept (Communism) with unconditional subjectivity.

According to M.M. Kruger (1979b:30-32), teachers who have gained the scientific knowledge of fundamental pedagogics should be able to differentiate between education and indoctrination. Kruger wrote regular features in the journal *Educamus* on fundamental pedagogics as a form of in-service teacher training.<sup>14</sup> In the February 1979 issue, he urges teachers to master the scientific concepts of fundamental pedagogics. In September, he provided an agreeable set of principles to explain the meaning of science:

---

wyse geleentheid geskep word om vertrouensensies te beoefen in die lyflike teenwoordigheid van anderkleuriges, of is die alledaagse ontmoetinge genoeg om vertrou te laat gedy?

- (a) Scientific knowledge should be universally valid.
- (b) This knowledge should give the bearer thereof a firm grip on reality.
- (c) However certain the knowledge is, further scientific findings and explanations may require him to change his mind where new perspectives on reality are revealed.
- (d) Scientific knowledge must help man to understand the human world in which he is compelled to live and let live. Science is not meant to supply the answers to superhuman questions.
- (e) Scientific knowledge should be supplemented with transcendental knowledge, obtained from a particular life-view (philosophy of life). The Christian should therefore maintain that it is absolutely necessary that scientific knowledge be borne by Christian principles (Viljoen, 1978, quoted in Kruger, 1979).

What we have seen in this section is that fundamental pedagogics projects an image of the teacher as the embodiment of Christian (Calvinist) values, a person who is armed with scientific knowledge and who can play a significant role in leading a child to adulthood.

This concludes the review of the literature by the proponents of fundamental pedagogics. In the next part of this chapter, I will examine the critique that has been leveled against them by South African academia.

## **2.5 The Critics of Fundamental Pedagogics**

### **2.5.1 Introduction**

Following the conclusions drawn in sections 2.3 (Surveying the Battlefield) and 2.4.1 (The Landscape...), we can expect the main critics of fundamental pedagogics to be white, English-speaking South Africans. We would be right. With few exceptions, they

---

<sup>14</sup> These articles were primarily meant as study notes for teachers who were improving their qualifications through UNISA, but were also directed at all other teachers as a form of INSET (In Service Teacher Training).

launched their critique from their base at the English-medium 'Historically White Universities' (currently known as 'Historically Advantaged Institutions'), such as the University of the Witwatersrand or the University of Natal.

Many of these critics would participate in the annual Kenton Conference,<sup>15</sup> where critiques against fundamental pedagogics were amongst the papers that were debated. Criticism still features regularly in the University of Witwatersrand based journal *Perspectives in Education*. The most comprehensive discussion of the dilemmas surrounding fundamental pedagogics, however, is without a doubt the 1982 publication *Problems of Pedagogics*, a collection of papers edited by Beard and Morrow.

In addition to South African based critiques, there have also been some international analyses from academics based in the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Australia. Their work is included in this review of the literature.

Fundamental pedagogics has come under scrutiny from a multi-disciplinary viewpoint. The critique has focused on several key areas of analysis, and spans educational, philosophical, political, sociological and linguistic perspectives. In sections 2.5.2 to 2.5.6 I will examine their main claims.

### **2.5.2 Say what?**

If one acquires the language of these people, one can embroider for pages an idea which could be expressed in a few sentences, or perhaps in a few letters. There doesn't even have to be an idea. Their language is self-propelled and so profound that no-one can grasp it. The principle is simple: the more difficult the word one uses, the more difficult one's subject. After a while, it is so difficult that one can't write about it in Afrikaans anymore. Then – o joy! – one fabricates words, that *look* like Afrikaans words, little monsters and unnatural outgrowths with Afrikaans names (Bertyn, 1983:1).

---

<sup>15</sup> The first of these annual conferences of education academics was held at Kenton-on-Sea (hence the name). Reviews and commentary on these conferences have been published in *Perspectives in Education*.

One level of criticism against fundamental pedagogics is directed at its inaccessible language. Bertyn's despair (above) testifies to the fact that this does not only affect those who have difficulty understanding Afrikaans, as Bertyn's first language is Afrikaans.

Bertyn seems to have created an 'emperor with no clothes effect' on the rest of the critics. Gluckman (1983:111) admits that she now has gathered the courage to speak out against the language that is used in pedagogics. She humorously admits that, prior to reading Bertyn's outrage, she always considered the possibilities that her 'understanding was deficient', or that the 'translator was at fault' or that because the writers were all professors and doctors of education, they 'knew what they were talking about'. Similarly, before Chisholm and Randall (1983:107) begin to comment on a new, pedagogics-inspired perspective on the 'History of Education', they feel that they need 'to decode some of Professor Coetzee's language to actually understand what he is saying'.<sup>16</sup> Reagan (1990:66) views fundamental pedagogics as a classic case of the 'use of academic language to mystify and reify, relatively simple and straight-forward ideas'.

The critics generally agree that the use of pretentious and complex language takes educational discussions out of the realm of the general public and thus fosters an ethic of 'leave it to the experts'. According to Reagan (1990:166), the deliberate use of expert jargon also results in 'divorcing classroom practice from meaningful theoretical discourse, and vice versa'.

### 2.5.3 Says who? 'slegs vir ingewydenes'<sup>17</sup>

A second problem expressed by the critics concerns their difficulty in entering into a meaningful debate with the proponents. The critics agree that a substantial debate is virtually impossible. Beard (1981:243) concludes that pedagogics is

---

<sup>16</sup> Chisholm and Randall in their response to Prof. Coetzee's (1983) article on metagogics, in which he sets out the principles of metagogics as his preferred alternative to 'History of Education'.

<sup>17</sup> 'only for the initiated'

inaccessible to the non-pedagogician (phenomenologist) ... (who) ... cannot understand the terminology, for it refers to the phenomenological activity involved and can only be understood by doing what the terms designate, namely becoming a pedagogician.

Nicholls (1990:37), too, stumbles and falls as he tries to engage with the theory of fundamental pedagogics. He believes that, as a system of knowledge, fundamental pedagogics is a closed circuit. He accuses the proponents of 'laager thinking' that suffers from 'intellectual incest'. The critics believe that the terms of the debate have been circumscribed by the presuppositions of fundamental pedagogics in such a way, that they exclude the possibility of a rational dialogue. Enslin (1990:87) states that 'under the regime of fundamental pedagogics', only 'those initiated into the rules of science, and who recite the true educational doctrine of Christian Education are qualified to speak'. All others, by refusing to exclude the political from their theoretical discourse, may not speak. Parker (1981:26) concludes that 'given its own presuppositions, the fundamental pedagogician's view of education is correct', and since fundamental pedagogics is 'remarkably consistent and free of contradiction', Parker suggests that a debate between the pro's and the anti's is senseless. There cannot be a rational debate because a commitment to the presuppositions is 'irrational' and based on a 'leap of faith'. Once accepted, the presuppositions themselves become 'arbiters of what counts as rational'. Nicholls (1990:37) wonders:

What is the purpose of a theoretical academic orientation that we can't judge critically? If one does not accept ...(its)... presuppositions as authoritative, one is seen as acting from one's own debased desires and egoism. A Catch-22 situation exists. No academic engagement is possible.

#### **2.5.4 'Unexplained, if not inexplicable?'**

The possibilities for debate are not only constrained by the use of language and by presuppositions that are not open to challenge, but also by the fact that the terminology in fundamental pedagogics is abused. Fouché (1982:159) questions the validity of the claim of fundamental pedagogicians that they derived their theory from the phenomenological philosophy of Husserl and Heidegger. Based on her assessment of the

work of Landman, Fouché concludes that indeed, it ‘borrows from phenomenological terminology’ but that the use of this terminology is ‘misappropriated’. For example, she argues that although Landman distinguishes between prejudice and presuppositions (see also 2.4.2) and that he therefore (like Heidegger and Langeveld) rejects Husserl’s view of the phenomenological method as presuppositionless, he fails to explain clearly his own position or his position *vis-à-vis* Heidegger or Merleau-Ponty’s epistemological claims. Unlike Langeveld, Landman (or from my reading, any of the other proponents of fundamental pedagogics) does not explain how and why he diverges from Heidegger or Husserl, whom he claims as his sources. As Fouché (1982:162) concludes, ‘Landman limits the term reduction to a reduction to essences, thereby mutilating Husserl’s reduction.’

Similarly, she calls Landman’s use of Heideggerean terms (such as *Dasein*) ‘not only eccentric, but unexplained, if not inexplicable’. Fouché sets out a number of examples that illustrate the differences between Heidegger’s philosophy and the fundamental pedagogician’s use of his theory. Pedagogicians simply seem to practise, what Fouché (1982:165) says ‘can charitably be called bad phenomenology’. She accuses them of using phenomenology for their own ideological reasons. By doing so, she claims, they have brought phenomenology ‘into disrepute among many philosophers and educationists in South Africa’.

Segal (1993), too, rejects the idea that fundamental pedagogics practices phenomenology. Instead, he argues, they ‘engage in a kind of etymological analysis of the origin of the words’. He believes there are contradictions between the formal claims in fundamental pedagogics and its actual practice. After analysing Viljoen and Pienaar (1971), Segal (1993:181-182) concludes:

He [Viljoen] never accounts for the relationship between what he says and what he does. I would like to call this contradiction between saying and doing an ontological or existential contradiction. (rather than) logical ... (because it concerns a) ... contradiction between a statement and an activity.

Segal suggests that fundamental pedagogics needs to 'give substance to their concepts of phenomenological and etymological analysis'.

Enslin (1981:151-152) finds 'conceptual confusion' when she challenges the notions of 'validity' and 'truth' in fundamental pedagogics. She alleges that validity is presented in terms of 'the logical form of an argument, and truth is a question of the factual or material content of a statement'. Fundamental pedagogics not only fails to make a clear distinction between 'validity' and 'truth', but also takes an ambiguous stand on the 'criterion of objectivity' and it espouses a 'naive view of verification'. Enslin finds fundamental pedagogics, as a theory of knowledge, 'quite inadequate'.

MacLeod (1995) critiques the idea that fundamental pedagogics should be seen as a human science rather than a social science, as suggested by Higgs. Higgs (1994a, 1994b) argued that fundamental human values are 'perennial and the domain of the human sciences, while the transient social and cultural values are the domain of the social sciences'. MacLeod believes that this divide between the individual and society is artificial because the one could not exist without the other. She concludes that this caveat becomes

a platitude, as (Higgs) lacks the theoretical tools with which to indicate exactly *how* the social and cultural are linked to human existence (MacLeod, 1995:68).

Margetson (1981:195) rejects the 'puritanical compartmentalising of the pre-scientific, scientific and post-scientific spheres'. He maintains that if

...both scientific and post-scientific activities are matters which are practised ... (then) ... there must be some connection or similarity between the spheres. But any such connection or similarity detracts from the complete authority and superiority of science: if science begins to resemble the practices of everyday life, then the walls of the compartment reserved for science being to crumble.

Compartmentalisation of knowledge also suggests that there are at least two types of knowledge: a scientific type which holds universalist validity, and a particular type which



has validity in one specific context (such as within one culture, but not in another). Margetson (1981:196) finds that the criteria for such distinction are not sufficiently clarified and suggests, therefore, that the differentiation is 'obscure if not non-existent'.

The concept of 'philosophy of life' does not help to explain MacLeod's *caveat* or Margetson's objections. By focusing on the work of P.C. Luthuli, Morrow (1989:26-27) takes issue with this concept. He maintains that the term is used 'in many different contexts', and in an incoherent manner. Morrow finds that there is an 'ownership problem'. When Luthuli maintains, for instance, that there are 'as many philosophies of life as there are people' (Luthuli, cited in Morrow, 1989:27), he does not explain what he means. Morrow wonders,

How many 'philosophies of life' are there (just to keep it simple) in South Africa?

Morrow considers several options: There could be two 'philosophies of life' – one black and one white. This option is created by Luthuli's frequent use of the phrase 'Black philosophy of life'. There could also be more, as Luthuli speaks of a 'Zulu philosophy of life' which implies there could be a 'Tswana philosophy of life', a 'Venda philosophy of life', and so on. This option may be too limited as well, however. Morrow starts to marvel at the endless possibilities of an 'Empangeni philosophy of life', an 'Ulundi philosophy of life', a 'Soweto (Zulu) philosophy of life', a 'Soweto (Sotho) philosophy of life', or perhaps even a 'Kuils River philosophy of life'.

Morrow (1989:32-33) also questions the tacit assumption that a particular 'philosophy of life' can be equated with a particular philosophy of education. He criticises Luthuli's assumption that 'where there are cultural differences, there should be educational differences' (Morrow, 1989:14). Luthuli, as a proponent of fundamental pedagogics, assumes that the ultimate goal of education is adulthood, a concept that assumes meaning in accordance with a particular view of life as embraced by a particular people (see 2.4.2). For Luthuli (1982:31), this means, for instance that '...the driving force behind the intrinsic aim of Zulu education is a Zulu philosophy of life.'

In extending this belief, Luthuli (1981) is of the opinion that it would be 'pedagogically unsound' to provide 'the same education for Whites and Blacks in South Africa'. By adopting the suppositions of pedagogics, Luthuli (1982) believes that education in the context of the Zulu philosophy of life, will have to (like any other particular philosophy of life) conform to the universally valid pedagogic principles as identified by fundamental pedagogics. Morrow (1982:85) responds that, 'This kind of reference to a particular framework of thinking is acutely anti-philosophical.' In later work, Morrow (1989:17) expands on this point:

One central characteristic of a philosophical enterprise is its refusal to regard any authority (scientific, philosophical or otherwise) as beyond the reach of critical scrutiny.

Morrow (1982:103) finds 'massive contradiction' in the position that a 'philosophy of life' is concerned with 'all reality' whilst at the same time it must conform to 'universally valid pedagogic principles'. Morrow concludes that this contradiction stems from the 'unhappy relations between the framework and the filling'. Morrow (1989:35) further clarifies his point:

...framework by Pretoria, filling by locals (e.g. Luthuli). Pretoria will provide the 'universally valid pedagogic principles' and various locals will translate them into 'meaningful' educational policies in terms of their various 'philosophies of life'.

Morrow (1989:41) concludes that Luthuli's (and by extension, fundamental pedagogics') concept of a 'philosophy of life' cannot survive critical scrutiny. The universalist framework of fundamental pedagogics (see the 'scientific phase' in section 2.4.2) is not, as its proponents claim, impartial. As any other framework, it 'places restraints on what kind of fillings it can accommodate' (Morrow, 1989:61).

### **2.5.5 An outgrowth of ideology?**

Ashley (1989) has no doubt that the origins of the 'framework' or the 'filling' of fundamental pedagogics, as referred to by Morrow, are linked to Christian National

Education. He explains that Christian National Education received its first formal codification in 1948, with the publication of the Policy Statement by the Institute for Christian National Education in Potchefstroom. This document set out the Christian National basis of various aspects of education, including the roles of the state, parents and teachers, the content of the syllabus and the education for non-Afrikaner groups of the population. In this context, Ashley quotes the Chair (in 1948) of the Federasie van Afrikaner Kultuurvereniginge (FAK), J.C. van Rooy, who said:

Our Afrikaans schools must ... be the places where our children are steeped and nourished in the Christian National spiritual culture of our nation. We want no language mixing, no cultural mixing, no religious mixing nor racial mixing (Van Rooy, cited in Ashley, 1989:8).

Ashley (1989:8) claims that at this stage of their development Christian National principles and practices were stated in 'straightforward terms, in direct derivation from their base of Calvinist Afrikaner Nationalism'. He believes that the concept of Calvinist Afrikaner Nationalism was 'extensively broadened by two developments'. The first was the advent of fundamental pedagogics, and the second the National Education Policy Act of 1967. Ashley traces fundamental pedagogics to C.K. Oberholzer's *Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde* (1954), and he writes:

(Oberholzer's work) reflected the adoption of a phenomenological mode of analysis and ... resulted in the re-writing of Afrikaner Nationalist educational theory in a manner that has not altered fundamental principles, but rather the way these principles are expressed (Ashley, 1989:8).

Ashley thus sees fundamental pedagogics as an educational expression of Afrikaner Christian Nationalism, imbued with values and beliefs that had their origins in 'the history of Afrikaner nationalism and its struggle for linguistic, religious and national survival' (Ashley, 1989:27).

Kallaway (1983:162) believes that fundamental pedagogics 'arose out of the need to make Christian National Education academically respectable'. As such, it is seen as an

‘outgrowth of the educational ideology of Christian National Education’ (Reagan, 1990:66).<sup>18</sup> Reagan concludes:

(Fundamental pedagogics) is an integral component of the ideological foundation for apartheid, and it thus functions to both justify and legitimate the reality of separate educational systems.... (It) provides an intellectual and ‘scientific’ justification for racist and separatist educational policies.

The critics agree that fundamental pedagogics serves the interests of the ruling ideology. Moreover, says Fouché (1982:165), it is ‘a bad ideology, (...which...) only serves the interests of the White Calvinist Afrikaner group’.

Beard *et al.* (1981:15) conclude:

...the parallels between certain aspects of Pedagogics and certain aspects of the political philosophy of the Government are almost too good to be true. The need for the exercise of authority, for structures, for control, for guidance: they are all present in the political structure.

Parker (1981:27) confirms this, when he examines the notions of ‘freedom’ and ‘authority’ in fundamental pedagogics, in which he finds the embodiment of an ‘authoritarian conception of education’, in which the child must be ‘moulded and inculcated into an attitude of obedience and submission towards authority’. This, according to Parker, fits closely with the ‘prevailing conception of government in which the State is seen as having virtually unlimited powers of coercion over the individual’.

Parker (1981:27) concludes:

What is frightening about Fundamental Pedagogics is that it provides a justification for an authoritarian conception of both education and government which makes the coercive actions of both the teachers and the State correct and by definition right.

---

<sup>18</sup> Reagan's article prompted George Yonge (1990, 1991) (University of California-Davis) to respond, arguing that fundamental pedagogics is a philosophy ‘for education’ and not ‘of education’.

A number of critics find the influence of Calvinism and Christian Nationalism evident in fundamental pedagogics. This influence, says Gluckman (1981:121), culminates in an equation of the terms 'cultural' and 'spiritual'. She also believes that the acceptance of the Calvinist belief in authority leads fundamental pedagogics into a 'patently false conclusion', viz. that 'achievement is only realised through obedience'.

MacLeod (1995, 67-68) uses a post-structuralist framework in her critique. She believes that the educational needs of the child, defined by fundamental pedagogics as dependent and in need of help, 'draws heavily on the Calvinistic notion of the child as born in sin and thus deficient'. By defining the child in this way, 'discursive pedagogical practices' are created, which allow the child to take on the discursive position of 'dependent/incompetent'. In this way, the 'nature' of the child is produced and reproduced.

The critics also agree that fundamental pedagogics plays a role in reproducing the ruling ideology in South Africa by affirming and legitimating the policy of Christian National Education. This policy includes racist features that state that education for black children

(should) preserve the 'cultural identity' of the black community (although it will nonetheless consist in leading 'the native' to acceptance of Christian and National Principles) ... and must of necessity be organised and administered by whites (Enslin, 1988:141).

Christian National Education policy describes the 'native' as being in a state of 'cultural infancy' therefore requiring guidance from the 'superior white culture'. In this way, Enslin (1988:140-141) argues, 'Black children are thus to learn submission to the rules of the established order'. It is not difficult to draw parallels between the projection of black people as being infant-like and the notion in fundamental pedagogics that a child is 'in need of assistance'. Simultaneously, the Christian National Education idea of a 'superior white culture' resonates well with the nature of adulthood and the role of the adult in fundamental pedagogics.

Wolff (1991) agrees. He sees fundamental pedagogics as a 'bizarre cross between Lutheran repression, misunderstood Husserlian phenomenology and sheer naked racism'.

He sees the ‘obsession’ of fundamental pedagogics with ‘adulthood’ as a ‘code for something very nasty’:

Blacks are children, only two generations out of the trees, charming but feckless, manifestly unable to manage their own affairs, unless guided firmly by the appropriate white hand (Wolff, 1991:91).

Wolff does not believe, however, that these ideas are exclusive to Afrikaner Calvinists.

To illustrate this, he quotes the

greatest of all Liberal philosophers, John Stuart Mill, who cautioned that the Principle of Non-Interference was meant to apply only to human beings in the maturity of their faculties, and not to those backward states of society in which the race itself may be considered as in its nonage (Wolff, 1991:92).

Lawrence (1984:90) suggests that analyses of fundamental pedagogics that ignore the broader social structures in which it is produced will be deficient. He maintains that such analyses rest on a false assumption that fundamental pedagogics, as a system of knowledge, can be ‘viewed as separate from the *interests* of the *producers* of that knowledge’ (italics are original). In his critique, Lawrence contests the idea that there is a necessary relationship between the phenomenological method and the conservative social interests that it serves in the South African context.

### **2.5.6 A paradigm for change?**

Given all the previously cited levels of criticism, the critics reject the idea that fundamental pedagogics can play a role in the transition and new dispensation in South Africa. Nicholls (1990:40-41) believes that it will be difficult to decrease or eradicate the influence of pedagogics in teacher education because it is ‘very entrenched and backed by a powerful political lobby’. One of the problems that he sees is the fact that ‘many

teacher educators have been so thoroughly schooled in pedagogic thinking that other philosophies are not amenable to them'.<sup>19</sup>

Enslin (1990) thinks that fundamental pedagogics does not provide us with insights into the social and educational order in South Africa, gives us no alternatives to that order, and does not present ideas on how teachers can contribute to transformation. She contends that:

By excluding the political as a legitimate dimension of theoretical discourse, fundamental pedagogics offers neither a language of critique, nor a language of possibility (Enslin, 1990:78).

MacLeod (1995) also rejects the idea of excluding values in the name of science. She disagrees with 'the idea that the person as subject is separated from the method' in fundamental pedagogics. She explains:

Yonge admits that 'fundamental pedagogic findings almost always are intermingled with pronouncements stemming from the author's philosophy of life'. While he finds this to be a 'serious annoyance', post-structuralists would say that this is precisely the point. Attempting to extract the worldview from the process is an attempt to extract human, as if human were not the central point of human activity (MacLeod, 1995).

Enslin (1990:89) believes that in order to oppose fundamental pedagogics and its symbiotic relationship with Christian National Education, the critics have to counter the 'dominant discourse', challenge its 'presuppositions', restore the 'political from its position of forbidden speech', and overthrow the 'divisive practice of depicting the teacher as expert scientist'.

Segal (1993:181) sees no place for fundamental pedagogics in a changing South Africa, because its procedures of critical scrutiny are 'arbitrary and contradictory' (see Segal in

---

<sup>19</sup> Nicholls (1990:41) suggests that perhaps the best way to challenge fundamental pedagogics is not philosophically or academically, but theologically. It is established in the religious world that there are different theological interpretations which are open to interrogation. This means that 'the religious interpretation implicit in Fundamental Pedagogics can be challenged'.

2.5.4). He reaches the conclusion that fundamental pedagogics 'cannot be used as paradigm to understand change; it needs itself to undergo change'.

Higgs' attempts to effect such paradigmatic change does not convince MacLeod (1995:68). She concludes that Higgs still 'lacks the theoretical tools' to explain the divide that he creates between the 'perennial human values' and the 'transient social and cultural values'. She believes this theoretically constituted divide prevents Higgs from being successful in his attempt to 'rescue fundamental pedagogics'.

The possibility that fundamental pedagogics is a viable theory in a changing education system is also rejected by Hofmeyer and Hall (1995:91). In their synthesis report on the National Teacher Education Audit, they recommend that:

Authoritarian, teacher-centered, single-theory approaches to teacher education, such as Fundamental Pedagogics must be replaced by learner-oriented philosophies and theories of education which are consonant with the values, goals and principles of education reconstruction and a democratic society.

Hofmeyer and Hall suggest that teacher educators may not be conversant with alternative theories, and that they should therefore participate in staff development programmes to acquire new knowledge and skills.

In assessing the critique on fundamental pedagogics, we can conclude that as an education theory its opponents found it: (a) inaccessible and mystifying; (b) unamenable to rational challenges; (c) inarticulate, conceptually confused and contradictory; (d) symbiotically related to Christian National Education and apartheid ideology; and (e) unable to play a role in a changing South Africa.

## **2.6 A Gap in the Literature**

In section 2.3 (Surveying the Battlefield), the debate between the proponents and the critics of fundamental pedagogics was outlined, showing that it has predominantly been



a debate between white Afrikaans-speaking and white English-speaking individuals. Reagan (1990) recognises the rift between, what he calls the 'English philosophy of education', and the 'Afrikaans philosophy of education'. He believes that philosophers of education in the English-speaking universities of South Africa draw on work from the United Kingdom and the United States of America. They are, according to him, engaged in

what must be considered a foreign, even somewhat alien activity, for the referents of their work, and indeed the body of scholars they identify with most closely, are external to South Africa, not only geographically, but more importantly, culturally and ideologically (Reagan, 1990:63-64).

Mistakenly, he assumes that this is not the case with the proponents of fundamental pedagogics, because he states:

If the scholarship of the English philosophers of education is to some extent foreign and imported, such is most certainly not the case for the Afrikaans philosophy of education ... called *fundamentele pedagogiek* (Reagan, 1990:64).

Reagan's assessment poses a number of interesting propositions for this thesis. He implies that English-speaking philosophers of Education in South Africa have equipped themselves with a set of foreign 'theoretical tools', that have been developed out of the immediate context in which they find themselves. His statement assumes that theoretical concepts have a symbolic quality, and that they represent special meaning in the context in which they are produced. He also implies that when these concepts are removed from their original site of production, they take on different meaning and become 'foreign referents'. Reagan does not think that the proponents of fundamental pedagogics work with a set of foreign referents.<sup>20</sup> It is exactly the purpose of this thesis to show that, on the contrary, they did indeed do so.

---

<sup>20</sup> I do not believe that the majority of critics share Reagan's belief. Most of them trace fundamental pedagogics to Langeveld, a Dutch scholar. I must admit though, that I have been surprised at the

By this point, it should be clear that I disagree with Yonge's (1991) assumption that 'fundamental pedagogics as an approach to the study of education knows no citizenship' (see 2.2). I support Giroux's (1992:3) comprehension of pedagogy as

a configuration of textual, verbal and visual practices that seek to engage the processes through which people understand themselves and the way in which they engage others and their environment. It recognises that the symbolic representations that take place in various spheres of cultural production in society manifest contested and unequal power relations. As a form of cultural production, pedagogy is implicated in the construction and organisation of knowledge, desires, values and social practices.

According to Giroux, this means 'respecting the complexity of the relationship between pedagogical theories and the specificity of sites in which they might be developed'.

I believe that the proponents as well as the critics of fundamental pedagogics, each in their own way, have underestimated and disrespected this relationship between theory and site of production. The proponents largely believed that they could simply lift Langeveld's theory without accounting for the immense contextual differences between Holland and South Africa. The critics have indeed linked fundamental pedagogics to its apartheid Christian Nationalist Education context, but have largely ignored the fact that most of its concepts are foreign. The contexts of Holland and South Africa were characterised by divergent socio-economical and political contestations. This thesis assumes that there is a significant connection between knowledge and power in the production of knowledge. Enslin (1990:78) quotes a set of questions from Foucault's (1972) *The Archeology of Knowledge* that adequately captures the dimensions of knowledge and power:

...who is speaking? Who, among the totality of speaking individuals, is accorded the right to use this sort of language...? Who is qualified to do so? Who derives from it his own special quality, his prestige, and from whom, in return does he receive if not assurance, at least the presumption that what he says is true? (Foucault, cited in Enslin, 1990).

---

number of South African academics who assume that Langeveld was an Afrikaner. Certainly all the

By understanding pedagogy in this way, I want to explore an historical dimension that may shed new light on our understanding of the relationship between fundamental pedagogics and its South African apartheid context. This thesis will explore a gap in the literature on fundamental pedagogics. This gap does not allow us to see that the historical relationship between the Dutch and the Afrikaners played a meaningful role in the development of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa. This gap also obscures or denies the fact that Langeveld conceptualised his theory in a particular social, historical and political context that was vastly different from the post 1948 South Africa in which fundamental pedagogics was introduced and further developed.

My claim that fundamental pedagogics sounds so similar, but means something different than Langeveld's theory, will be demonstrated in the final part of this chapter, when I briefly discuss Langeveld's most significant claims and place these in the post Second World War context in which he introduced his education theory to Holland. This final part of the chapter sets out to demonstrate that indeed fundamental pedagogics and Langeveld's theoretical pedagogy do sound similar, and that this is puzzling because the historical contexts in which both these theories were introduced were very different.

## **2.7 Striking and Puzzling: Similarities and Contrasts**

The final section of this chapter outlines Langeveld's main ideas, as expressed in his famous *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, and relates those ideas to their Dutch context.

It falls outside the scope of this study to present an in-depth discussion of Langeveld's contribution to the field of education. This section is brief, and leans heavily on research that has been done by Langeveld scholars A.J. Beekman (interviews), B. Levering (1985, 1991a, 1991b) and I. Weijers (1994, interviews).

---

teachers that I have spoken to assume Langeveld to be an Afrikaner.

The purpose of this final section of Chapter Two is to introduce and describe Langeveld's main concepts and briefly compare them to the main concepts used in fundamental pedagogics. In this comparison, I will refer to some of the earlier sections of this chapter. In addition, I will demonstrate that Langeveld's ideas not only globally resembled those expressed in fundamental pedagogics, but that fundamental pedagogics even uses similar or identical terminology and phrases. Although I briefly reflect on this demonstrated similarity, an in-depth analysis will follow only in the final chapter of this thesis, when the research questions set in this study are discussed.

Following Giroux's (1992) notion of the (political) symbolism of pedagogical theories, this section starts with a brief discussion of the Dutch post Second World War context in which Langeveld introduced his theory.

The Second World War significantly impacted on Dutch society. The late 1940s and the 1950s can be seen as a time when Holland was 'in the scaffolds'<sup>21</sup> of reconstruction and development in an effort to rebuild the society. This meant not only literally the rebuilding of destroyed property, but was also aimed at the reconstruction of the social and economic fabric of society.

It was an era of real optimism, because after all the economic crisis of the thirties and the Fascism of the early forties had been defeated. The challenge was to build a democracy that would promote not only economic growth, but also ensure that the days of totalitarianism were gone forever. The society was seen to be in need of democratic individuals who could contribute positively to the moral and socio-economic reconstruction of a post-war society. Education and schooling were thought to be capable of playing a major role in this reconstruction process, and people were generally optimistic about the possibilities for social engineering.

---

<sup>21</sup> *Holland in the Scaffolds* was the title of an interesting appendix to the *Volkskrant* edition of 24 December 1994. This appendix contained a number of interesting pieces on the spirit of the late 1940s and the 1950s in Holland.

As will be shown in greater detail in Chapter Four, Holland had historically developed a particular way of funding education. All schools, independent of their religious or other basis, received equal financial backing from the state, based on enrollment numbers. Parents had the right to send their children to a school of their own choice. This meant that if you were Catholic you could choose a Catholic school, and if you were a Calvinist you could choose the other. Alternatively there were the neutral, open schools for those who preferred that option.

Schools (teachers) were acknowledged as an important extension of the home (parents), which was considered the primary site for pedagogy. Schools were part of larger networks, apart from the school. There was, for example, the Calvinist church with its Calvinist minister who could be consulted. There was also the Calvinist radio to listen to, Calvinist television to watch, a Calvinist youth movement to spend ones free time with, Calvinist political parties to vote for, a Calvinist union that bargained for you and Calvinist magazines and literature to read. This kind of extensive network was repeated for Catholics, Liberals and Socialists. Each of these networks formed what was referred to as a 'pillar'.

The organisation of higher education also reflected the 'pillarisation' of Dutch society. Although they were not obliged to do so, Calvinist students could opt to study at the Free University of Amsterdam and Catholics could go to the Catholic University in Nijmegen; there were other options for those who preferred a 'neutral' institution, such as the University of Amsterdam or the State University of Utrecht.

Langeveld had obtained his Doctoral degree from the University of Amsterdam in 1931, as a graduate student of Prof. P. Kohnstamm. Kohnstamm had encouraged him to attend lectures by famous philosophers throughout Europe, and Langeveld had taken the opportunity to learn personally from Husserl, Heidegger, Litt, Cassirer, L.W. Stern and Martha Muchow (Klinkers & Levering, 1985:449).

In 1946, a year after the Second World War ended, Langeveld published the first edition of his major work, *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*. In that same year, he also

established education as an autonomous scientific discipline at the State University of Utrecht. As we saw in section 2.4.1, Beyers Nel, who also had been one of Kohnstamm's scholars in Amsterdam in the 1930s, had already taken a similar initiative in 1937 at the University of Pretoria.

Whilst Langeveld recognised the value and interrelatedness of other human and social sciences such as philosophy, sociology and psychology, he claimed the existence of a pedagogic reality which warranted a separate and autonomous scientific field of study. Following on Wilhelm Dithey's distinction between 'natural' and 'human' sciences, Langeveld describes education (pedagogy) as an 'experiential science and a human science, as well as a normative science, that is enacted with practical intentions' (Langeveld, quoted in Klinkers & Levering, 1985:451). Unlike previous educational thinkers, Langeveld proposed to develop scientific knowledge by studying the independent phenomenon of education itself. In Langeveld's own words (1979:34), 'We do not want to interpret ... (the phenomenon of education) ... from a source other than itself'.

In this way he differed radically from previous education theorists who saw education as a realm in which theories and philosophies which were developed outside of the phenomenon of education itself could be applied. Such theorists would take, for example, Calvinism or Catholicism as their point of departure, and then study (and recommend) how the doctrine (of Calvinism or Catholicism) could be enacted in the process of education.

One such prominent academic in education was J. Waterink, who worked at the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam. Throughout his career, Waterink made it clear that he considered all people to be first and foremost God's creatures, and that Biblical (Calvinist) norms should determine what happens in education. He believed that individuals should give meaning to the phenomenon of education on the basis of the Word of God, and that educators should set their goals accordingly. Although he believed that one should assess and accommodate the capacities of individual children, the ultimate goal of education for all children alike was to serve God in the context of

Calvinist morality. There were also prominent education thinkers in other 'pillars', such as J. Hoogveld, who worked at the Catholic University of Nijmegen. His main inspiration came from the work of Thomas of Aquinas.

Significantly, Langeveld formulated a theory that could be applied to educational thinking in **all** of the Dutch 'pillars'. Because his theory was so universalist in its orientation, it was attractive both to individuals who were comfortable in their respective pillars, as well as those who were – in rapidly increasing numbers – moving out of these networks in search of new alternatives. Langeveld's theory articulated the possibility of pluralism in the unfolding of a new post-war Dutch collective identity. As Levering (1991:151) concludes:

Besides the fact that Langeveld was responsible for making post-war pedagogy a factor to reckon with in the Dutch university system, he also contributed significantly to a break-through of pillarisation. Langeveld attempted to develop educational theory that was acceptable to Christian as well as non-religious communities.

Langeveld offered an attractive and convincing framework of ideas on the upbringing of children (*opvoeding*) and education (*onderwijs*), brought together in a framework of pedagogy. He named people as *animal educandum*, by which he meant that people are not only susceptible to pedagogy but also inescapably in need of it in order to become human. We find the same idea echoed in C.K. Oberholzer's (1954) *Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde* (see 2.4.2).

In order to gain scientific knowledge about the phenomenon of education, Langeveld build on Husserl's phenomenological philosophy. Klinkers and Levering (1985:455) state that Langeveld's use of phenomenology is often misunderstood, partially due to the fact that he clarified his position in very few publications. Langeveld made it clear, however that unlike Husserl he had no philosophical intentions with his phenomenology. Langeveld's use of phenomenology was, first and foremost, practical (Weijers, 1994:199). Diverting from Husserl, Langeveld did not recognise transcendental subjectivity as a useful concept in education, because it meant the removal of a focus on

the concrete world and concrete subjects under investigation (Klinkers and Levering, 1985:455), and was therefore not relevant in education as a practical science. Langeveld (1972:110) believed that any attempt to objectify science would result in its 'depersonalisation', and as such would contradict the practical intentions and usefulness of education as a science. Langeveld saw the education process essentially as the 'enactment of values', topped by 'self-responsibility' as the highest attainable value (Klinkers & Levering, 1985:456).<sup>22</sup>

There has been confusion about the use of phenomenology in fundamental pedagogics as well. Landman (1983) did attempt to clarify its utilisation, by following Langeveld's divergence from Husserl's philosophical intentions. According to Landman (1983:61), 'phenomenology primarily refers to a method and not to a philosophy. The time of phenomenological philosophy has lapsed.' Landman's critics believed that he did not adequately account for whatever he felt had caused this 'lapse'. As has been previously outlined in section 2.5.4., the use of phenomenology in fundamental pedagogics was heavily condemned. Criticism, such as that coming from Fouché and Segal for instance, suggested that the utilisation of phenomenology was so unintelligible that it was questionable if one was justified in calling it phenomenology at all. The critics pointed out that whilst Langeveld was clear about his position *vis-à-vis* Husserl, Landman's (and by implication others in fundamental pedagogics) use of phenomenology was anything but transparent.

According to Langeveld (1979), pedagogy is an intentional and normative science, that is to say, education is not merely descriptive but also prescriptive. However, given its claim of autonomy, its norms would have to be determined within the scientific discipline of pedagogy itself, and should not be confused with norms in a particular doctrine. Pedagogy is a science that 'not only wants to know how things are, it wants to know (its object of science) in order to know how to act' (Langeveld, 1979:1). Similarly, fundamental pedagogics proponents Van Rensburg and Landman (1988:414) discuss

---

<sup>22</sup> In a comprehensive (unpublished) research proposal, Levering indicated that it would be interesting to investigate the influence of French existentialist phenomenology on Langeveld's work. According to Levering, there is much to suggest that French philosophers, such as J.P. Sartre and M. Merleau-Ponty, could well have been of greater significance than Husserl, particularly since the 1950s.



pedagogy as a 'normative science'. They state, '...the pedagogician can utilise pedagogic norms to evaluate and even direct particular education situations'.

Langeveld (1979:59) held that the main goal of upbringing (at home) and education (at school) was to raise children in such a way that would enable them to make what he termed 'self-responsible and self-determining' moral choices and decisions in life. He felt that these moral choices could be religiously inspired, but also otherwise, say for instance by Humanism. Good upbringing did not necessarily mean raising your child according to the teachings of a particular doctrine or ideology. Significantly, good upbringing would enable people to find their own personal and unique voice and also find ways of articulating that voice meaningfully (*mondigheid*). These ideas fitted well in post-War Holland, where citizens were expected to contribute constructively to the reconstruction of the society.

The educational (pedagogical) aim of *mondigheid* should be seen in the context of moral development and being truthful (loyal) to one's personal convictions (Weijers, 1994:192). Langeveld believed that a child should gradually learn to take full responsibility for his own convictions and their enacted consequences. In *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*, Langeveld (1979:93) stated:

Human beings are creatures who are capable of making moral decisions.... education cultivates moral self-determination in the unadult ... if someone has decided to enact a moral decision in a particular way, than that is typical for (his) moral judgment, which may be unpersuasive to others, ... one would admit that this judgment is personal ... there may be no one else who recognises the correctness of the decision.... If need be, the (individual) accepts his ultimate solitude and remains all alone – or alone with God – with his moral decision.

Although the circumstances under apartheid and Christian National Education were hardly conducive to the development of *mondigheid* as it was intended by Langeveld, we find the above statement echoed in fundamental pedagogics, when Griessel and Oberholzer (1994:67) state:

Morality as a mode of human existence implies making decisions or choosing. Independence (as being self-dependent), however, implies taking up a stand, and remaining true to one's own choice despite the worst consequence which may occur as a result of such a choice or action. Judged by this criterion, man is therefore adult when he is not only capable of making an independent choice but also upholding and honouring his choice and accepting responsibility, even under adverse circumstances.

In spite of the intentionality of education, not all interactions between adults (parents) and children were seen to fall into the same category. Langeveld (1979:41-44) distinguished between *omgang* (ordinary association, or everyday encounters) between adults and children and *opvoeding*, that is, those encounters where the adult as the educator intentionally used his or her influence and appealed to the educative potential or capacity of the individual child. As Langeveld (1979:41) explained:

There are – without a doubt – many associations between adults, i.e. parents, and children that are not educative. But the association can at any given time be changed to become educative, and is therefore a pedagogically preformed field.

Fundamental pedagogics reverberates this view:

The education situation is the outcome of a particular type of association between at least two people, one of whom is the adult and the other one the adult-in-the-making. Any association of an adult (educator) and a not-yet-adult (educand) creates a preformed pedagogic field. This implies that the associative situation can be changed into a pedagogic situation by the educator (Griessel & Oberholzer, 1994:27).

The existence of so-called ‘educative authority’ (*opvoedingsgezag*) was seen as crucial in the ‘pedagogic situation’ (Klinkers & Levering, 1985:452). Langeveld pointed out that in this relationship of authority, there would be tension between the need for obedience on the one hand and the charge of independence on the other. Whilst most authors saw ‘authority’ and ‘freedom’ as opposites, Langeveld believed that ‘authority creates freedom’ (quoted in Stellwag, 1973:149). He saw educational authority as functional in a relationship where a child accepted and trusted the authority of a parent.

Should trust and acceptance be absent, then an adult could only resort to coercion, which Langeveld did not see as a measure of educative authority. Langeveld (1979:69) believed that adults presuppose and also appeal to a child's potential moral courage to become a 'self-responsible self-determining' adult. According to Langeveld (1979:63-64), it was considered most important that the educator himself had to give the right example:

In the relationship of authority, the personal bond (between educator and child) gradually disappears, but never disappears entirely.... The educator loses his right to speak ... when he merely states (announces) norms. This means that the personal aspect in a relationship of authority is more than a factual instrument. Exercising authority in education presupposes that the educator himself enacts those norms.

Again, we find the same ideas repeated in *Fundamental Pedagogics* (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:426-427):

Characteristic of the pedagogic relationship of authority is the gradual reciprocal involvement of educator and educand in the situation. Gradually, the personal bond in the relationship weakens, though it never disappears entirely. In the situation of authority, the person of the educator is not merely a factual instrument – the true educator is himself follower of the principles that he teaches; hence it is imperative for the maintenance of his authority that the educator should give the clearest evidence of his disciplinary mission and his own subservience to the standards presented to his young charges.

In spite of their common claim that education has prescriptive qualities, both Langeveld and fundamental pedagogics did not mean that pedagogy, as a science, should prescribe what *kind* of morality would be preferable. Both Langeveld and the proponents of fundamental pedagogics claimed that morality remained a personal choice. Fundamental pedagogics suggested that such choices were made and applied in what was termed the 'post-scientific phase', where education is enacted according to a particular 'philosophy of life' (see 2.4.2). In terms of making moral choices, Langeveld (1979:76) also felt that 'the ultimate (substantive) goal of education depends on the (personal) values and their priorities that (the educator) acknowledges'. Compare this to fundamental pedagogics which claimed: 'Pedagogics ... takes cognisance of norms; however, science never

makes a choice between particular values or lays down particular norms for life.... For the educator, these will be norms linked with the philosophy of life as a special rank (order) of values...' (Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:414).

Whilst pedagogy as a science could not decide what or whose morality was preferable, Langeveld believed that as a scientific discipline it should set the parameters of what would be acceptable within a framework of four anthropological axioms. Outside this framework, one could not speak of true education. Langeveld's (1979:76-78) first axiom would also have been acceptable to fundamental pedagogics:

(a) Education is a social phenomenon. The anthropological assumption is that human beings are capable of being influenced by other human beings, should they not be, then they would be incapable of being educated (*onopvoedbaar*).

However, Langeveld's next three, interrelated axioms – again – appear to be difficult, if not impossible, to reconcile with apartheid philosophy, and would also have been highly impractical in the policy context of Christian National Education:

(b) On the other hand, should the social qualities of human beings be seen in such a way that they lack all qualities of individualism, than education would merely be a process of assimilation ...(absorbing)... the dominant perceptions of a collective.

(c) Education therefore demands the moral equality of all of humanity, as well as an acknowledgment of individual differences representative of one's self-image.

(d) Moral equality creates the unity of humanity. In biological terms, all human beings are classified the same. Within this classification, we can distinguish several races ... and individual differences, but the unity of humanity is found in the fact that every individual is capable of making moral decisions and acting upon these (Langeveld, 1979:76-78).

It is of course hardly surprising that we do not find any such references to racial equality in fundamental pedagogics. Rather than seeing moral choices as individual and personal decisions, fundamental pedagogics seemed symbiotically linked to apartheid thinking,

which automatically lumped people of the same race or ethnic group together, as if – mechanistically – they all thought alike and all enacted the same moral principles. Statements that suggest this position are abundant. I refer in particular to section 2.4.3, when we noted that Landman for instance stated that ‘the Afrikaners’ could claim their own ‘national character’, and that they all were ‘eminent church-beings, who accept the Bible as infallible’ (Landman, 1979:179). Roos (1973:94) also believed that ‘Afrikaners work best with their own people’ and he believed that all people should ‘peacefully live together in their own ethnic groups or nations’. The tension between personal and ethnic morality also became evident in section 2.5.4, in Morrow's criticism of Luthuli's notion of a ‘Zulu philosophy of life’.

In conclusion, it appears that the cornerstone of Langeveld's theory, which was that each unique individual should be taught to take full responsibility for his or her own personal beliefs and actions (*zelfverantwoordelijke zelfbepaling*), did not resonate at all with the human conditions that were created in the post-1948 political context of South Africa, where individual identities were made subsidiary to a set of projected, collective group- and ethnic identities. Whereas the idea of ‘self’ in Langeveld's Dutch context clearly meant a personal self, the ‘self’ in South Africa's political context meant an ethnic self, placed in the hierarchical framework of apartheid. Afrikaner Nationalism and its historic link to Calvinism directed the proponents of fundamental pedagogics to apply their pedagogy to a collective ethnically-based cultural and religious sense of self, in spite of their claims of scientific neutrality.

Langeveld, coming from a position where his war-time experiences with Nazi ideology in occupied Holland were still fresh, warned against blind conformism. Although the following statement was not specifically directed at the situation in South Africa, Langeveld's opinion was clear:

Very frequently, one comes across the opinion that the goal of education should be to raise good citizens (*staatsburger*). Undoubtedly, one could only expect from anarchistic pedagogy ... (the desire)... to raise bad citizens. It should be possible, however, that (good) citizens could oppose the state on moral grounds ... seeing the goal of education as raising ‘good citizens’ would mean pure

conformism ... there is the danger of (blind) collectivism, which would replace the capacity for moral self-determination of the individual person, and as such preclude (authentic) education (Langeveld, 1979:95).

It is, perhaps, ironical that whereas Langeveld stressed the practical nature of pedagogy, fundamental pedagogics was, if nothing else, at least highly impractical in the apartheid education context where *mondigheid* and *zelfverantwoordelijke zelfbepaling* would probably have been dangerous concepts if taken seriously.

Given the enormous differences between Holland and South Africa, it seems puzzling indeed why Afrikaner educators and academics wanted to transplant Langeveld's theory to their own context. It is essentially the objective of this research to investigate possible historical reasons that could help us understand why and how this situation came about.

The next Chapter discusses the research methodology, as well as the specific methods that were used to gather and interpret historical data in my quest to find answers to the question stated above.

## **Chapter Three**

### **Travelling Companion or Tour Conductor?**

#### **Researching the Journey of Pedagogics**

### **3.1 Planning the Itinerary**

This Chapter discusses the ontological and epistemological assumptions of the research methodology in this study, as well as the specific methods that were used to gather and interpret the data.

The focus of the research is on the historical and transcontinental journey of fundamental pedagogics, from Holland to South Africa. The main research question posed in this study is:

How does the historical and socio-political context of Dutch-South African linkages in the field of education elucidate the meaning that fundamental pedagogics took on in South Africa?

The basic assumption of the methodology used in the search for meaning, as proposed in the main research question, does not presume that any single study has the ability to capture the 'true' or 'real' meaning of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa. Major differences of opinion between advocates and critics were highlighted in the previous chapter. Their contrary perceptions enunciate philosophical and ideological differences. This study will not attempt to defuse these ideological divisions, but seeks to analyse and contextualise them from a perspective that has previously been neglected.

The purpose of this study is to follow fundamental pedagogics on its journey, and to seek explanations for how it became possible that similar theoretical statements came to mean very different things in the divergent contexts in which they were applied. Foucault (1972) calls this the ‘enunciative function’ of statements, the idea that statements are imbued with but also create contextual meaning.

Two subsidiary questions were formulated to demarcate and direct the study in the context of its main research question. The first subsidiary question focuses on the time prior to the existence of Langeveld's education theory. It queries the historical relationship that guided Afrikaner politicians and educators to Holland rather than elsewhere in their quest to re-shape the educational landscape of South Africa. The question is: What happened historically that made Dutch education theory such a ‘natural’ candidate?

For reasons that will be further explained briefly in this chapter and in more detail in Chapter Four, I chose to periodise the first research question predominantly in the time between the late 19<sup>th</sup> century, when the South African (formerly Anglo-Boer) Wars shifted Dutch-South African relations in significant ways, and the beginning of the Second World War, which again altered the bi-lateral relations between these two countries.

This first subsidiary question investigates: How did the early history (1881-1939) of converging Dutch-Afrikaner politics express itself in the developing education policy context in South Africa?

The second subsidiary question investigates the context in which the transfer of Langeveld's theory to South Africa took place. Langeveld wrote his major work *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek* during the second World War, the first edition being published shortly after the end of the war.

The focus of Chapter Five is on the period between the beginning of the Second World War (1939), when bilateral relations between Holland and South Africa temporarily



came to a halt, and the year 1963, which ended the first decade of the so-called ‘Cultural Accord’ between the two countries. The second subsidiary research question queries how the transfer occurred, and who stood to benefit from it. The question is framed as follows:

How does the later diverging history (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics explain the differences in the evolving education theories of Holland and South Africa?

This chapter discusses my methodological justifications for both why and how I gathered, selected and interpreted data as I followed the journey of fundamental pedagogics.

This chapter also interrogates some of the dilemmas that I experienced as an historical researcher of that journey. These methodological and conceptual dilemmas arose as I found myself fluctuating between being a traveling companion and simultaneously a tour-conductor in my construction of the journey. I felt like a traveling companion, as I followed the historical events on the trail of fundamental pedagogics, and became a tour-conductor as I had to produce my own (re)construction of that trail, which meant considering and selecting data.

This chapter will deal with several areas:

- Consider the epistemological perspectives that have shaped the conceptualisation and methodology of this inquiry (3.2 - 3.4).
- Outline the methods that were used in gathering and organising the necessary data for the literature review, which was presented in Chapter Two (3.5).
- Discuss the selection and treatment of data sources for each of the two subsidiary questions (3.6).
- Reflect on the methodology used in the construction of the two historical accounts if you like, in which the data sources were interpreted and synthesised into coherent narratives that separately aim to provide an answer to each of the research questions (3.7). Collectively, these subsidiary questions form the basis for the critical

discussion of the main research question which appears in the final chapter of this thesis.

- Acknowledge the limitations of the research, by exploring some of the constraints that were imposed on this study (3.8).

### **3.2 A Multifaceted Approach**

The research questions that have been posed in this study demand a methodological approach that is multifaceted. It is clear that the central research question stretches across a number of academic disciplines, and as such requires an interdisciplinary or perhaps even a counter-disciplinary focus. Firstly, the research is historical, in that it is directed at an historical event: the transcontinental transfer and divergent meanings of fundamental pedagogics. This focus requires a looking back. The actual research for this thesis took place at a time when South Africa was in transition, away from the dominance of fundamental pedagogics evident in the apartheid era. My research on fundamental pedagogics now (that is, in post-apartheid South Africa), is motivated by a desire to obtain or broaden our historical perspective on its legacy. The historic nature of the phenomenon under investigation demands a methodology that is aimed at a reconstruction and interpretation of past events.

In order to discuss the research questions adequately, historic research alone would not suffice. Since education does not occur in a vacuum, my study of (the journey of) education theory, as a sub-set of social theory, questions the relationship between social theory and social context; thus the inquiry stretches across the social sciences and humanities. In addition to being historical, this study is also sociological in that it examines pedagogy as a form of cultural production, it is political as it assumes that cultural production both reflects and creates relations of power, and it is philosophical because it questions the properties of knowledge and meaning.

In addition, the methodology in this inquiry is comparative, since it involves cross-national research that focuses on cross-national (Dutch and South African) similarities and differences in the relationship between education theory and social context.

This study is committed to an interpretative understanding of an (historical) human experience. Qualitative research methods were used to gather and analyse the data. Qualitative research is not readily captured in a single definition. Denzin and Lincoln (1994), in their authoritative *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, are at pains to characterise the diversity of qualitative methodologies. They argue that as a 'set of interpretive practices', qualitative research, 'privileges no single methodology from another' (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994:3). Hitchcock and Hughes (1995:27) conclude that qualitative research is 'ultimately a frame of mind...an orientation and commitment to studying the social world in certain kinds of ways. Denzin and Lincoln (1994:4) elucidate this rather vague notion of 'certain kinds of ways', by juxtaposing them with the dominant approaches in quantitative research:

The word *qualitative* implies an emphasis on processes and meanings that are not rigorously examined or measured (if measured at all) in terms of quantity, amount, intensity or frequency. Qualitative researchers stress the socially constructed nature of reality, the intimate relationship between the researcher and what is studied, and the situational constraints that shape inquiry.... (They) emphasise the value-laden nature of inquiry ... (and)... seek answers to questions that stress how social experience is created and given meaning. In contrast, quantitative studies emphasise the measurement and analysis of causal relationships between variables, not processes. (In quantitative studies) ... inquiry is purported to be within a value-free framework.

This inquiry will draw on several research methods, including content analysis of documents and interviews with experts in a process of continuous analysis of data.

The general methodology in this study has been inspired by Grounded Theory Methodology, first introduced by Glaser and Strauss in 1967.<sup>1</sup> This type of methodology

---

<sup>1</sup> An excellent overview of the development of Grounded Theory is offered by Strauss and Corbin (1994).

is geared to develop theory that is grounded in data which has been systematically gathered and analysed. Theory is not presented as a set of conclusions following data analysis, but instead evolves during actual research through continuous interplay between analysis and the selection and interpretation of data.

The methodology is meant to aid researchers to develop theory that is ‘conceptually dense’ – that is, with many conceptual relationships, which are presented in discursive form, embedded in a ‘thick context of descriptive and conceptual writing’ (Strauss & Corbin, 1994:278). Grounded theory researchers are interested in

patterns of action and interaction between and among various types of social units.... they are much concerned with discovering *process* – not necessarily in the sense of stages or phases, but in reciprocal changes in patterns of action/interaction and in relationship with changes of conditions either internal or external to the process.

### **3.3 Mirrored Journeys: Personal Biography and Research Interests**

Behind the methodological approach of any inquiry, with all its implicit ontological and epistemological assumptions, stands ‘the personal biography of the gendered researcher’ who ‘approaches the world with a set of ideas, a framework (theory, ontology) that specifies a set of questions (epistemology) that are then examined (methodology, analysis) in specific ways’ (Denzin & Lincoln, 1994:11).

This is unmistakably the case with this inquiry. This study, as discussed in Chapter One, has its origins in a set of personal and intellectual puzzles that are related to where I, the researcher, come from. Rather than assuming the possibility of value-free research, as in the positivist or empirical-analytical tradition, I acknowledge that the interpretive framework and my own values ‘form the pattern out of which (my) historical narrative(s) (will be) woven’ (Feinberg; 1983:115).

One of the great advantages in conducting research for this study rested in my ability to read Dutch, Afrikaans and English. From the literature review it is clear that, even

though there are a number of English translations of fundamental pedagogics texts, most texts appeared in Afrikaans only. Fluency in Dutch made for easy access to Dutch historical data and Langeveld's collected works. Lastly, my knowledge of English gave me access to the work of critiques of fundamental pedagogics, and gives me the opportunity to write this thesis in a language that is accessible to most South Africans as well as internationally.

In order to follow fundamental pedagogics on its journey, my own journey led me, in 1994 and again in 1996, to travel back to where it all began – the Department of Education at the University of Utrecht in the Netherlands. That is the site of production of Langeveld's theory. This is not an unfamiliar place for me. It is the same department from which I graduated in 1988, long before I ever knew that one day I would find myself in South Africa, grappling with what I believed to be a distortion of Langeveld's work. My research focus demanded a renewal with once familiar places and faces. Mediated by almost a decade of living and working in South Africa, my research reshaped familiarity, such as Langeveld's major theoretical concepts, into unfamiliarity, as I attempted to contrast and compare them with the corresponding South African terminology.

In many ways, my research interests mirror my personal journey which attempts to connect a dual Dutch-South African identity, where both sides are sometimes complementary, sometimes conflicting, and always challenging in an ongoing process of making meaning. My first-hand knowledge and experiences in both countries sensitised me to their contexts, in ways that help me to grasp tacit knowledge, gained 'between the lines' during the research process. Altheide and Johnson (1994:492-3) point to the value of tacit knowledge that features as common sense, which provides 'the deep rules and deep substantive or cultural background critical for understanding any specific utterance or act'.

Whilst I studied the Dutch South-African links academically for the first time in the context of this thesis, I have learnt about them in primary and high school and remember many (often heated!) conversations, particularly with my father whose generation grew

up with a positive affinity for South Africa (read: Afrikaners) that was later challenged by the anti-apartheid opposition of my generation.

Apart from an academic interest, albeit biographically reinforced, there were also practical considerations that led to the decision to gather the data for this study predominantly in the Netherlands. These considerations were based on efficient use of time. A sabbatical leave took my family to Holland between July 1994 and January 1995. There I was afforded the opportunity to devote six months to research. As a full-time lecturer working at a turbulent South African university, and as mother of two young children, I knew that such a golden opportunity would not come easily again.

I realised that for biographical reasons I was particularly well-placed to gain access to the required data in the Netherlands. My connections helped me to get office space and easy access to data sources at the University of Utrecht, mainly through the intervention of Dr. Bas Levering, one of the supervisors of this study. Furthermore, Langeveld's successor, A.J. Beekman, offered to be a referee in the research process. In addition, I was aware of the spectrum of other possibilities for data gathering, and I knew where and whom I could interview in the Netherlands, both at universities and in non-governmental organisations.

This led to a decision to focus on Dutch-based data, a bias that I want to declare openly. There is no doubt that this thesis would have looked different had I searched for data mainly in Pretoria.

### **3.4 Inquiry and the 'Fabric of Context'<sup>2</sup>**

As I stated in the introductory chapter of this thesis, my inquiry starts from a recognition that research is an 'interpretative enterprise' (Tuchman, 1994:317). This point of view rejects the notion that history is purely referential, or that historical 'facts' speak for

---

<sup>2</sup> A term used by Davis (1991:78) in *Historical Inquiry: Telling Real Stories*.

themselves. Historical inquiry, or any other inquiry for that matter, implies making choices that impact on the picture that the researcher creates when she chooses to foreground some events and ignore others. Any phenomenon has a (historical) context that harbours multifaceted meanings. Historical inquiry thus involves a process of selection and interpretation.

My research acknowledges the significance of interpretation in selecting the evidence which, collectively, will guide the construction of an historical narrative. In constructing my narratives, I reject the idea that there is only one apprehendable reality of which my study captures a small part.

Feinberg (1983) raises an interesting analogy between historical inquiry and making a puzzle. He questions the notion that interpretation is analogous to putting together the pieces of a puzzle. This idea assumes that if the puzzle could be fully pieced together, then presumably we would have the historical ideal –accurate description. The problem with this view, says Feinberg (1983:119), is the idea that

the pieces are tied together into some pre-existing whole ... where the whole remains only to be discovered and described. Rather, the act of putting the pieces together as well as deciding just which pieces are significant issues form a perspective that itself is part of the interpretive process. Moreover, the story is not complete until that perspective has itself been raised to the level of a problem that requires discussion, analysis and criticism.

Thus, I believe that research cannot converge on the ‘true’ state of affairs, even when it proposes disclaimers based on flawed human intellectual capacities, as propositioned by critical realists. (See, for example, Cook & Campbell, 1979, cited in Guba & Lincoln, 1994:110).

I believe that what is generally referred to as ‘reality’ is a set of alterable constructions, mediated in a web of economical, political and social beliefs. One of the basic points of departure in this study is the idea that Langeveld found (but also positioned) himself in a context where his ‘web of economical, political and social beliefs’ differed in significant

ways from that of the fundamental pedagogics discourse in South Africa, as lived by its proponents. As a consequence the theoretical concepts, although captured in similar terminology, reflected and created different realities.

It is the purpose of this study to reconstruct and interpret these divergent realities through constructing a set of historical narratives that are credible and convincing to the reader.

Davis (1991:78) believes that historical narratives, like all other stories, 'transport incidents and interpretations through time against the fabric of context'. Historical inquiry develops what he calls 'interpretive themes'. These interpretations may not be accepted by the reader, but, concludes Davis, 'without interpretation an asserted history fails'. He implies that historical accounts should be 'as faithful as possible to available evidence', and he warns us that the hallmark of competent history lies in the dominance of explicit interpretations. He concludes:

Clearly, when a narrator's proffered interpretations are only illustrated by story elements, the possibilities for history have been transformed into ideological justifications (Davis, 1991:79).

This qualitative distinction between historical and ideological accounts raises a number of dilemmas for this study in terms of the nature of evidence, and the manner in which an historian uses this evidence. It assumes that the use of evidence and interpretation can lead us either to an 'historical account' which is explicit in terms of the historian's own 'voice', or, by contrast, to a story which merely reflects and/or expresses the historian's ideological beliefs. The former is seen as the result of competent historical inquiry and the latter, however eloquently articulated, as inadequate historical research. These beliefs are based on a set of assumptions about science and its relationship to ideology that has been questioned by Foucault (1972). He found the notion of ideology difficult to make use of, for three reasons:

The first is that ... it always stands in virtual opposition to something else which is supposed to count as truth.... I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that which comes under the category



of scientificity or truth, and that which comes under some other category, but seeing historically how effects of truth are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true or false. The second drawback is that the concept of ideology refers, I think necessarily, to something of the order of that subject. Thirdly, ideology stands in a secondary position relative to something which functions as its infrastructure, as its material, economic determinant, *etc.* For these three reasons, I think that this is a notion that cannot be used without circumspection (Foucault, 1972, cited in Barrett, 1991:123).

Barrett (1991) concisely sums up these ideas when she says that Foucault is suspicious of the concept of ideology because: '(1) it is implicated, as the other side of the coin, in unacceptable truth claims, (2) it rests on a humanist understanding of the individual subject, and (3) it is enmeshed in the unsatisfactory and determinist base-and-superstructure model within Marxism'.

Foucault's critique on the notion of ideology, along with Barrett's analysis, are of methodological and as well conceptual interest for this thesis. Foucault questions the assumption that non-ideology is more truthful than ideology. Instead of contrasting levels of truthfulness, he suggests an analysis of competing forces in the determination of what constitutes ideology and what does not. The 'effects of truth', or in other words the politics of truth, are produced in relations of power.

Conceptually, this critique of ideology is significant in the appraisal of the differences between Langeveld's theory and fundamental pedagogics. When Foucault's critique is applied to the central tenets of this thesis, it challenges my original view that fundamental pedagogics constitutes an ideological distortion of Langeveld's theory, which, as the original theory, I assumed to be more truthful than it's supposed mutilation.

Methodologically, Foucault's critique of ideology challenges the properties of 'evidence' in historical accounts. In selecting and interpreting pieces of evidence, the driving question is no longer whether they testify to the truth, but rather how they are evident in a portrait of the (historical) politics of truth.

Barrett's second point resonates interestingly with a concept that will be further developed in the final chapter of this thesis. This concept concerns the idea of the individual 'self' as a prominent image of modernity which features centrally in Langeveld's education theory (see also 2.7). Finally, Barrett's last point contests the value of the traditional Marxist analytical model. As a model, it has been extensively contested inter- as well as intra-paradigmatically, the latter most effectively by the Frankfurt School which developed the notion of Critical Theory. Giroux, as a prominent exponent of Critical Theory in the field of education, was quoted earlier in this thesis; he suggested that pedagogy, as a form of cultural production, manifests contested and unequal power relations. The inseparability of education and politics is one of the basic assumptions of this thesis.

### **3.5 (Re)searching the Literature**

Before I could shift my focus to the research questions of this thesis, I concentrated on a review of the literature. My objectives were to: (1) reacquaint myself with Langeveld's work, and deepen my understanding of his work in the context of this particular study, (2) gain insight into the main claims of fundamental pedagogics, and (3) explore the critique that has been leveled against fundamental pedagogics.

In terms of the first objective, Dr. Bas Levering and I met on a weekly basis, between July and December 1994. We discussed my progress, and critically interrogated Langeveld's works. Most of Langeveld's work had been prescribed literature in my graduate courses, but I re-read a selection of his books with renewed interest for the purpose of this study. In our weekly discussions, we (1) identified the most appropriate of Langeveld's own texts, and selected literature about Langeveld, (2) explored possible categories for analysis, and (3) interpreted and debated the selected key texts. In

addition, I interviewed A. J. Beekman who had succeeded Langeveld in 1972, and had retired from the University of Utrecht in 1986<sup>3</sup>.

Furthermore, as a result of an analysis of the combined data sources, the research involved a study of Modernity, with a particular focus on the concept of 'self'. A decision was made to study Modernity as an historical phase, by looking back, guided by J.F. Lyotard's (1979) *The Post-Modern Condition*<sup>4</sup>. Lastly, I examined the context of Dutch society in the period set for this research in terms of the broad developments in educational thought in Holland.

The second objective – to gain insight into the claims of fundamental pedagogics – required me to read across the spectrum of South African publications on fundamental pedagogics<sup>5</sup>. In addition, I sought expert opinion in a set of interviews with individuals who have written extensively in the field of fundamental pedagogics.<sup>6</sup> Finally, the third objective was addressed by a selecting and reviewing the literature in which fundamental pedagogics was critiqued.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Beekman was interviewed twice, once in September 1994 and once in December 1994, to discuss progress and the direction that the research had taken.

<sup>4</sup> I am much indebted to Bas Levering, who helped me systematically through this book. The original title is *La Condition postmoderne: rapport sur le savoir*. Written in 1979, this report was commissioned by the Government of Quebec in Canada. I actually first read the Dutch translation of the book *Het Post-Moderne Weten...* before I read the English translation *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. My understanding of (post) modernity was further developed through an interview with Prof. J. Nederveen-Pieterse of the Institute for Social Studies (ISS) in The Hague.

<sup>5</sup> As indicated in the preface of Chapter Two, I started off in the library of the University of Pretoria. Further expert advice from library staff at the University of South Africa (UNISA) and the University of Natal-Durban, as well as an ERIC search on the topic, led me to the selection of data sources that is reflected in Chapter Two of this thesis. I should also mention that both Prof. B.F. (Dinie) Nel, and Prof. W. Morrow commented on an early version of my research proposal, and that both suggested a number of appropriate data sources.

<sup>6</sup> I interviewed Prof. P. Higgs and Prof. M.O. Oberholzer, who both work at UNISA.

<sup>7</sup> I worked on the advice of a number of experts, which included Dr. S. Segal and Prof. P. Enslin, both from the University of the Witwatersrand, Prof. G. Yonge from the University of California-Santa Barbara, Dr. B. Parker of the University of Natal-Pietermaritzburg and Prof. W. Morrow from the University of the Western Cape. In addition, I read through all annual conference proceedings of the Kenton Conferences in search for critiques on fundamental pedagogics.

### 3.6 The Selection and Treatment of Data Sources

In the next section of this chapter, I reflect consciously and explicitly on the methodological decisions that I made as I selected and analysed the data that provided the basis for both the historical narratives. One common feature in my approach to all subsidiary questions was the use of a research diary. This diary served as a chronological record of *what* I learned and insights on *how* I learned it. Ely *et al.* (1991:69) maintain that such diaries can become the place where one teases out meaning and reflects upon meaning as it evolves. They also believe that such logs can be the site where:

...each qualitative researcher faces the self as an instrument through personal dialogue about moments of victory and disheartenment, hunches, insights, assumptions, biases and ongoing ideas about method (Ely *et al.*, 1991:69).

My research diaries helped me to pull various thoughts together or to take them apart. It contains notes that served as signposts in further analysis. It helped me to navigate my research journey and to distinguish the methods and procedures that I used in each of the individual research questions. In reality, the data gathering and analysis for these questions often happened concurrently.

#### 3.6.1 Subsidiary question 1

How did the early history (1881-1939) of converging Dutch-Afrikaner politics express itself in the developing education policy context in South Africa?

The data gathering for this question started by seeking expert advice at the African Studies Center of the University of Leiden, the Netherlands.<sup>8</sup> Central to this inquiry was Afrikaner Nationalism and historical Dutch-South African relations. The interviews, guided by the research questions, were informal and exploratory in nature. I was advised on some of the major texts that could be consulted in order to gain access to the field.

I then worked with the expert subject advisors in the media center of the African Studies Center, who further helped me to select and locate key secondary sources on the study of Afrikaner Nationalism, particularly with regard to its Dutch connections. This was the start of a systematic literature search. Margin notes were made in the selected texts, and I created an entry in my research diary for each book (chapter) or journal article that I read. The entry stated the type of source (e.g. secondary, book record) the authors, year of publication, and a brief summary in which I started to speculate on possible themes or categories of analysis. Huberman and Miles (1994:432) state that Grounded Theory acknowledges one important point: 'Analysis will be undifferentiated and disjointed until the researcher has some local acquaintance with the setting'. The analysis of secondary sources gave me the opportunity to start to note patterns and themes in Dutch-South African relations and helped me to make a sensible historical periodisation in order to reduce the data for the subsidiary question as above.

In the next phase of the research, I explored the possibility of obtaining relevant information from three different NGO's, each of which was related to Dutch-South African relations in its own distinctive way.<sup>9</sup> During an initial visit, I assessed the possibilities of locating primary as well as additional secondary data sources in each of these institutions. In addition, I made contact with staff members in these organisations who were willing to be interviewed.

The first organisation that I consulted was the *Suid Afrikaanse Instituut* in Amsterdam, which hosts a whole array of Dutch-South African initiatives. One of the main organisations hosted by the institute is the *Nederlands Zuid-Afrikaanse Vereniging* (NZAV) (Dutch-South African Association). This association was founded in 1881 and

---

<sup>8</sup> I interviewed Prof. Vernon February, a South African poet and intellectual who also holds a position at the University of the Western Cape in South Africa, and Dr. Stephen Ellis, the former editor of *Africa Confidential*.

<sup>9</sup> As elsewhere in the world, Dutch anti-apartheid organisations struggled to find a new identity and focus in the post-apartheid era after 1994. On 1 January 1997, three such organisations officially amalgamated into the NIZA (Netherlands Institute of Southern Africa). The NIZA comprises the former Dutch Committee on Southern Africa, the Eduardo Mondlane Foundation and the Dutch Anti-Apartheid Movement.

still exists today. The objectives and activities of the organisation will be extensively discussed in Chapters Four and Five. Although the institute itself would not agree with me, I saw it as a conservative organisation that historically has focused narrowly on cultivating relations between Afrikaners in South Africa (to the exclusion of other South Africans) and interested Dutch citizens. One immediate clue to its agenda is its name: the fact that they call it the *Suid Afrikaanse Instituut* (Afrikaans) and not the *Zuid Afrikaanse* (Dutch) seems significant. The Suid Afrikaanse Instituut has an extensive and well looked after historical archive and library. I sought expert advice from the research staff of the institute, and was given access to all its files.<sup>10</sup>

The second NGO that I consulted was Kairos, which is a progressive ecumenical organisation that co-operated with Beyers Naudé in South Africa and regularly advises Dutch parliamentary and other political committees on Dutch foreign policy and linkages with South Africa. In this organisation, I was able to benefit from an extremely well-informed staff.<sup>11</sup> The focus of discussion was on (a) Dutch-South African relations, particularly the Calvinist influence and the role of Dr. A. Kuyper; and (b) the Dutch - South African Cultural Accord.

The third organization was *Komitee Zuidelijk Afrika (KZA)* (Committee on Southern Africa), a progressive anti-apartheid movement which played a vocal and significant role in informing and mobilising Dutch public opinion and the various political movements in opposition to apartheid. An initial interview revealed that this organisation could be most helpful to this thesis with regard to the earlier mentioned 'Cultural Accord' between Holland and South Africa, which proved significant for the second set of subsidiary questions of this thesis.

---

<sup>10</sup> I interviewed Dr. Veltkamp (senior researcher), about the nature of the activities of the NZAV, and its role in mobilising Dutch interest in South Africa. Dr. Veltkamp also helped me to interpret and work with their index system, and to locate unique historical data sources. Mrs. Seton (office manager) went – many times – up and down the steep wooden staircases of the building at the Keizersgracht in Amsterdam, to locate the files that I requested, and on occasion even brought down unrequested but most interesting (dusty!) files, which helped to make this research such an exciting endeavor for me!

<sup>11</sup> I interviewed Dr. E. van den Bergh, who also helped me to locate additional secondary sources and continued to send me interesting and relevant material long after I returned to South Africa.

For each of these three NGO's, I prepared a set of semi-structured interviews, guided by a set of focus points. The interviews explored different 'pathways' into the historical data needed to answer my first research question. The interview questions focused: (1) the particular role that the NGO played in the relations between Holland and South Africa; (2) its main goals; (3) its main successes and failures; and (4) its current challenges. Furthermore, I sketched my research outline and asked for advice on where I could find appropriate historical data and what (according to the interviewee) the major historical themes were in the relationship between Holland and South Africa.

The three interviews were recorded manually, with short notes taken during each interview which were further analysed immediately afterwards. The data from these interviews was analyzed and compared. It provided me with a global picture of the spectrum of historical involvement of Dutch NGO's in the bilateral relations with South Africa. What also emerged is that traditionally these NGO's have worked closely with competing political parties in Holland, representing very divergent political and religious interests. The NGO's were in many ways entrusted with the enactment and day-to-day management of aspects of Dutch foreign policy. Significant for this thesis was the so-called 'Cultural Accord' between Holland and South Africa (1953-1981). Education and academic exchanges fell within the realm of this accord.

It became clear that, in terms of the first subsidiary question, the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut would be best placed to start a systematic analysis of primary data sources. My reasoning was as follows: Since fundamental pedagogics was predominantly advocated by Afrikaners, it would be most interesting and appropriate to investigate forces that would have invited and encouraged Afrikaner South Africans to look to Holland when defining and developing education theory after they came to power in 1948. The obvious place to start, given this reasoning, was the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut.

Guided by the research questions, I studied the catalogues and indexes of the NZAV and other archival collections. On the basis of this, I selected and read numerous files, which included minutes of meetings, letters, memoranda, personal and official correspondence,

speeches, newspaper clippings, statutes and constitutions of various organisations, and annual reports.

All these documents were analysed in terms of their:

- subject matter (what is it about)
- direction (how is it treated, e.g. favorably or not?)
- goals (what goals are intended?)
- actors (who is represented?)
- authority (in whose name/interests are statements made?)
- location (where does the action take place?)
- conflict (what are the sources and levels of conflict?)
- endings (in what ways are conflicts resolved?) (Robson, 1994:241)

Each document was scrutinised along the lines of the categories outlined above. As a first level analysis, the information was summarised and recorded in my research diary.

After this, all the data that were gathered from the analysis of primary and secondary sources as well as from the interviews were coded. I examined the main claims made by the various actors and authors, and the evidence supporting or contradicting such claims. Four focal points emerged in my analysis of the period from the mid 19<sup>th</sup> century to the start of the Second World War.

Firstly, Dutch-South African relations in this historical period were heavily biased towards Afrikaner South Africans and were driven by sentiments of ‘kinship solidarity’. Secondly, Dutch support for South Africa promoted national Dutch interests as much as it professed to support Afrikaners. Dutch interests in South Africa were linked to its colonial competition with England, as forms of cultural, religious and economic expansionism. Thirdly, Dutch efforts to support Dutch education in South Africa were contextualised in terms of the first and second points made above, and received by Afrikaners as mixed blessings. Fourthly, bilateral religious – that is, Calvinist – connections played an important role in shaping foreign relations between the two countries. Of particular interest in this matter is the role of Abraham Kuyper.



A draft response to the first research question was written. Certain gaps in primary source evidence were identified, in consultation with the main supervisor of this study, Prof. Jonathan Jansen. In August and September 1996, I returned to the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut archives to look for additional documentary evidence where needed, with a special focus the role of Dutch teachers in South Africa, who were sent by the Foundation for Dutch Education in South Africa to South Africa around the turn of the century to take up teaching positions.<sup>12</sup>

A second draft of the first historical narrative was submitted to both supervisors of this research and additional expert commentary was solicited.<sup>13</sup> After all comments were taken into consideration, a final draft of the first historical narrative (Chapter Four) was written.

### **3.6.2 Subsidiary Question 2**

How does the later diverging history (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics explain the differences in the evolving education theories of Holland and South Africa?

The research for this set of questions started by interviewing a number of experts: Dr. E. van den Berg at Kairos, Dr. Velkamp at the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, and Mr. K. Koster at the Committee on Southern Africa (KZA). The main purpose of these interviews was to find a way into the data for this research question, and to explore a possible demarcation of the topic under investigation. It was necessary to decide on (1) potential themes that could be explored in the context of this question, and (2) how to situate the study in a particular historical period.

---

<sup>12</sup> I interviewed Dr. Ena Jansen, a South African academic from the University of the Witwatersrand, who was a temporary researcher at the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut in Amsterdam. Dr. Jansen edited a very interesting collection of letters from a Dutch teacher in South Africa, written to his wife in Holland.

<sup>13</sup> Comments came from Dr. Heather Hughes, of the Political Studies Department at the University of Natal-Durban.

These interviews were exploratory and open in nature, guided by the subsidiary questions above. During each of the interviews, I was shown or made aware of data sources that were of possible interest to this study. Brief notes were taken during the interviews which were elaborated on and analysed directly afterwards.

The interview at KZA provided a useful chronological overview of the bilateral relations between Holland and South Africa between 1945 and 1994, seen from an anti-apartheid perspective. It became obvious that economic interests have always been of great significance in the ties between the two countries. As mentioned earlier, I do not deny the importance of economic interests nor their influence on other spheres of contact, such as cultural linkages. However, an economic focus is not at the center of this thesis. I acknowledge that this is a limitation of this study. The interview also focused on the significance of the Cultural Accord between Holland and South Africa.

The interview at Kairos focused on cultural and religious contacts between Holland and South Africa from various perspectives, such as the sanctions campaign against South Africa and the influence of the progressive ecumenical movement in opposing apartheid. In addition, we discussed the notion of kinship between the Dutch and the Afrikaners and its role in shaping an (historical) outlook on bilateral ties.

The interview at the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut provided me with many pointers to help me locate significant primary data sources in the archives of the Institute. I was advised on how and where I could find material on: (1) a significant Cultural Relations Committee, (*Commissie ter bevordering van de Culturele Betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Zuid Afrika*); (2) the day to day management of the Cultural Accord by the NZAV; and (3) the Foundation for South African Students (*Studiefonds voor Zuid Afrikaanse Studenten*) which considered grant applications from South African students for study in Holland.

All three NGO's welcomed my study, and opened their doors for any research that I wanted to conduct in their organisation.

After the interviews were analysed, I focused on collecting and analysing primary data sources at the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut in Amsterdam. I conducted these analyses in the much the same way as I had in the research for the first subsidiary question. In the historical archives, I located minutes of meetings, letters, memoranda, personal and official correspondence, speeches, newspaper clippings, statutes and constitutions of various organisations and annual reports. In a first analysis, I organised the documents (see term from Robson, in 3.6.1) and then I established a number of categories that, as emerging themes, were relevant in relation to the specific research questions.

I subsequently broadened my focus to include secondary sources that could help me to interpret and contextualise the themes that had emerged from the analysis of primary data sources.<sup>14</sup>

The focal points that emerged from the research were: (1) The Second World War significantly changed the political context in the relationship between England and Holland, which in turn, shifted the relationship between Holland and South Africa. (2) The Cultural Accord that was reached between Holland and South Africa was heavily biased towards Dutch and Afrikaner South Africans. (3) This bias was contested in Holland, amidst growing pressures for anti-apartheid sanctions. (4) Dutch educators, generally speaking, did not critique fundamental pedagogics' use of Dutch social and education theory in the apartheid context.

As a last step in the data gathering process, I interviewed two senior officials in the Dutch Ministries of Education and Foreign Affairs.<sup>15</sup> The purpose was to report back on my research activities, as both Ministries had committed funding towards the project, as well as to discuss my preliminary findings in the light of the process of normalisation of bilateral relations between Holland and South Africa. These interviews took place in December 1994, eight months after the first democratic elections in South Africa. The

---

<sup>14</sup> These literary sources were obtained from the main library of the University of Utrecht, the Kairos documentation collection, the African Studies Center in Leiden, and the documentation collection of the Committee on Southern Africa (KZA).

<sup>15</sup> I interviewed Mr. F. Lander from the Ministry of Education, and Ms. H. Koopman from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

discussion with both officials focused on the policy principles that informed past (that is, for the duration of the first Cultural Accord, 1953-1981) as well as newly emerging principles, particularly in the field of education, and specifically in teacher education.

After all data sources were considered, a first draft of the second historical narrative was written and submitted to the supervisors of the research. A second draft was developed and additional expert advice was obtained.<sup>16</sup> A final version was completed, and appears as Chapter Five of this thesis.

### **3.7 Research as Emplotment**

In this section, I will discuss the process by which the data sources were interpreted and used in the construction of the historical narratives in this thesis. Polkinghorne (1995:5) uses the phrase 'narrative configuration' to refer to a process by which events are drawn together and integrated into a temporally organised whole. In this process, the researcher employs a 'thematic thread' which features as a plot in the integrating operation of 'emplotment'.

Polkinghorne (1995:5-6) follows Bruner's distinction between paradigmatic and narrative modes of thought, and uses this distinction to identify two types of narrative inquiry:

- (a) analysis of narratives, that is, studies whose data consists of narratives or stories, but whose analysis produces paradigmatic typologies or categories; and
- (b) narrative analysis, that is studies whose data consists of actions, events and happenings, but whose analysis produces stories (e.g. biographies, histories, case studies).

The use of narrative inquiry in this study falls within the second category, and uses emplotment and narrative configuration as its primary analytic tools.

---

<sup>16</sup> Comments came from Dr. Heather Hughes of the Political Studies Department at the University of Natal-Durban and from Ms. A. Steeman, formerly of the Dutch Committee on Southern Africa.

The data sources which I mentioned in the previous section were examined in terms of possible categorical identities in an analytic procedure that emphasised ‘a recursive movement between the data and the emerging categorical definitions during the process of producing classifications that will organise the data’ (Polkinghorne, 1995:10). My task in this analytic procedure was to develop a plot that would show how the various data components are related. Starting with each subsidiary question, I would ask myself how my analysis could compose and shape possible answers to these questions. In this process, I looked for historical evidence that would fit the emerging plot or contradict it. This meant, as discussed in 3.4, searching for specific evidence that would confirm an emerging plot or rejecting the emerging plot because of lack of evidence.

The historical narratives that I wanted to produce had to be mindful of the cultural context of the issues under investigation. I also wanted to create a sense of historical continuity within as well as between the two narratives.

Pulling the two narratives together again required a process of emplotment, since collectively the stories are designed to address the main research question of the thesis. The main question arose out of wonderment: How did it come about that Langeveld's concepts meant such different things in South Africa and Holland?

In an ongoing process of interpreting evidence, making claims, and testing how the evidence warranted the claims, the stories emerged.

T040179

### **3.8 Methodological Limitations**



Several methodological limitations have been mentioned in previous sections of this chapter. Summing up, they were the result of time constraints, which meant that the data collection became primarily focused on documentary sources kept in Holland. One has to assume a particular bias as a result. Our understanding of history is informed by a selective reading of documents, but these documents themselves may also be selective.

What ‘people decide to record, leave in or take out, is itself informed by decisions which relate to the social, political and economic environment of which they are a part’ (May, 1993:149-150). As I mentioned earlier, this thesis would have looked different had I mainly searched for data in Pretoria.

To accommodate this bias, the historical narratives in this thesis need to be clear in terms of their interpretation of that environment and the role that was played by the particular institutions where the documents were kept. This required me to focus not only on manifest content – the directly visible characteristics of the various documents – but also on latent content – the meanings contained within the communications that were documented (Babbie, 1995:335). This issue was addressed through a study of secondary sources as well as the analysis of my reports on interviews with experts. Combined, they assisted me in my interpretation of the context in which these documents were compiled and stored in archives.

A rather unusual constraint arose from the fact that some of the documents in the Suid Afrikaanse Instituut had gone missing or had been damaged, after a Dutch anti-apartheid group had broken into the institute in 1984, and thrown many archival pieces into one of the famous Amsterdam canals! Although many documents were retrieved, some had become quite illegible. These damaged documents testified – in a unique fashion – to the intensity and complexity of Dutch-South African relations!

This complexity foregrounds another limitation that needs to be acknowledged: this thesis focuses predominantly on how Dutch linkages assisted the development of apartheid education through academic, religious and cultural linkages. While this particular role is highlighted, the opposite role – that of Dutch resistance to apartheid in all its manifestations – does not feature prominently. This does not mean that I do not acknowledge that there was fierce Dutch opposition to apartheid, including apartheid education, but it is simply not the objective of this thesis to document such opposition, or even to present a ‘balanced’ view. However, the fact that it was possible for Dutch conservative forces to directly or indirectly assist the development of fundamental pedagogics, and therefore apartheid education, will be the subject of critique.

Lastly, I want to acknowledge that this thesis is limited to an analysis of the impact of historic Dutch-South African connections on the development of fundamental pedagogics on a theoretical level. As such, this study could serve as a background to an empirical study on how teachers' exposure to education theory, in Holland to Langeveld and in South Africa to fundamental pedagogics, has affected their educational practices. MacLeod (1995) argues convincingly that it would be simplistic to assume a direct link between theory and practice. She suggests (1995:63) that 'the teacher as a contradictory subject in many non-uniform discourses stands the middle ground between theory and practice. An analysis of institutional practices in both teacher education institutions as well as in schools falls out of the realm of this study, but would constitute an interesting sequel.

## **Chapter Four**

### **Transfer and Transformation:**

### **The Journey of Christian National Education (1881-1939)**

#### **4.1 An Orientation to the Chapter**

This chapter presents the first historical narrative of this thesis. The guiding question is: What happened prior to the journey of fundamental pedagogics that made Dutch education theory such a ‘natural’ candidate for Afrikaner political and educational attention? The narrative focuses mainly on the early context of Dutch-South African relations, set in the period 1881 to 1939. I chose to set the research questions between the early 19<sup>th</sup> century and the beginning of the Second World War (1939) for two reasons: (a) It was during this time that a Dutch Christian National Education (CNE) movement arose in Holland, and that attempts were made to transplant a similar ideology to South Africa; and (b) This era saw two historically significant wars – the South African (Anglo-Boer Wars) and the Second World War – both of which significantly altered bilateral relations between Holland and South Africa.

A subsidiary research question spells out the focus of this chapter and investigates:

How did the early history (1881-1939) of converging Dutch-Afrikaner politics express itself in the developing education policy context in South Africa?

This narrative demonstrates that not only fundamental pedagogics but Christian National Education, too, had its origins in Holland. CNE, which played a significant role in the complex network of apartheid policies after the 1948 National Party election victory,



was in fact not an entirely new concept. Rather, as this chapter will confirm, it was a revival of an earlier form of CNE that had been established in South Africa in the late 1800s with Dutch support.

This historical narrative in this chapter explores the significance of the transfer of CNE in Dutch-Afrikaner politics between 1881 and 1939. The transfer of CNE was not without its problems, as the Dutch and the Afrikaners developed different political agendas over time. The Dutch clearly had imperial motives when they attempted to transplant their CNE model to South Africa. In the South African context, CNE developed its own unique meaning when the Afrikaners adapted it to suit their emerging nationalist struggle.

The journey of Christian National Education from Holland to South Africa is prefaced by a discussion of the Dutch education policy context in which it originated in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. A number of contextual differences between Holland and South Africa will thus become apparent.

## **4.2 The Dutch Origins of Christian National Education**

In 1801, 1803 and 1806 a series of Education Bills were introduced in Holland. These Bills were based on a set of principles that was adopted in the 1795 Constitution, which was significantly influenced by the principles of the French Revolution (equality, fraternity and liberty), which had produced secular state schools (Du Toit, 1955:81). The Bills reduced the influence of the churches on schooling in favour of state control on curriculum and governance of public schools. In 1830, this principle was reinforced by a royal decree which stated that teachers were explicitly prohibited from teaching religion that was informed exclusively by one religious doctrine. In addition, it was ruled that textbooks which were considered offensive to any particular religion could not be used in schools (Roling, 1982:76).

This meant that religious education was delegated to the various Christian churches and to the religious institutions of minorities, such as the Jews. The new Education Bills were considered controversial and were criticised, particularly by a growing Calvinist opposition which rejected the idea that the state should decide what was taught and who should teach in schools. Their opposition gave birth to a movement of Christian Nationalism in the early 19th century, led by Willem Bilderdijk (1756-1831).

Bilderdijk's following consisted of a literary-cultural movement which sought to promote Calvinism through the arts, as well as a political movement led by Guillaume Groen van Prinsterer (1801-1876). In his 1847 publication *Ongeloof en Revolutie* (Unbelief and Revolution), Groen van Prinsterer expresses the opinion that the 'Spirit of Revolution', so alive and well in Europe at the time, denied the sovereignty of God in all spheres of life and that Christians should reject revolutionary thought such as that propagated by the French Revolution (Hexham, 1983:204-205).

Groen van Prinsterer claimed that whenever and wherever unbelief appears, revolution and social disintegration will follow. He didn't necessarily reject the basic ideas of the French Revolution, but saw these aspirations as valid only in the context of a recognition of the ultimate authority of God. The atheist basis of the revolution meant a threat to the authority of God. His movement was aptly called the Anti-Revolutionary Movement. Groen van Prinsterer

made a precis of his ideology in the term 'Christian-historical', making clear that the guidelines of the Biblical revelations are always primary and should serve as a corrective to what people believe can be read from history which was directed by God. (Schutte, 1987:393).

One of the foci of the Anti-Revolutionary Movement was education. The movement proposed that children should be shielded from the liberalism of the state. Because of their baptismal promises to bring their children up in the Christian faith, parents had to ensure that their education was Christian. The Movement, therefore, felt that parents needed to have some measure of control over the appointment of teachers (Hexham, 1983:205). The movement unsuccessfully tried to start their own 'free schools' (that is,

free from state interference in school curriculum). However, the aristocratic Groen van Prinsterer failed to make the movement into one that carried the broad political support of the Christian working class.

His successor, Abraham Kuyper (1837-1920), proved more of a populist and was decidedly more successful in gaining the support of the masses. Kuyper managed to make the Anti-Revolutionary Movement, which was converted in 1878 to a political party, into 'an important factor in Dutch politics profiting from the fact that that society, which for decades had seemed to be petrified, had begun to stir' (van Koppen, 1992:237).

Kuyper developed an 'impressive range of activities' that stretched from being a clergyman to being the general editor of a Calvinist daily newspaper (*De Standaard*) to being the founder of the orthodox wing of the Dutch Reformed Church to being one of the founders of the Calvinist 'Free University of Amsterdam (1880) where he also taught. He also played a significant role in Dutch politics, first becoming a member of Parliament in 1874, and then Minister of Home Affairs and Chairman of the Council of Ministers from 1901 until 1905 (van Koppen, 1992:237-238).

Kuyper's support for the so-called 'free school' movement had its origins in Groen van Prinsterer's belief that the Reformed churches should unite against the common enemy of liberalism. This belief was coined in the famous slogan 'In isolation lies our strength' (van Prinsterer, quoted in Hexham, 1983:206). Linked to the idea of isolating and strengthening Christian groupings and their influence on the state was the concept of 'sovereignty in one's own circle'. This concept was based on the idea that 'God created the cosmos as a multitude of circles of life, all subjected to His sovereignty and will, characterised by their own nature and tasks and free and independent of each other: sovereign in their own circles' (Schutte, 1987:396). The socio-political effect of this idea was that each of these 'circles' or 'spheres of life' functioned on the basis of their own rights and laws. They were largely self-sufficient, and therefore in many ways independent from the state. The state was seen as a special circle, with the unique task of

protecting the individual and maintaining justice between the circles but with no authority within the sovereign circles. In this way,

the Netherlands fell apart into a divided nation of separate independent groups. Each group participated in the democratically chosen parliament, and together they governed the pillarised country according to a consociational model.<sup>1</sup> In this manner, Kuyper withdrew large parts of social life from the influence of the state (Schutte, 1987:397).

Kuyper argued that Christian theology taught the existence of two types of people in the world: the saved (Christians who accepted God's salvation), and the lost (those who rejected the Gospel and rebelled against God by ignoring His commandments). For Kuyper this meant that Christians should recognise the ultimate authority of God in all social institutions and not only in the church (Hexham, 1981). One such institution that was of crucial importance was, of course, the school. Kuyper strove for sovereignty within a Calvinist circle, but extended these rights to other Christian parental groups, as well as to non-Christian groups such as humanists, atheists and the Jewish community in Holland. An important slogan captured their resistance to state schooling and clearly expressed their views: 'The School belongs to the Parents!'

This belief led them to found parent associations which were responsible for the establishment and supervision of religion-based schools, where the schools themselves would decide on their curriculum and staffing policies. A national organisation, the Foundation of Christian National Schooling (*Vereniging Christelijk Nationaal Schoolonderwijs*), expressed its explicit preference for schools not to be supervised by unaffiliated parental groupings, but rather by organisations which were directly linked to local churches and parishes. This last point caused opponents of these 'special' schools to question whether it was indeed the parents who were in charge of these schools, or whether it was the churches (Roling, 1982:80).

---

<sup>1</sup> A consociational political system is 'run on the basis of compromise and power-sharing ... avoiding majority rule which may antagonise smaller or weaker groups. The government is a cartel of the elites of the major groups. These leaders are engaged in constant negotiation and reach decisions by consensus.... (Other) rules include proportional representation of all the main population groups in key political and administrative positions.... (All groups) ... keep separate schools, community

As a member of Parliament and later as a leading figure in government, Kuyper and his Anti-Revolutionary Party tirelessly fought for recognition and financial support from the state for their so-called 'free schools'. They wanted them to be placed on equal footing with the secular state schools and gradually they gained success. After a long succession of legal accommodations, the Dutch CNE movement achieved its final victory in 1917 when a new constitutional principle was adopted that gave full recognition and equal financial support to Christian schools. As a result, two parallel education systems emerged: The first one consisted of a 'neutral' public school system governed by the state, and the second one was a 'special school' system which was controlled and governed by parent-based religious or community organisations. Both systems received equal financial backing from the state, and their subsidies were predominantly based on their enrollment numbers. This dual system of education has survived in Holland to the present day.

From the above, it should be clear that the main objective of the Dutch CNE movement was not to fight for a Calvinist-inspired curriculum in all Dutch schools. Instead, its goal was to ensure that parents or organisations acting on their behalf, and not the state, should decide on the ideological and religious outlook of a school. Apart from their Christian duty to do so, they suggested a more worldly justification as taxpayers. They felt that since they paid their taxes and thus contributed to the government's budget, they had a right to say how they wanted their money to be spent.

Although they were the most active objectors to a state-controlled curriculum, the Dutch CNE movement was not the only grouping that voiced misgivings about state control over schools. A rather amusing example of this arose in 1898, when the Department of Education sent to all schools the texts of patriotic songs which all children were requested to learn in honour of the upcoming inauguration of the new Queen Wilhelmina. However, teachers who belonged to the socialist teachers' organisation refused to teach their classes these 'idiotic songs'. They were of the opinion that

---

organisations and a distinct identity while sharing certain overarching values, institutions and identity with the rest of society' (Lijphart, 1977, cited in Smooha & Hanf, 1992:32-33).

‘flattering royalty would contradict the spirit of the proletariat’. In an ongoing war of words, proponents of special schools then pointed out that this incident proved that public schools were not only Godless, but were also in a position to actively undermine the state (Roling, 1982:82-83).

The concept of ‘sovereignty in one’s own circle’ proved a significant factor in Dutch politics and policy making. Holland developed into a pluralist society where people lived in their ‘own’ circle and tolerated the others, but kept away from those other circles as much as they could.

### **4.3 A Boer Victory Awakens Dutch Kinship**

The previous section discussed the Dutch context in which Christian National Education originated and was given meaning. It was from this particular context that the journey of CNE to South Africa began.

Between 1881 and 1884 – the end of the First Boer (South African) War to the restoration of Transvaal independence – Dutch interest in the political developments in South Africa was great. The initial success of the Boers against the British in 1880-1881 and then the visit to Holland in 1884 of President Kruger, General Smit and the Reverend Du Toit, the Transvaal minister of Education, had led to ‘unprecedented outbursts of national feelings in Holland. (The) Boers gave to a nation which had so long doubted the meaning of its existence, the realisation of being an old imperial power’ (van Koppen, 1992:243). Squashed between the main European powers – England, Germany and France – there was a growing fear that Holland would be swallowed up and disappear. The Boer successes against the British had – by extension – brought glory to the Dutch, who developed a keen interest in their South African ‘cousins’.

A range of socio-political problems existed in Holland at the time. One such problem concerned the national tensions that were caused by disputes that have been described earlier, namely the role of the state in the school and the corresponding school funding

controversy. Both the Dutch liberals and the Kuyper-led Calvinists in Holland saw the Boer successes as an inspiration to the Dutch nation. They saw in South Africa (projected as a kind of New Holland) explicit and unique opportunities for Dutch cultural, religious and economic expansion and they applied these ideas in local Dutch politics (van Koppen, 1992:243; de Graaff, 1993:393).

The widespread support for the Boers created a sense of unity in pillarised Holland that stretched across religious, ideological and social groupings, and thus contributed to Dutch nation-building. In its transition from a class-conscious society to a pillarised pluralist democracy, the Dutch needed a new sense of national cohesion and the pro-Boer movement provided an issue that satisfied this need. Van Koppen (1992:244) argues:

The action in favour of the Boers and based on national feelings made the political, religious and social lines fall away for a moment. In that sense, the pro-Boer movement was an integrating force. The sense of national unity in the Netherlands of these years being still fragmentary and immature, the awakening feelings of kinship with the South African Boers among broad layers of society, not only among the upper class, but also among the lower middle class and the Calvinistic labourers, may even be regarded as a nation-forming factor.

Apart from being a unifying factor, the Dutch also used the Boer struggle to further their own specific (political) agendas in Holland. Kuyper and his Anti-Revolutionary Party acknowledged the economic significance of the Dutch-South African link, but also stressed a religious dimension. Kuyper presented the Afrikaners as the 'bearers of the true, *in casu*, Calvinist and anti-revolutionary Dutch national character' (van Koppen, 1992:245). The Dutch liberals also stressed the potential for economic expansion, but put more emphasis on opportunities for cultural (language and literature) linkages. Both Dutch groups cultivated sentiments of kinship to Afrikaners, and spoke of the need to support Afrikaner opposition to Anglicisation (Lammers, 1985:16).

Kuyper frequently devoted columns in his Calvinist newspaper *De Standaard* to the situation of the Afrikaners and criticised British foreign policy towards South Africa. In his newspaper, he also expressed support for those Afrikaners who resisted the liberal

President Burgers. In 1876, Burgers had introduced a neutral state school in the Transvaal, based on ideas which in many ways reflected the ideas of the Dutch liberals. He introduced an education Bill articulating a respect for all religions, but declaring that the state should provide public secular education (Du Toit, 1955:79). These ideas were forcefully resisted, in particular by the conservative Kruger-led 'Dopper' section of the Afrikaners. As André du Toit (1983:951) explains:

Kruger ... had his roots deep in the Trekker tradition, particularly in the conservative Dopper subcommunity that had itself been reconstituted in a distinct Afrikaner church (the *Gereformeerde Kerk*) under the aegis of ministers from the *Afgescheidene* Reformed Church in the Netherlands, the spiritual home of Abraham Kuyper.

Kuyper, as a competent manipulator of public opinion, used the resistance to liberal principles in South Africa in his own Calvinist-inspired national resistance to the Dutch liberal government and his fight for CNE in Holland.

In 1877, with the annexation of the Transvaal by the British, Frans Lion Cachet – a Dutch immigrant who had moved to South Africa in 1858 – started an impressive campaign against President Burgers in Kuyper's anti-revolutionary newspaper (Schutte, 1986:18). In its 20 February 1877 edition, he stated that through Burgers' policies the *Zuid-Afrikaansche Republiek* would surrender to a 'most pathetic form of modernism'. He also accused Burgers of striking a deal with the British and having arranged for the annexation of the Transvaal, so that he could avoid the upcoming presidential elections against Kruger. Kuyper saw an ally in Lion Cachet, in their sympathetic projection of the Boers as Calvinist and anti-revolutionary congeners.

Both Kuyper and Lion Cachet believed that the Boers had the 'historic task of civilising (i.e. converting) Africa' (quoted in van Koppen, 1992:65). Using his newspaper (7 January 1898) to voice his opinions, Kuyper stated that

...the Black continent does not necessarily have to remain a place of darkness and ignorance: it has a future (...the nature of which...) will be decided on the basis of the outcome of the struggle between the three



main religions: Protestantism, Catholicism and Islam (...in Africa) (van Koppen, 1992:65).

Kuyper saw the Dutch CNE struggle, therefore, as not only of importance in Holland but also in South Africa. Christian National Education would strengthen a Calvinist base in Holland, and a strong Calvinist 'motherland' could be of significance to religious and political developments in South Africa and even elsewhere on the African continent.

In 1881, a number of Dutch pro-Boer initiatives were brought together in a new Dutch-South African organisation, the *Nederlandse Zuid-Afrikaanse Vereniging* (NZAV), which opened a national office in Amsterdam. Article One of their statutes reveals:

The Foundation aims, within the confines of international laws and regulations, to do all it can to:

1. Promote ties with our congeners (*stamgenoten*), and in consultation with them, to create and develop opportunities for agricultural and industrial growth and trade relations;
2. Inform public opinion about the situation in South Africa.<sup>2</sup>

An interesting paragraph was added to the second point of Article One:

Any attempt, by way of propaganda, to influence the moral or religious nature of the population here (in Holland) is out of the question.

This addition to Article One had come about after considerable dispute between Dutch liberals and Calvinists, who had different agendas when it came to cultivating relations with the Boers in South Africa.<sup>3</sup> To accommodate their differences, the NZAV officially adopted a neutral stance. Kuyper, however, ensured that if a specific request involving a religious dimension did come *from* South Africa, this article would not preclude a positive response. One example that he used to illustrate his point concerned a request by the Transvaal government to send teachers, but only Christian (that is, Calvinist) teachers to strengthen Dutch-Afrikaans education.

---

<sup>2</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut; Archives NZAV; Article 1; Statutes NZAV; 1881

<sup>3</sup> For a detailed description of the events that led up to the establishment of the NZAV and the negotiations between the liberals and Calvinists see Van Koppen (1992:78-90).

Both liberal and Calvinist groupings continuously tried to exert their influence on the policies of the NZAV and on the execution of its policies. Their political differences led to frequent disputes in the organisation. However, pragmatism prevailed as both groupings had enough in common to co-operate on the basis of both their feelings of kinship with the Afrikaners and their recognition of a potential for good trade relations.

Kinship feelings amongst Dutch Calvinists, were reinforced and inextricably linked to their religion. This gave a particular flavour to their support for Afrikaners. The possibility of emigration to South Africa in some ways softened the threat that Holland would be absorbed by its powerful neighbours. It offered the possibility of an 'escape route'; as Kuyper had said, 'In case life would be made unbearable for us Christian people, then we will march out as free sons, to the new Holland, to Transvaal' (Kuyper, cited in van Koppen, 1992:244).

#### **4.4 Transplanting Christian National Education**

One of the activities of the NZAV concerned sending Dutch school textbooks to South Africa. The first annual report of the NZAV (1881) mentions that they were requested to do so by the Superintendent of Education in the Transvaal, G.L. du Toit, who acted on behalf of President Paul Kruger. The textbooks were particularly intended to counter the Anglicisation of education in South Africa, particularly in the Transvaal.

There was a real need for suitable history textbooks that described South Africa's history from a Dutch-Afrikaner perspective, and not from a British point of view. The 1886 annual report of the NZAV mentions the urgent need for Dutch financial support to commission a study that would produce a well-researched and documented history. The intention was that this study would subsequently lead to the development of suitable history textbooks for use in schools. The NZAV alerted the donor community:

...if we want the Dutch Republics to remain independent and not to be absorbed into the British Empire, there is a great urgency to counter their powerful influence (...on language, culture and economy...).<sup>4</sup>

In an 1886 membership drive in Holland, potential members of the NZAV were informed about the Anglicisation of Boer education. Their pamphlet explained:

It is well known that the British want to Anglicise the Boers in times of war and in times of peace. In 1881, the Boers proved on the battlefield that their nationalism and independence is sacred to them. But, more pervasive than the crude violence of war, is the continuous presence of British capital and the English language. If we wish the Dutch Republics to remain independent, and not to be absorbed into the British empire, then there is a great urgency to counter this powerful (... British ...) predominance.<sup>5</sup>

At the same time, the NZAV felt that it needed to address an incorrect perception that many British citizens seemed to have of Dutch descendants in South Africa:

...a significant part of the British people wrongly assume that the barbaric native is a model of affability and that the Dutch Boer is an inhumane oppressor. The fact is that one can educate these barbaric Kaffirs and Hottentots by teaching them to *work* instead of *lazing about*. (... and this is ...) a much more sensible approach than the British efforts to *civilise* them. This is clear to the Boer, but seldom to the Englishman.<sup>6</sup>

In the 1887 annual report, it was recommended that the organisation should do more to inform the general public of Great Britain about the plight of the Dutch in South Africa.

Two years before this, in 1885, the NZAV had addressed the Dutch Parliament in an open letter in which they requested support for a policy that would facilitate access of South African Afrikaner students to Dutch post-secondary education. In their letter, they pointed out South African interest in this matter. They stated that:

---

<sup>4</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; discussed in Annual Report NZAV, 1886 (my translation)

<sup>5</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; Appendix to Annual Report NZAV, 1886 (my translation)

The difficult struggle against British dominance is reinforced by the fact that the better educated Dutch Afrikaners have to go to England to further their education.<sup>7</sup>

The letter also reminded the Dutch of their unique linkage with South Africa:

South Africa is the only country in the world where the Dutch immigrant can remain loyal to his own National character (*volksaard*).<sup>8</sup>

The request by the NZAV to adjust the admissions criteria for Afrikaners who wanted to study in Holland was considered and approved by the Dutch parliament. This meant that entry requirements to higher education for Afrikaners became comparable to those of Dutch citizens who had lived overseas.

It was with regard to Dutch-South African links in higher education that the Dutch Anti-Revolutionary Party would later experience great disappointment. Kuyper had expected visiting Afrikaner students to exclusively enrol at the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam which he had helped to found. The Afrikaner authorities, like the Superintendent of Education in the Transvaal, G.L. du Toit, rejected this idea. Du Toit, who was part of an 1884 Transvaal delegation to Holland, showed an interest in a range of Dutch universities, including those which were state-controlled, liberal and secular in their outlook.

Initially, du Toit's contact with Holland had almost exclusively been with the Anti-Revolutionaries, because of their ideological and religious ties. The 1884 Transvaal delegation to Holland showed a broader orientation. Van Koppen (1992:130) argues that pan-Dutch expectations with regard to the *Zuid Afrikaansche Republiek* must have felt oppressive to the Afrikaner Nationalist du Toit, who would not have wanted to see British imperialism replaced by a new predominance in Dutch nationalist style. Instead,

---

<sup>6</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; Annual Report NZAV, 1887 (my translation)

<sup>7</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; Open letter to the Dutch Parliament (April 1885); signed by D. Cordes (chair) and N.A. Calish (General Secretary). Appeared as appendix to Annual Report NZAV, 1885 (my translation)

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

whilst they were obvious in their need for independence from the British, they also felt a growing need to distinguish themselves from the Dutch. A manifesto published in the newspaper *Die Afrikaanse Patriot* in January 1876 had already exemplified this desire that was nurtured by a section of the Afrikaner population:

...there are three types of (Afrikaners), ... (those with) ENGLISH hearts, (those with ) DUTCH hearts. And, then there are Afrikaners with Afrikaans hearts. The latter we call TRUE AFRIKANERS (*REGTE AFRIKANERS*), and these we ask to side with us. We appeal (to you) to recognise (that) Afrikaans is our mother tongue, given to us by our dear Lord. And, they must stand with us through thick and thin; and, not rest before our language is generally recognised in every respect as the language of our people and our land.<sup>9</sup>

Whilst the 1884 Transvaal delegation would have felt solidarity with the Anti-Revolutionaries in terms of their Calvinist roots, it was also clear that their community needed abundant financial support for the promotion of Afrikaner education. If they had focused exclusively on the Anti-Revolutionaries, they would have alienated other (and perhaps richer!) potential donors in Holland.

The NZAV became instrumental in setting up a bursary fund, the *Studiefonds voor Zuid Afrikaansche Studenten* that offered bursaries to 'youngsters from the *Zuid Afrikaansche Republiek* and other parts of South Africa to enable them to study in Holland'.<sup>10</sup> The regulations of the Fund stated that the selection of bursars would be undertaken by the Board of Directors of the Fund, but specified that this would occur in 'co-operation with the Transvaal Government'.<sup>11</sup> In this way, they made the selection of candidates subject to the approval of the Kruger-led Transvaal authorities who, one may assume, would be unlikely to grant such opportunities to their political or religious opponents.

---

<sup>9</sup> From: *Die Afrikaanse Patriot*; 15 January 1876. quoted in February (1991:81)

<sup>10</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut. Archives NZAV; Appendix 5 to the minutes of the Annual Federal Meeting of the NZAV, dated 9 June 1888; *Regelement Studiefonds voor Zuid Afrikaansche Studenten* (Rules and Regulations) (my translation)

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, article 9

Apart from sending textbooks and facilitating higher education for Afrikaners in Holland, a request came to send Dutch teachers to South Africa to teach in primary schools. In the 22 February 1888 edition of the *Nieuws van den Dag*, the general secretary of the NZAV, C.B. Spruyt, publicly called on teachers to apply for such teaching positions in the Transvaal. He explained some of the requirements:

Those teachers who wish to be posted to the Transvaal have to be members of the Protestant Church, and be able to read from the Scriptures in church. They should also have a good singing voice and some knowledge of music in order to lead a church in the singing of hymns.<sup>12</sup>

Spruyt also tried to warn candidates by noting:

Young healthy Dutch men will succeed in South Africa if they are not too stubborn, and if they understand that the general conditions in this new country are quite different from the old country. They should also know that it doesn't suit a stranger to look down on all that seems odd and unusual. If they want to adapt, they should understand that their own 'bookish' knowledge is not as valuable as the wholesome and practical knowledge of the Boers.<sup>13</sup>

Later that year, in a special report, Spruyt explained that teachers would be expected to do more than just teach. Indeed, they would be considered part of the farming community. They could expect to carry out duties such as 'counting sheep, general house repairs, harvesting *etc.*' Spruyt believed that this would suit a man with the right work ethic:

...usually this is Kaffir-work, but one can't depend on the Kaffirs and the work has to be done....<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives *Hoofd Comité* NZAV. A copy of the newspaper, the *Nieuws van den Dag*, of 22 February 1888 was inserted in a file which contained notes that were used to prepare the 1888 Annual Report of the NZAV (my translation)

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives *Hoofd Comité* NZAV. A copy of a report, 'On Education in the South African Republic', dated 24 December 1888, was inserted in a file which contained notes that were used to prepare the 1888 Annual Report of the NZAV (my translation)

In order to financially support those Dutch teachers who were interested in a posting to South Africa (Transvaal), a new fund was created in May 1890, and was affiliated to the NZAV. It was named 'the Fund in Aid of Dutch Education in South Africa' (*Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid-Afrika*). Its Board consisted of 32 influential academics, nobility, clergymen and lawyers who confidentially circulated a pamphlet for fundraising purposes amongst their friends and acquaintances, in order to collect money for this cause (Jansen, 1983:6). Their circular passionately stated its case:

Representatives of divergent religious communities of our country have united to request your co-operation with regard to the preservation of our mother tongue as the people's language (*volkstaal*) of South Africa. It still is the language of the nation. It still (...can...) satisfy the spiritual and moral needs of the growing population in the fast developing Boer nations.... But, more than ever before, it is a case of now or never. Our generation has the moral duty to co-operate with dedication, with this form of the peaceful expansion of our nation.<sup>15</sup>

They, too, warned of the threat of English predominance:

British preponderance in the world of finance and industry assures them, by peaceful means, of much greater influence on the Boer Republics, than they ever managed to gain through armed conflict. In order to turn the tide, Holland has only one, but thank goodness an effective means. This is the power of language. 'The language is the people, it is the nation itself.'<sup>16</sup>

The circular also explained that it was indeed an excellent time to start the fund, since it would work in tandem with the 1889 decision of the Transvaal government to pay four and a half pounds per pupil per year to every teacher who, through Dutch-medium teaching, would promote Christianity through prayer and scripture reading.

The fund operated as a loan bank, giving advances to approved teachers so that they could finance their journey and support themselves until a suitable position was finalised. The statutes of the fund reveal a focus beyond financial assistance to teachers:

---

<sup>15</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives *Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika* (FHO) FHO (7) 1890, pamphlet marked 'Confidential, not for public consumption'

The fund aims to finance *all* (my italics) that promotes the Dutch language as a vehicle for thought in education in South Africa.<sup>17</sup>

At the 1891 annual meeting of the directors of the fund, it was reported that ‘several hundred candidates have applied’. Through a selection process with ‘very stringent criteria’, this number had been reduced to nine appointable teachers. They all had to sign a contract before they left, stating that they were members of the Protestant church, that they had certified proof of good conduct issued by the appropriate authorities, and that they were willing to contribute to the growth of ‘National Education in the South African Republic, (...and the...) the Protestant-Christian spirit of (...National Education...), which has been described in article 2 of law No. 8, 1892, in relation to article 1(b) of the same law’.<sup>18</sup>

After three months in South Africa, the first appointed teacher, Giel Zonneveldt, wrote to the Board of Directors of the fund. He had found work in Bethal, on the farm ‘Witrand’, and reported back:

I have been appointed as a teacher in the farm school of Mr. J.H. Smit, who treats me well. Although the Transvaal Boer feels an antipathy towards all *uitlanders*, he generally treats them well if they are well behaved and (in my case) if I give the children a wholesome and practical education.... The number of children at the school stood at 15, but due to the harvest needs, it has now been reduced to 8. I will accompany the Boer to the bush, and continue to teach from a linen tent!<sup>19</sup>

In the time between the appointment of this teacher to the Transvaal in 1891 and the start of the second Anglo-Boer (South African) War in 1899, the Dutch-born N.

---

<sup>16</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>17</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives: *Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika* (FHO) FHO (1) ‘Reglement van het Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika (Rules and Regulation of the Fund) 2nd Edition; July 1897

<sup>18</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives *Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika* (FHO) FHO(1) Document: ‘Voorwaarden voor het verstrekken van reistoelagen aan Onderwijzers uit het Buitenland’ 1894 (Conditions for the issue of Travel allowances to Teachers from Abroad); see also Jansen, 1983:6



Mansvelt took over the position of Superintendent of Education in the Transvaal. Mansvelt used his excellent contacts with the NZAV and its affiliates to reduce the British influence in schools and involve Holland in the education system that was evolving under his leadership (Lammers, 1985: 32).

This time also saw the growth of friction between Afrikaners and Dutch immigrants in South Africa. The Dutch immigrants, who came with Dutch qualifications and credentials, often landed the better-paid jobs at the expense of local Afrikaners. There was also the question of language. Dutch was the official language at the time, but there was a growing section of the population that wanted to see Afrikaans play that role. The 1896 Annual meeting of the NZAV discusses an open letter from 'several Dutch Afrikaners to their Brothers in Holland', who ask for Dutch support in their efforts to start a new Afrikaans-medium literary magazine. They explain:

...We will not forget that our National roots are Dutch, and not English ... and although politically we are now separated, there is a bond between us, the bond of consanguinity, religion and language. (... However ...), it is crystal clear that there is a tremendous need for (reading material) *by* and *for* Afrikaners. Dutch books ... do not appeal to the majority of the people; they contain too many strange and unfamiliar words, expressions and contemplations, and as a result, the desire to read diminishes. (... In order to rekindle that desire ...) Afrikaners must start by writing (...in Afrikaans).<sup>20</sup>

Mansvelt instructed all schools to observe Departmental rules stringently, particularly where the situation concerned a change in policy that he had effected. Whereas the departmental regulations had first stated only 'Christian education' as their goal, under Mansvelt it was changed to 'Protestant Christian education' (Lammers, 1985:32).

---

<sup>19</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut. Archives *Fonds ten behoeve van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika* (FHO) FHO(1) Confidential report, dated 25 May 1891

<sup>20</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut. Archives NZAV; Appendix 14 of the 1896 Annual Report of the NZAV. This letter was signed by five prominent Afrikaners, one of them being Prof. De Vos, Professor of Theology and Chair of the 'Taalbond'. Attached to the letter is a message of support for this initiative by B.H. de Waal, the Dutch Consul-General in Cape Town, dated 19 August 1896.

In the first few years after Mansvelt's appointment, many schools were closed and teachers fired as a result of intensified inspection, aimed at appraising the specific Protestant Christian nature of schools. However, in the later years of his administration, the number of schools grew substantially again, after suitable teachers – that is, those who subscribed to the Protestant Christian nature of education – were hired. A significant number of these teachers had been actively recruited in Holland. All of these Dutch teachers, like Giel Zonneveldt, had to sign the contract in which they pledged their full co-operation in shaping the school curriculum in a Protestant Christian spirit.<sup>21</sup>

Many of these teachers were united in an organisation that had been founded in April 1893, following the example of a Teachers' Union in Holland which was affiliated to the Anti-Revolutionary Party and the Dutch CNE movement. The stated goal of the Organisation of Teachers in South Africa (*Vereniging van Onderwijzers en Onderwijzeressen in Zuid Afrika*), was to 'promote Christian and National Education in and by the school, in the context of the history and unity of our People (*Volk*) in language and descent' (quoted in Lammers, 1985:34). Their statutes clearly communicated their aims:

Article 2.

As an organisation of pedagogues, we recognise that the Holy Scriptures reveal the deepest mysteries of the nature and destiny of humankind, and we adopt the Word of God as our fundamental principle.

Article 3

a. Schooling (*Onderwijs*) and Education (*Opvoeding*) are inseparable.

b. Education should be Christian and National.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Lammers (1985:34) gives the following statistics, based on figures that the *Zuid Afrikaanse Republiek (ZAR)* Department of Education presented at an Education Symposium in Paris in 1900: At the time, there were 349 South African teachers from outside of the Transvaal (mainly from the Cape Colony), 323 European teachers (mainly Dutch) and 158 Transvaaler teachers employed in the Transvaal Education system

<sup>22</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut; Archives FHO. I found a copy of the *Journal of the Organisation of Onderwijzers en Onderwijzeressen in Zuid Afrika*, dated December 1903, unclassified, in a map of the FHO collection. The journal notes that it is for the first time since the Second Boer War that they can resume their activities. An abbreviated version of the minutes of their first meeting, held on 31 December 1903, reveals that the meeting resolved a change in article 4 of their statutes, opening membership to teachers working in English schools. All other articles remained unchanged and the organisation remained committed to the CNE philosophy.

Before the Second Boer War, the organisation was open only to teachers who worked in the Christian Dutch (medium) Schools.<sup>23</sup> The organisation made policy proposals, organised curriculum debates, lobbied officials and supported the government in its attempts to construct a Protestant Christian National education system. Schutte (1986:107) argues that the Dutch influence on schooling was not only evident in the number of Dutch teachers working in South African schools at the time, but that the whole education system itself, in terms of its main policies, was influenced by Holland. This was particularly evident in the basic principle of the system which assumed that what was taught in schools was, in the first instance, the responsibility of parents rather than the state. The department's role was to stimulate, subsidise and regulate schooling, albeit within their stated policy objective of creating a system of Christian National Education. Furthermore, it was eminently clear that the education system was meant for white children only.

When the political tensions in South Africa were rising in the build-up to the Second Boer (South African) War, the 1899 annual report of the NZAV makes mention of their deep concerns with regard to the conflict between the British and the *Zuid Afrikaansche Republiek*. Since one of the stated objectives of their organisation was to inform the general public, both in Holland *and* abroad,<sup>24</sup> the NZAV decided at a meeting held on the 20 July 1899 to send a 'very grave message to the people of Great Britain'. After some introductory paragraphs, in which they outlined the positive historical relations between the 'people of Holland and Great Britain', they warned:

...we fear that many of you are on the verge of violating the rights of the people of the South African Republic, a branch of our common stock. They may be weak in number, but they are strong in virtues which are

---

<sup>23</sup> At the first meeting of the organisation after the war, in 1903, it was decided that teachers who worked in English schools could join as well. There probably was a very practical reason: many of the Dutch teachers had been sent back home by the British, tremendously reducing the membership of the organisation.

<sup>24</sup> article 1 point 2; Statutes NZAV 1881

counted highest by all Anglo-Saxons: they have courage, love of liberty, self-reliance and a profoundly religious spirit....<sup>25</sup>

They pleaded with the British people to:

...desist from any attempt of money makers or statesmen to hinder the ... development of ...(the Boers)... own nature or genius, trying to subject them to your own will.... Desist from creating and seizing every opportunity and pretext for interfering with their private affairs.<sup>26</sup>

The minutes of the 1899 annual meeting of the NZAV reveal that in one week 140,147 Dutch people signed this manifest. Most British newspapers published it, but generally, as the Board of the NZAV disappointedly ascertains, without any editorial comment.

Dutch-Afrikaner frictions in South Africa faded into the background during the second Anglo-Boer War, when both groups were united in their struggle against the British (Lammers, 1985: 36). Dutch teachers, alongside their Afrikaner colleagues, joined the army and many schools were closed.

#### **4.5 Christian National Education as Resistance**

After the British victory and the 1902 peace agreement between the British and the Boers (*Vrede van Vereniging*), their roles in shaping the education system reversed. It was now the British who set out to steer the education system away from its existing Dutch-Afrikaner character. Milner, the new British Governor of the Republics, cynically commented on the history curriculum:

---

<sup>25</sup> Manifest, composed by Prof. J. de Louter, Board member of the NZAV. Apart from the English translation (appendix 7 of the 1899 Annual Report), which was sent to the British media, the 1899 Annual Report of the NZAV mentions that this text was also translated into German and French, and sent to appropriate newspapers around Europe.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*

At present, I shrewdly suspect the 'studious youth' are brought up almost exclusively on Majuba, with a little Jameson raid thrown in as seasoning<sup>27</sup> (quoted in Lammers, 1985:36).

The new administration fired a substantial number of Dutch teachers and replaced them with British ones. Many of these new recruits had previously worked in other British colonies, such as Canada, New Zealand or Australia. It was decided that the medium of instruction in schools would be exclusively English, and basing any lessons on Dutch or Afrikaner inspired versions of history was forbidden. A great number of Dutch teachers, many of whom had become prisoners of war, were repatriated to Holland.

Nevertheless, Dutch Calvinist support continued to influence the development of education ties between the two nations, particularly with regard to the employment of Dutch teachers in Christian schools. Now that the new government of the South African Republics no longer supported the Dutch-medium Christian schools, it became financially almost impossible to maintain them. Once more, however, a growing resistance against the Anglicisation of education developed amongst Afrikaners, who were strongly in favour of what they saw as their 'own' education – vital in the survival of the Afrikaner nation, its religion, culture and language. This resistance became very much a grassroots organisation, where parents were encouraged to instruct their children about their 'own' history and religion and the God-given task of making South Africa a Calvinist nation. These educational tasks were specifically delegated to parents, which was an attitude which had previously been encouraged in Holland. Education became central to the broader political goal of achieving Afrikaner self-determination.

Kuyper's Anti-Revolutionary Party, and the Dutch CNE movement with their 'sovereignty in one's own circle' and 'in isolation lies our strength' ideology, had long promoted their ideas with slogans such as 'the school belongs to the parents'. These sentiments had already been welcomed by Dutch and Afrikaners when Calvinist teachers were in a position of strength, prior to the second Anglo-Boer War. Now they were welcomed again, in an attempt to counter the post Anglo-Boer War efforts to anglicise

---

<sup>27</sup> During the battle at Majuba (1881) and the Jameson Raid (1895), the Boer army had been victorious

education policies. More than ever the Afrikaners experienced these policies as a great threat to their very existence and to the national character of their people. Schutte (1987) states that in order to

...fend off the threats, they grabbed from the weapons of the available Kuyperian arsenal. Their priorities were clear: church, education, and the socio-political order....

A commission for Christian National Education in South Africa was established in 1902. Dutch support was rallied through the NZAV. Dutch (Calvinist) teachers were again sent to South Africa, but most definitely not on the same scale as before the second Anglo-Boer War.<sup>28</sup> Kuyper had become Prime Minister of Holland in 1901 and was not directly involved in the day-to-day management of NZAV-coordinated efforts to send Dutch teachers to South Africa, but he clearly expressed his views on who he thought should go:

Not just any teacher, just because he is Dutch, is a man after the Afrikaners hearts, nor after our hearts for that matter. In the interest of South Africa, we wish to send only Christian teachers to work with the children of that unfortunate community (Kuyper, cited in van Koppen, 1992).

The end of the war had also marked the end of an era between Holland and the Afrikaners. Although the Dutch continued to support the Boers, they seem to have come to the realisation that their pan-Dutch sentiments were a thing of the past. Slowly they came to accept that Afrikaners were indeed related to them, but that they were a separate nation. With the idea of New Holland fading, Dutch efforts to support Afrikaners refocused on the preservation and protection of Afrikaans as a language and the parallel existence of the Dutch language in South Africa.

---

over the British

<sup>28</sup> In 1904 there were only 65 Dutch teachers working in South Africa, most of whom had already been there before the second Anglo-Boer War. Between 1902 and 1908, only 30 new Dutch teachers arrived (Lammers, 1985:55).

For the Afrikaners, the war and their experiences in the British concentration camps had ignited an increasing Afrikaner nationalism. This nationalism distinguished itself not only from its obvious opponent, the British, but also from the Dutch and from forms of pan-Dutch imperialism. It became much harder to fundraise in Holland for Afrikaner nationalism than it had been during the time when the Dutch cherished their pan-Dutch ideals. The membership of the NZAV decreased from 6,632 at the end of 1901 to 5,364 by the end of 1903 (de Graaff, 1993:92), and financially the organisation was losing strength.

A second, much smaller organisation, the *Christelijk Nationaal Boeren Comité* (CNBC) (which on principle had never joined the NZAV), was also losing members. They, like the NZAV, tried hard to get Dutch donors interested in the Afrikaner CNE schools. The NZAV encouraged local chapters to adopt specific schools, but it was very difficult to raise sufficient money. Louis Botha wrote in December 1903 to W.J. Leyds, the representative of the *Zuid Afrikaansche Republiek* in Europe, that in the Transvaal alone, they needed 12,000 Dutch guilders a month to sustain CNE schools. The NZAV and the CNBC, even after they joined forces for this specific purpose, could not come up with that amount (de Graaff, 1993:101-102). In South Africa, too, the National Committee for CNE strove to keep the schools going. Their General Secretary, H. Vischer, wrote to H.J. Emous who was Chair of the CNBC at the time:

I have told General Smuts that we wish to include the Free State in our organisation. This would strengthen us against state funded education. The whole funding position (of the Government) remains something of a mystery to me. As long as we can't do more here, our position remains precarious. The demand for (CNE) schools is actually increasing and that, of course, means that – again – we need more money.<sup>29</sup>

In October 1905 the Commission for Christian National Education in Pretoria organised a 'People's Congress', which resolved:

---

<sup>29</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut; Archives H.J. Emous, personal correspondence from H. Vischer (General Secretary of the *Hoofd-Commissie voor Christelijk National Onderwijs* in Pretoria) to Mr. H.J. Emous of the *Fonds ten Behoeve van het Hollands Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika*, letter dated 29 August 1904

In negotiations with the Government on the issue of education, it has become clear that the rights of our people (*volk*) are not recognised; on the contrary, they are being taken away from us. Therefore, this congress will go ahead with the organisation of education of our own people in accordance with the principles of Christian National Education. We call on our people to educate their own children.<sup>30</sup>

It was stipulated that only white people who were in favour of CNE could join. It was clear that their intention was to build a grassroots organisation amongst white CNE followers. The congress decided that local chapters (neighbourhood committees) should be elected, which in turn would have to set up district committees, which would then elect a National Committee to organise and administer the CNE movement. However, even these attempts failed to sustain the movement. In a political settlement in 1907, it was resolved that the CNE schools would be able to apply for state funding (de Graaff, 1993:102). However, the agreement meant that they would have to compromise on curriculum and governance of schools, and also indicated that the appointment of Dutch teachers would be discouraged and phased out in state-funded schools. On 13 May 1907, H. Vischer of the CNE Committee wrote to H.J. Emous to explain the new situation:

Last week I spoke to General Smuts (privately at his house and therefore confidentially), about bringing out Dutch teachers. Officially, this can not be encouraged, since the appointment of teachers from England, or the British colonies, has also been stopped. The goal is to provide for the need for teachers through our own local (teacher education) programme, so that we can get qualified Afrikaner staff.... Have I told you yet that our leaders *cannot* act any other way because of their alliance with the Nationalists? ... (however) nothing will stop (people living) in the main towns and cities from starting their own schools. The new Law leaves a gap for that possibility.<sup>31</sup>

In spite of the fact that the new law would not stop private CNE schools, Vischer did not think that this option was viable because it had already proved to be too difficult financially to sustain them. He suspected that most CNE schools would be absorbed into

---

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.* Attached to one of the letters there was a copy of a report by the Congress organising committee, appointed by the Central Committee of the People (*Hoofd Comite van Het Volk*), dated 12 October 1905



the state-funded system where they would have far less control over the curriculum. Disappointedly he predicted:

What will probably happen is that most CNE schools, if not all, will transfer (to the state system) so that our cause will just be something that is spoken of, or written about. So many of the powerful spokesmen for our cause have no personal interest in the matter ... (and) once they are confronted with the realities on the ground, they start to compromise and surrender! I do not want to give names, but I know of many who do not have children themselves yet, and who, unlike teachers, do not have to make a living (from working in) schools.<sup>32</sup>

The Commission on CNE decided to disband. Vischer wrote, 'It is only financial obligations to the Nederlandse Bank, that still keeps the committee members together'.

Very few Dutch teachers were sent to South Africa after this. The 1908 Annual Report of the Fund in Aid of Dutch Education in South Africa mentioned that only four teachers went that year. The Fund seemed aware that it was not so much in aid of Dutch education, but rather in aid of Afrikaner education:

...the Dutch teacher can heed the noble call to help to build a young nation with a great future....<sup>33</sup>

In the next year, 1909, fourteen teachers were recruited, but only six of them were able to go. The others first had to learn English, since, as the report mentioned, 'this is currently the medium of instruction in schools'.<sup>34</sup>

The proclamation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 gave the NZAV new hope of increasing their influence. Already in their 1909 report, they proudly announced:

---

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, letter dated 13 May 1907

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>33</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; in Annual Report 1908, report-back by the management committee of the Fund in Aid of Dutch Education in South Africa, signed by C.J.K. Van Aalst (Chair) and N. Mansvelt (General Secretary)

<sup>34</sup> *Ibid.*, Annual Report 1909

Whether the National character of the (Union) will be predominantly British or Dutch-Afrikaner, will depend on the Dutch-Afrikaner part of this new nation.<sup>35</sup>

In any case, it was felt that the British influence on South Africa was sure to wane, as was confidently mentioned in the NZAV 1909 annual general meeting, when an unnamed 'English politician with considerable South African experience' was quoted; he predicted that the Unification of South Africa would prove to be the 'first chapter of the fall of the British Empire'. The minutes also reveal that the NZAV was of the opinion that while there were fewer opportunities for Dutch teachers in South Africa, the possibilities in higher education and teacher education should not be underestimated:

the Afrikaners are discovering that education organised along British lines, leaves many gaps, and that they can learn a lot from the scientific approach of Dutch (and other continental) pedagogy. This is what draws Afrikaner students to our country.<sup>36</sup>

At the meeting, B.B. Keet, who was previously the Chair of the *Afrikaner Taalvereniging* in Stellenbosch but studying in Holland at the time, wished to address the NZAV gathering. He pleaded with them to help the Afrikaners strengthen their culture and language. Mr Keet believed that Afrikaner students did not come to Holland only to undertake scientific study, but also to be revitalised, or in his words, to 'refresh at the national source. However, he strongly felt that Afrikaners needed to develop their own language and literature, and strengthen their own national pride; Keet said, 'We are not Dutch, we are Afrikaners'. Keet hoped that, apart from academic students, 'Afrikaner teachers (will also be allowed to) come to Holland, to further their studies'. The Chair, van Aalst, ended the meeting by confirming the new direction that the NZAV had taken:

The majority of us do not need to be persuaded any more that the existence of Afrikaans is justified. Before the war, we thought differently,

---

<sup>35</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV; minutes of the Annual General Meeting in 1909, signed by N. Mansvelt (General Secretary)

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*

but the changed circumstances have made us change our minds... Afrikaners can come here to renew and strengthen themselves so that they can prepare for the great work that awaits them in their own country.<sup>37</sup>

#### 4.6 Nazism as a New Source of Inspiration

Co-operation in the field of education between the Dutch and the Afrikaners had significantly changed between 1902 and 1910 in three interrelated areas, setting a trend that continued up to the Second World War. The main shift had been in the ideological context of their linkage programmes. The emphasis was moving from a Pan-Dutch ideology and Calvinist solidarity to one where the Dutch slowly came to the conclusion that the best way to maintain a meaningful link with South Africa was to support Afrikaners in their quest to develop their own national character, through co-operation in the fields of culture, language and religion. This meant that, in practice, the main focus shifted from primary education to higher (mainly university) education. As a direct result of this shift, the annual general reports of the NZAV reveal that after 1910 a growing number of Afrikaner students came to study at one of Holland's universities, rather than Dutch primary teachers going to South Africa.

Most of these Afrikaner students received bursaries from the so-called 'South African Motherland Foundation' (ZASM), which channelled its money through the NZAV.<sup>38</sup> The ZASM and the NZAV still hoped that studying in Holland would 'mould these Afrikaners into purveyors (...of Dutch culture...) who on their return to South Africa would reinforce (...this...) culture and make (...it...) an even more attractive destination for Dutch emigrants (De Graaff, 1993:396). This proved to be too optimistic. The reality was that although the ZASM (in co-operation with the NZAV) had become 'the pivot

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid*

<sup>38</sup> The founders of this fund were formerly from the Netherlands South African Railway Company (NZASM), whose South African assets were captured by the British during the Boer war. The British government paid compensation for this in 1908, leaving the NZASM with almost 1.5 million Dutch guilders which they decided to dedicate to the promotion of Dutch interests abroad. Most of their funding was channeled through the NZAV. (For a detailed history of the NZASM see De Graaff, 1993).

and financial engine of institutionalised Dutch interest in South Africa, relations between the two countries were marginal in size and significance' (De Graaff, 1993:396).

An important development in the growth of Afrikaner nationalism was the establishment of the Afrikaner Broederbond in 1918.<sup>39</sup> Initially the organisation's membership consisted mainly of 'Dutch Reformed Church ministers, (members of) the teaching profession and those concerned with the administration of education in school committees and school boards' (Malherbe, 1977:668). Malherbe states that very soon most of them became politically oriented in their ideals. Moderates were weeded out and new recruits carefully screened. The Broederbond penetrated into the economic and banking spheres where it operated through subsidiaries<sup>40</sup> which had established 370 branches across the country:

Out of these organisations, which started in the first instance as welfare organisations to help poor Afrikaners, sprouted in the course of time, a big variety of Afrikaner economic undertakings, such as banks, factories, wholesale and retail concerns. Even maternity homes, hospitals and funeral parlours were not excluded, so that eventually, the *Reddingsdaadbond* could claim that it cared for Afrikaners literally from the cradle to the grave (Malherbe, 1977: 668).

Afrikaner nationalism continued to dissociate itself from Dutch influence, much to the indignation of the organised Dutch community in South Africa. The Dutch Foundation in Pretoria issued a statement in 1925, criticising

small minded people, filled with ambition and little sense of honour are the ones who shout 'Africa for ourselves, down with the *Uitlanders*.' (...in so doing...) they try to conceal their incompetence with exaggerated (excessive) nationalism, which is in fact nothing but selfishness (quoted in de Graaff, 1993:221, my translation).

---

<sup>39</sup> The Broederbond started under the title of *Jong Suid-Afrika* (Young South Africa) 'with the object of bringing together young Afrikaners in Johannesburg and on the Reef' who wanted to assert their Afrikaner cultural identity in an urban community which was overwhelmingly English (Malherbe, 1977:668).

<sup>40</sup> the *Helpmekaar* and *Reddingsdaadbond*

The NZAV was perhaps more diplomatic in its 1926 statement, in which its new chair, J.W. Pont, said:

Just as the shoot of a root cannot be cut off without committing suicide, the Afrikaners cannot be disjoined from their Dutch past. To be Dutch is in their blood, in spite of their resistance. This is why I trust the leaders of the Afrikaner movement, who love their people ... and I expect that the current crisis will eventually lead to a strengthening of Dutch influence (quoted in de Graaff, 1993:223, my translation).

Pont, who was not only the Chair of the NZAV but also a board member of the ZASM and the editor of the Dutch monthly *South Africa*, continued to advocate the NZAV's efforts to keep up a Dutch influence on the Afrikaner struggle for nationalist emancipation.

In 1929, Holland and South Africa entered into official diplomatic relations. This brought an end to the era in which the ZASM, through the NZAV, had been the main engine for the establishment and maintenance of Dutch-South African relations and the champion of Dutch interests in South Africa. From now on the two countries maintained not only private relations, but official ones as well (De Graaff, 1993:397).

In terms of academic co-operation, the Afrikaner organisation that saw to awarding study grants ensured that only those Afrikaner students who were thought to be able to withstand foreign influences were given permission to study in Holland. Their staunch nationalism did not go unnoticed. De Graaff concludes that by the early thirties, nationalism of Afrikaner students (in Holland) came so strongly to the fore that the ZASM board questioned whether a fruitful exchange of ideas with them was still possible. This was especially said to be true of students from Potchefstroom university – the academic stronghold of Afrikaner neo-Calvinism (De Graaff, 1993:401). Significantly, however, study grants continued to be awarded.

Holland was not the only European country that actively sought academic co-operation with Afrikaner students and their organisations. Furlong (1991:78-79) notes that an important source of cultural co-operation and scholarly exchanges was the German-

Afrikaans Cultural Union, under the presidency of J.F.J. van Rensburg, who also was the president of the Afrikaner National Student Union (ANS) founded by Piet Meyer in 1933. Whereas the Dutch bursar, the ZASM, had voiced its concerns about the lack of effect that studying in Holland had on the nationalism of Afrikaner students, the Nazis watched these same students with interest. They noted, for instance, their support for neutrality in the event of a war between Britain and Germany (Furlong, 1991:79). Furlong (1991:79) quotes the leader of the Nazi Party in South Africa, who commented on an address that van Rensburg gave to the Student Union in 1937 in Stellenbosch:

(Van Rensburg) emphasised that (through) national socialism ... Germany was being saved from the great danger of communism. (Van Rensburg) ... freely upheld national socialism as an example to the Afrikaners ... before the student body of Stellenbosch, from which the future leadership (of the Afrikaners) will be drawn.... (this) shows how lasting are the impressions that he gained on his visit to Germany.<sup>41</sup>

Other prominent Afrikaner Nationalists, too, showed that their views were significantly influenced by Germany. Nico Diederichs, for example, studied at the University of Leiden in Holland, but wrote his thesis in German.<sup>42</sup> He published his most famous work in 1936, in which he addressed the problems surrounding the political divisions amongst Afrikaners. He urged them put aside these differences and unite because he believed that ‘...only in the nation as the most total, most inclusive human community can man realise himself fully...to work for the realisation of the national calling is to work for the realisation of God's plan. Service to the nation is therefor part of service to my God (Diederichs, quoted in Furlong, 1991:92). Furlong argues:

This is not the language of traditional Afrikaner Calvinist Nationalism. Afrikaner heroes such as Paul Kruger would have found such views dangerously close to idolising the state. H.G. Stoker, a leading Afrikaner

---

<sup>41</sup> Furlong, in his chapter on the ‘Berlin connection’, offers a well-documented discussion of the most prominent individuals’ connections with German academia. Apart from van Rensburg, these individuals included Piet Meyer and Nico Diederichs, who would both, later in their lives, chair the powerful secret Afrikaner Broederbond. Diederichs served as longtime finance minister under B.J. Vorster, and became state president from 1975 to 1978. Hendrik Verwoerd, too, studied in Germany – in Hamburg, Leipzig and Berlin – preceding Meyer and Diederichs.

<sup>42</sup> His thesis was titled ‘Von Leiden und Dulden’ (On Suffering and Patience). He graduated in 1930.

philosopher expressed his concerns (about such views, and suggested that Diederichs) attributed to a nation ... that (which) belongs to God alone, and in so doing deifies the nation.

Furlong suggests that Diederichs' German-inspired views broke with the language of Neo-Calvinism, first promoted by 'the conservative turn-of-the-century Dutch theologian and politician Abraham Kuyper, with its respect for traditional institutions and a clear sense of the boundaries among the various spheres of life, family, church and state'.

In spite of the emerging linkages between the Afrikaners and the Nazis, the Dutch did not withdraw. In 1937, the official Dutch representative in Pretoria suggested that a bilateral accord should be prepared, which would actively promote cultural co-operation between Holland and South Africa (Holsappel, 1994:16). Because of its extensive experience in Dutch-South African relations, the NZAV was asked to assist in the preparation of such an accord. In light of this development, the general secretary of the NZAV, H. Bloem, undertook a study tour of South Africa later in that same year. In a detailed report (marked 'strictly confidential') to the board of the NZAV, he described the diversity of the South African population:

Whites, Browns, Yellows and Blacks all mix with each other, in spite of a strict separation between Whites and non-Whites. Whites can't cope without their 'kafferboy', Boers can't cope without their '*plaas-kaffers*'.... Many recently immigrated Dutch housewives complain about their servants. Why complain? It doesn't help. But I must admit that I believe that Blacks and Coloureds are frequently over-indulged.... Especially after spending some time in the more Dutch-Afrikaner environment of Pretoria, one can't shake off the feeling that the British-influenced Whites (in the Cape) are too indulgent.<sup>43</sup>

Bloem also concluded that 'Dutch-Afrikaners, especially the Transvalers, had the correct attitude towards non-Whites'. He further suggested that much unrest could be prevented

---

<sup>43</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives Hoofd Comité NZAV. Confidential travel report by H. Bloem to the Board 1937/38

if the 'northern' attitude would win over the 'colonial' attitude. Bloem recommended that

continuous Dutch emigration to South Africa (...will...) keep the ties with Holland alive and fruitful.... the Union represents the West, the bearer of White civilisation in this previously dark continent. The Union (...will have to...) stand more and more on its own feet, and (it) needs more Whites to achieve that.

In 1938, both governments appointed official committees to begin working on a cultural accord. In 1939, M. C. Botha, who was the chair of the South African committee, met with P.J. Idenburg, who represented the Dutch committee.<sup>44</sup> Together, they discussed a broad range of cultural issues, including academic co-operation. In his report-back,<sup>45</sup> Idenburg described his visits to a number of South African universities. He happily noted that the Afrikaans-medium universities seemed inclined to broaden their scope for co-operation beyond the (Calvinist) Free University of Amsterdam. The University of Cape Town, however, seemed lost for the Dutch cause. Idenburg concluded, 'It still is extremely English'.

Idenburg also believed that 'the future of Dutch-South African cultural relations would largely be dependent on (...the Afrikaner's...) level of proficiency in Dutch'. The report stated that for this particular reason the Dutch and South African government representatives elaborated on the expansion of Dutch as a subject at South African Universities. They recommended that, as soon as circumstances would allow it, an expert should be sent to Holland to investigate this issue. However, very soon after Idenburg returned home Germany invaded Holland. The Second World War would bring a (temporary) halt to efforts to prepare a Cultural Accord between Holland and South Africa.

---

<sup>44</sup> The Dutch committee was known as the Beelaerts van Blokland committee, named after its chair.

<sup>45</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives Hoofd Comité NZAV. Idenburg submitted this report to the Dutch Governmental Committee for the preparation of a Cultural Accord, in February 1940, just three



#### 4.7 Synthesis and Discussion of Research Question

The research concentrated on the early context (1881-1939) of the Dutch-Afrikaner relationship, with a particular focus on their linkages in education. The notion of kinship solidarity appears central. However, the relationship was often ambiguous, and their sense of solidarity frequently presents itself as existing in spite of themselves. One clear reason for the ambiguity is that the relationship was lopsided, with Holland asserting a dominant role and considering itself to be the 'Mother country'. The Dutch position was also unmistakably imperialist. It valued South Africa for its potential to promote Dutch economic growth, and also considered it a suitable emigration destination in times of (economic) hardship. The Boer successes against the British in the first Anglo-Boer War, seemed to bring vicarious glory to the Dutch, who wholeheartedly celebrated as if the Boer victories were their own, and then rallied together in a new pro-Boer organisation (the NZAV) which channeled financial and moral support in an affirmation of their kinship ties.

The Afrikaners seem to have received Dutch interventions as mixed blessings. Whereas they clearly needed Dutch support in their need to counter British predominance in South Africa, they were also increasingly keen to define their own independent national identity.

Education was seen as one important arena where the development of such an independent identity could be cultivated. Both the Afrikaners and the British competed to gain control over the curriculum for white South Africans. The Dutch were eager to assist the Afrikaners in their quest to counter British influence in schools. Their eagerness was not altogether altruistic, however, as they realised the importance of language in carving a foothold for themselves in Africa.

Central to the issue of Afrikaner national identity was the struggle to develop and maintain their own Afrikaans language. The Dutch seemed ambiguous on this issue.

---

months before the German invasion of Holland. A copy of the report is attached to the 1939 Annual Report of the NZAV.

They considered their own language, Dutch, as the preferred one in South Africa, and consistently stressed the importance of Dutch as language medium, particularly in schools. The Afrikaners had little option but to accept Dutch as medium of instruction, particularly since a great number of Dutch teachers worked in the school system, which was dependent on Dutch financial support rallied through the NZAV.

Another crucial feature of Afrikaner identity was Calvinism. In the context of education and schooling, Calvinism was expressed in the policy vision of Christian National Education. In order to understand the emergence of the CNE movement in South Africa, it is interesting to go back to the Dutch so-called *School Strijd*, literally, the 'School Struggle', which was a 120 year struggle for curriculum control in schools. The Dutch Calvinist movement had been outraged by the secularisation of Dutch Education at the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, following the French Revolution which saw its effects ripple throughout most of Europe. The movement secured the right, with financial backing from the State, to set up a parallel school system alongside the 'neutral' state school system, with Christianity central to its curriculum. Significant, however, is the fact that Christian National Education in the Dutch context did not mean that all national education should be Christian. Rather it meant that each and every child in the country should have the right to Christian schooling if their parents chose that option. In the unique Dutch political context, a number of parallel education systems emerged, all financed on an equal basis by the state.

A special relationship developed between Dutch Calvinists and their Afrikaner 'cousins'. A most interesting development ensued, where the Dutch, through the NZAV, closely co-operated with the conservative Kruger-led government in the Transvaal. It was agreed that only Calvinist teachers who would pledge their support for Christian National Education would be sent to South Africa. As a result of this agreement, non-Calvinist Dutch teachers were not considered for posts in South Africa. Dutch teachers in South Africa, therefore, did not represent the whole pluriform spectrum of Dutch educational thinking.

An interesting teachers' organisation – the *Vereniging van Onderwijzers en Onderwijzeressen in Zuid Afrika* (Organisation of Teachers in South Africa) – was founded in the Zuid Afrikaanse Republiek (ZAR) in 1893. More than half of its affiliated teachers were of Dutch descent. The organisation's statutes reveal one of the first tangible expressions of CNE ideology in South Africa. In their objectives (see 4.3), we clearly recognise the origins of the post-1948 National Party education policies. Another common feature concerned the link between Christian Education and racism, as the organisation was meant for whites only.

The outcome of the Second Anglo-Boer War signalled the decline of Dutch influence in South African schools. Peace agreements between the British and the Afrikaners prohibited both sides from employing expatriate teachers. Since Dutch imperialist prospects in South Africa were a thing of the past, Dutch public interest in South Africa and the Afrikaners steadily declined. Sharpened by their experiences in wartime concentration camps, Afrikaner nationalism profiled itself in ever sharper divergence from Dutch influence.

Afrikaner nationalism grew more militant in the 1930s. The struggle for self-determination as an Afrikaner *volk* grew, as did their desire to increase their political and economic control in South Africa. The fierce nationalism of young Afrikaner students studying at Dutch universities attracted criticism. A number of Afrikaner student leaders openly expressed interest and admiration for Hitler's growing National-Socialist movement in Germany. However, the Dutch seemed more puzzled than alarmed by these developments at this stage.

Dutch economic interests in South Africa, as well their need to secure suitable emigration destinations, never ceased. These seem to have been motivating factors when attempts were made to forge official bilateral ties (as opposed to the existing contact regulated by the NZAV, which was basically a non-governmental organisation) between the two nations in 1937. These new diplomatic efforts included attempts to promote cultural and academic exchanges. Efforts to formalise such initiatives were brought to a halt in 1939, when the Second World War commenced.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Transfer and Transformation: The Journey of Fundamental Pedagogics (1939-1963)**

#### **5.1 An Orientation to the Chapter**

This chapter presents the second historical narrative of this thesis. It examines the diverging history of Dutch-Afrikaner politics from 1939 to 1963, and particularly focuses on how these linkages impacted on ties in the field of education. The research question that is at the center of this narrative is:

How does the later diverging history (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics explain the differences in the evolving education theories of their two countries?

The narrative in Chapter Four demonstrated that, as a result of developments in the 1930s, Dutch-Afrikaner relations had already become somewhat strained as the Dutch disapproved of the fact that Afrikaner nationalists seemed to draw their inspiration from the emerging Fascist movements in Germany and Italy.

The second historical narrative starts at the onset of the Second World War, which sharpened the major differences in mainstream Dutch and Afrikaner attitudes towards Nazism and Fascism that had emerged earlier. The explicit ideological solidarity between the Afrikaner leadership and the Nazi movement in Germany introduced new strains into Dutch-Afrikaner politics, as they supported opposite sides in the war.

This chapter also explores how this significant disagreement was accommodated after the Second World War, when renewed efforts were made by both governments to restore and expand bilateral ties between the two countries. Their efforts resulted in a so-called 'Cultural Accord' between Holland and South Africa which formalised and regulated cultural and academic exchanges between the two nations. This chapter shows

that the apartheid politics of South Africa severely constrained the potential of this Accord.

It was against the backdrop of these rather ambiguous cultural and academic ties, which were eventually formalised in the Cultural Accord, that the transfer of Langeveld's education theory to South Africa took place. Langeveld had written his major work *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek* (Concise Theoretical Pedagogy), during the Second World War; it was published in 1946, shortly after the war had ended (see Chapters One and Two). The transfer of Langeveld's education theory was not a linear process or singular event, but rather evolved over time as different Afrikaner academics drew from Langeveld's theory.

Post-war academic contacts between individual Dutch and Afrikaner academics (such as Pretoria-based B.F. Nel; see Chapter Two) and institutions (such as the Free University of Amsterdam and the NZAV; see Chapter Four) slowly picked up again from where they had left off at the beginning of the war. Langeveld's work was very prominent in Holland, and given the long-standing ties in education between the two countries it would have been impossible for Afrikaner academics not to notice his contribution to the field at the time. Langeveld's influence became incorporated into an established academic tradition in which Afrikaner academics identified with continental philosophy, in opposition to English-speaking South African academics who predominantly built on Anglo-American academic traditions.

The first text on fundamental pedagogics in South Africa was introduced in 1954, when C.K. Oberholzer published his book *Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Pedagogiek* (Introduction to Principles of Education). Although this work directly drew from Langeveld's ideas, it also carried significant differences as it struggled to find ways to accommodate the deeply engrained links between Calvinist doctrine and education in Afrikaner history. Langeveld criticised C.K. Oberholzer's book, but also praised him as he concurred with Oberholzer's disapproval of Anglo-American traditions in educational philosophy. However, the different directions that Langeveld's pedagogy on the one hand and fundamental pedagogics on the other hand would take in their divergent policy contexts were never really debated as this became impossible under the conditions set by the Cultural Accord and the political dispensation of South Africa. This reality left the proponents of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa in academic isolation and intellectually unchallenged. As a result, fundamental pedagogics developed its own ideological meaning within apartheid South Africa, unaffected by any substantial critical

interventions which could have come from the proponents (or critics) of its Dutch counterpart, Langeveld's theoretical pedagogy.

The chapter ends in 1963, when the Cultural Accord had officially been in existence for one decade. This anniversary presented itself as an occasion to reflect on the value of the Accord. Once again, as they had done on so many previous occasions, both the Dutch and the Afrikaner authorities decided that despite their numerous misgivings they would continue their official co-operation. However, from the early 1960s onwards, the balance of power within the Dutch political context would start to shift towards an anti-apartheid stance and its related boycott politics.

The end of the first decade of the Cultural Accord, 1963, is an appropriate point to end this study because it was the beginning of an era in which the Netherlands became increasingly critical of South Africa. The international impact of the Civil Rights movement in the United States and the radicalisation of the struggle in South Africa marked the end of a window of opportunity for the conservative Dutch (educational) partners of South Africa to promote such academic and cultural exchanges between the two countries. Subsequent efforts to advance linkages were more and more constrained by the pressures of a growing Dutch anti-apartheid movement that challenged the ambiguous but accommodating relationship of the past.

## **5.2 A War-time Shift: from 'Sovereignty in own Sphere' to 'Totalitarianism in each Sphere'?**

This section explores some of the critical events in Afrikaner politics during the Second World War and their impact on Afrikaner education. These developments are significant in this thesis as they help to explain developments in education after the war, when the Nationalist Party came into power in 1948.

The Boer generals J.C. Smuts and J.B.M. Hertzog had co-operated since 1934 in the United Party. On the eve of the Second World War, their dispute about South Africa's position towards the war drove them apart. General Smuts wanted to fight on the British-Allied side, while Hertzog wished to remain officially neutral. D.F. Malan, from the nationalist *Gesuiwerde Nasionale Party* (Purified National Party) supported Hertzog. Smuts' position gained a majority of votes in the *Volksraad*, and Hertzog resigned. South Africa joined the Allied forces on 6 September 1939.

A few weeks later, Holland turned to Hertzog and asked for his help in an effort to persuade Hitler not to invade Holland. Hertzog refused, rejecting the idea of a possible invasion.<sup>1</sup> History proved Hertzog wrong; Germany invaded Holland on 10 May 1940.

Hertzog's split with General Smuts facilitated Afrikaner unity, since Hertzog's hands were cleansed of involvement with General Smuts, who was perceived as being too pro-British. A new all-Afrikaner alliance was formed between Hertzog and D.F. Malan.<sup>2</sup> Together they declared, on 27 January 1940, that they would form a new political organisation, the *Herenigde Nasionale Party* (Reunited National Party), more commonly known as the *Nasionale Party* (National Party) (Furlong, 1991:128). In their unification agreement, they spelled out the republican goals of their new party:

...the republican state-form, separate from the British Crown, fits best with the traditions, circumstances and aspirations of the South African *volk* and in addition is the only effective guarantee that South Africa will not be dragged again into Great Britain's wars.

After the German invasion of Holland, the *Herenigde Nasionale Party* (HNP) expressed its sympathy to Dutch Queen Wilhelmina and to the Dutch nation, but preferred to remain officially neutral. In spite of this, they openly showed great sympathy for Germany's national socialism. The spokesperson for the HNP, Dr. Otto du Plessis, produced a pamphlet in 1940, named *De Nuwe Suid-Afrika*, in which he glorified national-socialism and made suggestions for a South African version of this ideology (Holsappel, 1994:22).

The climate of reinvigorated Afrikaner Nationalism gave birth to a new right-wing organisation, the *Ossewabrandwag*, which was founded in 1939. By 1942, its

---

<sup>1</sup> On 21 October 1939, the Dutch Minister of Foreign Affairs, E.N. van Kleffens was extremely worried about the concentration of German troops near the Dutch border. He sent a cable to his official representative in Pretoria (Holsappel, 1994:18), suggesting that Hertzog should immediately send a message to Adolf Hitler urging him not to invade Holland and Belgium. The Dutch Foreign Minister implied that since Hertzog had not wanted to join the Allied forces in the war Hitler would take notice of such a request. However, Hertzog refused to comply with this request. In his response, dated 22 October 1939, addressed to the Dutch official, he clearly expressed a pro-German stance. He also reassured Holland that the idea of a German invasion of Holland was simply based on propaganda, coming from 'Germany's embittered enemies' (Holsappel, 1994:19).

<sup>2</sup>Hertzog's union with Malan would not last long. His earlier exposure of the Afrikaner Broederbond in 1935 had never been forgotten. A Broederbond campaign to destroy Hertzog followed. Disillusioned and harassed, he left politics in 1940 and died two years later (Wilkins & Strydom, 1979:53-75; Malherbe, 1977:23-30).

membership had surged to 400,000 (February, 1991:96). Its constitution echoed much of the pre-war Afrikaner Nationalist ideology:

Our slogan is: My God, my people, my country, South Africa... (We aim for):

1. the stabilisation of the spirit of Christian Nationalism (and a) Christian National idea in all walks of our national life (*volkslewe*);
2. the maintenance, extension and utilisation of our language and traditions of the Boer nation;
3. the protection and propagation of religious, cultural and material interests;
4. the encouragement and development of patriotism, national pride, love for freedom of the Boer nation;
5. the incorporation and welding together of all Afrikaners, male and female, who earnestly wish to pursue these ideals (quoted in February, 1991:96).

With terminology that closely resembled that of the growing Nazi movement in Germany, the Ossewabrandwag spelled out its priorities. They strongly promoted the family (*gesin*), blood purity (*bloed suiwerheid*), religion (*godsdienst*), fatherland (*vaderlandse bodem*, which literally means ‘the soil of the fatherland’) and a love of freedom (*vryheidsliefde*) as the greatest cultural and national inheritances of the Afrikaner nation (February, 1991:97). The Ossewabrandwag regarded the family as the absolute cornerstone of Afrikanerdom. Children were cherished, as they would swell the numbers of the *volk*. The Afrikaner was projected as both a family man (*gesinsmens*), as well as a national man (*volksmens*) (February; 1991:96).<sup>3</sup>

Nazi ideology also continued to inspire the Afrikaner *Nasionale Studentebond* (National Afrikaner Student League), as it had done since the 1930s (see 4.5). Piet Meyer, who jointly lead the organisation with van Rensburg (an ardent supporter of Nazism), ‘moved closer to national socialism by stressing the roots of Afrikaner unity in the “organic” concepts of race and family’ (Furlong; 1991:94).

Significant to this thesis is that Meyer tried to blend Kuyper's theory of ‘sovereignty in one's own circle’ (see 4.2) with the national-socialist ideology of Adolf Hitler. These new policy principles altered Afrikaner politics, resulting in a further diversion away from its original Dutch Kuyperian foundation, thus preparing a base on which the post-

---

<sup>3</sup> February draws from the booklet *Gesonde Huisgesinne bou 'n Lewenskragtige Volk!* (Healthy Families build a Vibrant Nation!) – a 1942 publication of the Ossewabrandwag.



1948 National Party government would later build. In a 1942 publication, Meyer suggested that:

The totalitarianism of the people's movement (*volksbeweging*), which is subordinate to the Word of God, means on the one hand the struggle toward an organic community on the part of the estates of the People which are integrated into the *volksbeweging*, and on the other hand it means the independent existence alongside the People of other organising human entities like the individual, the family and the church (Meyer, 1942, cited in Furlong, 1991:95).

The result was a 'curious transformation of Kuyper's theory of "sovereignty in own sphere" into one of "totalitarianism in each sphere", ... where the new ideas of fascist Europe (...were wedded...) to the old emphasis on church, family and *volk* ... of traditional rural and small-town Afrikaner society' (Furlong, 1991:95). This merger of ideologies was openly acknowledged by one of the Ossewabrandwag's most prominent members, J.B. Vorster,<sup>4</sup> who was tried in 1942 in a South African court for his Nazi propaganda, and for sabotaging the South African war effort. During his court case, Vorster declared:

We support Christian Nationalism, which is an ally of National-Socialism (...give it any name you like...) In Italy it is called Fascism, in Germany National-Socialism and in South Africa Christian Nationalism (Vorster, cited in Rozenburg, 1986:13).

By combining Christian Nationalism with Nazi ideology, a shift in emphasis became increasingly evident in the mobilisation of the *volk*. Whereas basic Calvinist principles had claimed to uphold the independence of the individual self (with only God placed above), totalitarian nationalism called for the subordination of the individual to the *volk*. In this way, the needs of the *volk* were placed between God and the individual. Simson (1980) states that by the early 1940s, H.G. Stoker, a leading Afrikaner Calvinist and philosopher, claimed to have achieved a 'theoretical reconciliation of the Kuyperian Calvinist strand with national totalitarianism':

Stoker (formulated) a concept of man as 'individual *and* social being', in opposition to liberalism's individualistic conception. Consequently, without totally surrendering the basic Calvinist principle of individualism, he would argue that in times of dire *Volksnood* (people's distress) social being (that is, the *volk*) took precedence over the individual (Simson, 1980: 176).

---

<sup>4</sup> Vorster would later be State President, from 1975 to 1978.

These ideas were promoted in the projected struggle between Afrikaner nationalism and British imperialism, and also had powerful repercussions in the field of education and schooling. Whereas both shared a common foundation in the ideas of Abraham Kuyper (see Chapter Four), significant differences were emerging between the Dutch and the Afrikaners as their ideological bases and their CNE policy contexts sharply diverged. Schematically, the situation can be outlined as in Figure 5.1:

**Figure 5.1**

**Kuyper's Christian Nationalism**

**CNE in Holland**

Stresses the individual (parental) right to choose a system of religious and ideological diversity (see Chapter Four)



Transplanted in a Dutch imperialist mode in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (see Chapter Four)



**CNE in South Africa**

Stresses the parental right to choose schooling for their own language/ethnic group in an anti-British imperial drive (see Chapter Four)



**Nazism and World War Two**



Holland occupied by hostile Nazi ideology. Dutch rejection of Nazi ideology

Afrikaner Nationalist identification with Nazi ideology impacts on CNE vision (see Chapter Four)

The identification with Nazi ideology also filtered into the curriculum at Afrikaner schools, and the Smuts government became aware of its impact in these schools. Furlong (1991:151) found that there was 'abundant evidence that many teachers were straying rather far from the official syllabi'. When interested outsiders, for instance, questioned students at these schools about 'which people in history had stood up for liberty ... the answers were Paul Kruger, George Washington, Malan and Adolf Hitler' (Furlong, 1991:151). The extent to which Nazi propaganda had found its way into Afrikaner schools is clearly captured in an essay that appeared in a high school magazine:

We few Afrikaners in South Africa...could well do with a man like Hitler for six months; then there would be a change. Hitler is a man of iron like Paul Kruger who can build a nation in the right way. If you listen to his speeches, even though you cannot understand them, then you can immediately hear and appreciate that he is a statesman in a thousand.... England is strong! True! But Germany too! Hitler may not be pillar of religion, but for building up a nation he is a man in a thousand. Heil Hitler!<sup>5</sup>

These ideas were obviously not stated in the official syllabi at the time, but rather were the personal beliefs expressed by teachers in the classroom. Schoolteachers formed one of the principal occupational groups in the Broederbond, which had close links to the Ossewabrandwag. The education authorities under Smuts instructed school inspectors to investigate this issue, but since the inspectors (uniformly senior teachers) were themselves as anti-British as their subordinates, the claims were not brought to book (Furlong, 1991:151).

In 1943 the Broederbond, through its subsidiary, the *Afrikaanse Kultuurraad*, called for a general strike in education (Malherbe, 1977:672). They issued a memorandum,<sup>6</sup> in which they stated their basic principles and beliefs:

...the Government is dragging educational issues into political affairs and politics into education, ... (and) the Afrikaans churches and educational bodies should ... not fail to take a stance on the matter.... (We believe that):

---

<sup>5</sup> This essay was translated and published in the *Rand Daily Mail*, 30 January 1940 (cited in Furlong, 1991:151).

<sup>6</sup> The memorandum was signed by M.C. Botha, who was Honorary Secretary of the *Afrikaanse Kultuurraad* and the *Pretoriaanse Onderwysraad* (Pretoria Education Council). He later became Minister of Bantu Administration and Development and of Bantu Education in the Vorster Cabinet.

- the (government's) true objective is simply to sacrifice Afrikaners on the altar of British-Jewish Imperialism;
- Afrikaners wish, through their churches, schools, committees *etc.*, to actively oppose the government's latest attempts at (the) Anglicisation ... (of education), and in so doing, aim to avoid a complete mutual estrangement of the two population groups, through: encouraging parents of the Afrikaans schools to ... refuse to send their children to such schools, and, only as a last resort, to take recourse in the establishment of their own schools with a definite Christian National basis, but for which they as taxpayers will demand their justifiable share of contributions from the state (quoted in Malherbe, 1977:691).

Against this background, General Smuts could have banned or taken other drastic action against the Broederbond and its associates, but he did not do so. One of the obvious reasons for this was his preoccupation with the war on the international front. However, his reluctance, argues Malherbe (1977:676-677), was also partly because he did not want to confront the Dutch Reformed Church (NG Kerk) and the teaching profession, for the traditions of both of which he had great regard. Apart from Smuts' personal respect for the NG Kerk, his refusal to confront them also indicated that the church was an institutional power base to reckon with in South Africa.

In addition, Smuts also avoided taking action against university students and staff, except when they were found guilty of criminal charges. This was in spite of some very wild pro-Nazi and revolutionary utterances in student organisations during the war (Malherbe, 1977:677).

Another reason that explains why Smuts would have refrained from a confrontation with Afrikaner right-wing politics was that Malan's National Party was already seemingly engaged in such an effort. Although there were many points of convergence between Malan's party and the Ossewabrandwag, there were also differences. Whilst the HNP supported a whites-only party political route to parliament, the Ossewabrandwag propogandised a non-party authoritarian state. When the Ossewabrandwag started to profile itself in political terms and threatened the political base of the HNP, Malan hit back. In doing so, he must have had the support of the Broederbond leadership. In September 1942, all HNP members were called upon to revoke their membership of the Ossewabrandwag. It also became forbidden for HNP office bearers to hold membership of both organisations (Pampallis, 1991:165). Many of them heeded this call, and the Ossewabrandwag's membership steadily declined during the course of the Second World War (Malherbe, 1977:684). However, after the war it emerged that rather than eliminating the Ossewabrandwag as a right-wing power base, their visions had become

absorbed in National Party politics and their leadership was set to play a prominent role in party politics.

During the Second World War, all efforts to formalise cultural linkages between Holland and South Africa had – temporarily – come to a halt. Official bilateral relations between the two countries were conducted between the Smuts government and the Dutch government, which had gone into exile in London. Their contacts focused almost exclusively on the war effort. The Smuts government assisted Holland by allowing Dutch men living in South Africa to be drafted into the Dutch army, or alternatively transferring them to the South African army. Those who refused military service were deported. In addition, Smuts gave financial support to Holland, and even arranged food drops over the northern parts of Holland during the so-called ‘hunger winter’ of 1944-45 (Holsappel, 1994:24).

### **5.3 Dutch-Afrikaner Rapprochement Politics after the War**

After the Second World War, contact between Holland and South Africa picked up from where it had ended (see 4.5). The NZAV was again set to play a prominent role in their rapprochement after the Second World War. The restoration of ties was not without its problems. The Dutch were now shocked at Afrikaner support for the Nazis, and the Afrikaners were cynical about Dutch gratitude to the British. In a personal letter to H. Bloem, then general secretary of the NZAV, F.C.L. Bosman aptly captured some of these sentiments. His letter is worthy of consideration, as it captures some of the dilemmas at the time:

You went through hell, thank God it is all over now ... with regard to Dutch emigration to South Africa, I recommend that Dutch organisations first come (here) to get reacquainted with the present conditions. The war has without a doubt, caused a rift between many of the Dutch and the Afrikaners... it is tragic that our traditional enemy (the British) have become your biggest friends... You people have regained your independence and your soul, (but) we continue our struggle against British predominance, as we have done for the past 150 years... it is not that we love the Germans, me least of all, but it is true that a certain section of the Afrikaner people has flirted with the Germans during the war... That was stupid and unfortunate ... luckily it didn't last ... but now we are back to where we were: a free South Africa, without any imperial ties, which only we can fight for. We have to do this speedily, otherwise I do not know what will become of our Black, Coloured and Indian

problems.... years of malaise, intense political debates and problems with the natives *etc.* are ahead of us.<sup>7</sup>

The NZAV discussed the issue of Afrikaner sympathy for Nazism at a general meeting on 24 November 1945, in hotel *De Poort van Kleef* in Amsterdam. It was the first time since 1939 that the NZAV had held an official meeting. The chair of the organisation, L.R. Middelberg, spoke of his disappointment with regard to the pro-nazi disposition of what he described as the 'Nationalist section of Afrikaners'. He explained:

...the Dutch position has radically shifted as a result of the war: we are grateful to the British who supported us when Europe was engulfed by German violence...<sup>8</sup>

However, even before there was an official resolve on these matters the NZAV felt confident that, after reacquainting itself with the new circumstances, it should continue to play a significant role in facilitating Dutch-South African contacts:

(we need to)...carefully consider how to renew ties with South Africa.... Before the war there were indications that there would be more official contact between (Holland and South Africa) at government level.... (However) that does not mean that there is no scope for the NZAV.... our work is of value ... especially to those who want to emigrate... For purposes of general propaganda and because of language, academic, cultural and economic interests we see (a meaningful role) for the NZAV, and we should broadly focus on economic and cultural ties....<sup>9</sup>

Middelberg also mentioned at the meeting that the NZAV was aware of a sizable post-war Dutch interest in emigration to South Africa. Part of this interest was said to come from Dutch pro-Nazi supporters. Middelberg dismissed their chances: 'We won't even mention the unpatriotic enemies of the people', and vowed: 'we will have to keep them here (in Holland)'

Dutch pro-Nazi interest in emigration to South Africa, as well as the pro-Nazi stance of sections of the Afrikaner community, both presented problems for the NZAV. A special Board meeting was called in December 1945, where the possibility of blacklisting Dutch and Afrikaner Nazi supporters was discussed at length. One of its board members, Prof.

---

<sup>7</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV. Collection *Activiteiten NZAV* VI/912. Letter from F.C.L. Bosman to H. Bloem, dated 15.09.1945 (my translation)..

<sup>8</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; minutes of Annual General Meeting 24 November 1945 (my translation)

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*

van Winter (also the editor of the monthly *Zuid Afrika* at the time), strategically cautioned:

We should be careful about creating a mechanism (referring to blacklisting), that would only work under a Smuts-led government. We should not neglect contact with those who could take over political power.<sup>10</sup>

The meeting resolved not to create a blacklist, but instead to carefully consider the merits of each case in their efforts to identify Nazi sympathisers. Although all Board members felt united in their anti-Nazism, they agreed with van Winter to keep the door open for the possibility of diplomatic, cultural and economic co-operation with South Africa, regardless of who would be in power there. The NZAV also speculated that the time of rivalry between Holland and Great Britain was a thing of the past. They believed that the war had changed British attitudes to Dutch influence in South Africa. The British would now, according to van Winter, 'be more open to the idea that, if Holland would have had more influence on the Afrikaners, many (of their) deviations could have been prevented'.<sup>11</sup>

Bosman, in his letter to Bloem, had advised the NZAV to contact Markus Viljoen, the editor of the popular Afrikaans weekly *Die Huisgenoot*, which had come out on 30 August 1945 with a powerful article criticising the Dutch. The NZAV asked Viljoen for clarification. In his response, dated 31 January 1946, Viljoen explained:

You must understand that the Germans have never harmed the Afrikaners. These days, there is so much noise about the German concentration camps and the tactics of 'scorched earth', but these murderous camps and (the British tactics of) scorched earth here have conveniently been forgotten.... I am anti-Nazi, but pro-German ... and just as the pro-Nazi – which are usually actually only pro-German – feelings amongst Afrikaners repulse the Dutch, (the Afrikaners are equally) repulsed by the Dutch glorification of the British. (Furthermore)...the Dutch are anti-Afrikaans.... they think they are superior, (and they have) no real interest in Afrikaner language and culture ... (they) never attend our Afrikaner cultural meetings and don't read Afrikaner literature. How can you be surprised that many Afrikaners are not keen on Dutch emigration to South Africa? From their point of

---

<sup>10</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut. Archives NZAV; Collection: Activities VI/912 Minutes Special Board Meeting 21 December 1945 (my translation)

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*

view, they prefer British immigrants, at least with those we know what we are dealing with....<sup>12</sup>

Somewhat surprisingly, perhaps, he ends his letter by saying:

...in spite of all this, we do support close cultural ties with Holland. We feel that this current distance (between the Afrikaners and the Dutch) is only a temporary thing, but that our blood and cultural ties will always remain. Co-operation will be mutually beneficial, just as parting ways, would be mutually disadvantageous.<sup>13</sup>

Viljoen's 'in spite of everything' attitude resonated with the NZAV, and it seems with the broader Dutch public, because the organisation started to grow again.

Their membership had reached an all-time low of 750 at the end of the Second World War. In their annual general meeting of 1946, the NZAV happily reported that their membership had increased to 2322 individuals. They also mentioned that there were approximately 2000 people wait-listed as emigrants to South Africa. The NZAV approved, noting: 'We see the emigration of good Dutch people (referring to the rejection of those with pro-Nazi sentiments) to South Africa as a powerful tool in strengthening the cultural and economic ties between both countries'.<sup>14</sup> Apart from strengthening ties in these fields, the Dutch government was interested in stimulating emigration (which suited the South African government of the day, which welcomed white immigrants). There was not a hint of sensitivity to the racial connotations of the whites-only immigration policy of South Africa. The NZAV's 1947 annual report mentioned:

The population growth of our country, as well as our limited natural resources, make emigration a pressing necessity. South Africa welcomes white emigrants, particularly the Dutch, alongside British immigrants.<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; Collection: Activities VI/912 Letter, dated 31 January 1946, from M. Viljoen, editor of *Die Huisgenoot*, to H. Bloem, general secretary of the NZAV (my translation)

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>14</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1946 Annual General Report, published in March 1947 (my translation)

<sup>15</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1947 Annual General Report, p.8 (my translation) Whilst the Smuts government encouraged immigration of white candidates, there were important differences between immigration rules for British and non-British applicants (including the Dutch). There were virtually no restrictions imposed on British immigrants; all other-applicants needed a whole range of permits, and were subjected to a special screening procedure (Holsappel; 1994:35).



Now that the Dutch government had decided to renew its official ties with South Africa, it wanted to come to a coherent post-war foreign policy towards South Africa. In March 1947, G. van der Leeuw was requested to travel to South Africa to explore the scope for bilateral relations, with a special focus on cultural and academic linkages. As a guest of the Pretoria-based society, the *Genoodschap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, van der Leeuw went to South Africa from April to June 1947. He visited all universities, conducted official meetings with South African government officials in Cape Town and Pretoria, held discussions with representatives of the Dutch government and discussed cultural relations with the Board of his host organisation. In addition, he gave numerous seminars and conducted church services in a number of congregations across the country.<sup>16</sup>

In his report-back, van der Leeuw also discussed race relations in South Africa. Without committing himself, he noted, 'to be able to speak of one national community, that would include the Bantu's, the Indians, the Coloureds and the Whites is not a reality as yet'. He also wrote about the unfolding differences between the 'all-Afrikaner *Nasionale Party* of D.F. Malan and Havenga', and the *Suid-Afrikaanse Party* of General Smuts, 'in which English-speaking and Afrikaans-speaking people' co-operated. He was, however, careful not to be seen to take sides:

The differences (between these parties) are generally described in terms of the (Nat's) exclusive focus on South Africa and the (Sap's) additional focus on the British Empire... the (Nat's) do not acknowledge that international relations and Britain's role in (global politics) have changed... the Sap's generally lack the ardent spirit that is exhibited by the Nat's...<sup>17</sup>

Van der Leeuw mentioned that he was frequently asked to explain why Holland chose the side of the British in the war. Apart from his general observations, he suggested many possible areas of cultural, religious and academic co-operation between Holland and South Africa, particularly in the fields of language and literature. He ended his report by concluding that there were many 'misunderstandings' between the Dutch and the Afrikaners. He felt that these could not be instantly eradicated by a Cultural Accord, and stated that only 'close contact' could achieve that. Van der Leeuw's visit marked another step forward in the preparation of an official agreement between Holland and

---

<sup>16</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV. A copy of van der Leeuw's report to the Dutch Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences was inserted by H. Bloem, the general secretary of the NZAV in a file that contained the minutes of the 1947 annual meeting of the NZAV (my translation).

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

South Africa that would promote and regulate cultural and academic exchanges between the two countries.

In his report-back, van der Leeuw captured an important policy principle that would guide Dutch foreign policy towards South Africa for a number of decades to come: the idea that ‘misunderstandings’ between the Dutch and the Afrikaners could best be addressed by the promotion of ‘close contact’ between them.

After van der Leeuw returned, the Dutch government appointed a special committee in November 1947. Its task was to coordinate all issues pertaining to South Africa, and to advise the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences, and the Dutch cabinet in terms of their policies towards South Africa. The committee consisted of three sections: an economic section, which had four members, an emigration section, with one member, and a cultural section, with seven members. The significance of the NZAV in Dutch-South African relations was acknowledged fully by the Dutch government. The organisation was strongly represented in the cultural section of the Ministerial committee. The chair of the NZAV was allocated an *ex officio* position. In addition, P.J. van Winter, the NZAV Board member who was mentioned earlier in this chapter, was also given a place. Most of the other cultural appointees also had had some kind of affiliation with the NZAV in the past.<sup>18</sup>

The NZAV, an essentially conservative organisation that focused on kinship ties between the Dutch and Afrikaner South Africans, had now secured a powerful role in shaping Dutch foreign policy towards South Africa. It was heavily involved in both formal government initiatives, through the Committee mentioned above, as well as in its own NGO activities. In addition, it was heavily involved in the activities of all its affiliates, such as the Fund for South African students (see 4.5). Its focus on South Africa was informed by historically congenial ties between Holland and South Africa, although with little or no focus on contact with population groups other than Afrikaners. Central to the organisation stood its continued commitment to cultivate Dutch-Afrikaner linkages.

---

<sup>18</sup> Suid Afrikaanse Instituut, Archives NZAV. A copy of a letter by the Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences to Mr.F. Beelearts van Blokland (the Chair of the 1939 committee that had been set up to investigate the possibility of a Cultural Accord) had been sent to the Chair of the NZAV. The letter was inserted in a file with a document pertaining to the preparation of a Cultural Accord. (my translation) The cultural section of the committee consisted of:(1) the Chair of the NZAV; (2) Prof. P.J. van Winter, Board member of the NZAV; (3) Dr. K.H. Gravemeyer, secretary of the Dutch *Hervormde Synode*; (4) Prof. N.A. Donkersloot, (5) Dr. J. Donner, President of the *Hoge Raad*; (6) Mr. W.F. Baron Röell, representing Foreign Affairs, and (7) Mr. C.J.A. de Ranitz, representing Education, Arts and Sciences.

#### 5.4 Waterink rather than Langeveld: The Politics of Invitation

Meanwhile, the NZAV's counterpart in Pretoria, the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, was looking forward to hosting a (still to be selected) Dutch academic, who would be the first to come to South Africa and who would set the tone in anticipation of the new Cultural Accord. The organisation's general secretary, D. Pont, had some suggestions:

In Stellenbosch they have indicated that they are interested in a town planner... Here in Pretoria, there is a keen interest to get an educational psychologist. They are thinking of Prof. Kohnstamm, although they realise that he is getting on in age, but they also frequently mention the name of Langeveld from Utrecht.<sup>19</sup>

The frequent referral to Langeveld in Pretoria is not surprising for at least two reasons. Firstly, Langeveld was difficult to overlook since he had made great strides in establishing himself as the leading academic in education in Holland since the publication in 1946 of his major work *Concise Theoretical Pedagogy*. He had written this book during the Second World War whilst his Jewish mentor, Prof. Kohnstamm, was in hiding. (His conversion to Christianity, of course, made no difference to the Nazi occupants of Holland.) During the war, Langeveld had deputised for Kohnstamm at the University of Amsterdam. Throughout the war, Langeveld had managed to keep in touch with Kohnstamm at his place of hiding (Klinkers & Levering, 1985:450).

The second reason why Langeveld's name would have come up in Pretoria was the fact that Langeveld was personally known to Beyers Nel. Both had been doctoral students of Prof. Kohnstamm at the University of Amsterdam in the 1930s, and they would have had ample opportunity to get to know each other. Langeveld had completed his doctorate in 1934, and Beyers Nel followed in 1935. At the time when the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika* was considering *who* to invite in the run-up to the Cultural Accord, Beyers Nel was Dean of the Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria, a position he had held since 1945. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that when Nel had the opportunity in 1947 to bring out either Kohnstamm or Langeveld, that he would have used his influence to try to bring his former fellow student. However, Nel was not going to be successful in this attempt. There was a enormous degree of sensitivity involved in the selection of the first candidate. The next paragraph of Pont's letter to van der Leeuw gives us an insight into the delicacies of the matter:

---

<sup>19</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut. Archives NZAV, personal letter from D. Pont, secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation). The letter is dated 24 April 1948.

...The first question now, is: say we do invite Langeveld, would we then have the most representative candidate, or is there another individual who is more suitable in this regard? The second question then immediately becomes, would (the most suitable candidate) be readily accepted here? Perhaps we should actually start with asking the latter question. A third question then remains: (will the Dutch) understand (our choice of candidate) without feeling that there are others who deserve their turn first. Could you let me know what you think?<sup>20</sup>

My interpretation of the events that unfolded after the letter was received by van der Leeuw requires some conjecture. There is no doubt that a copy of the letter was sent to the NZAV, as it was located in that organisation's archives. Given the prominent involvement of the NZAV, it is reasonable to assume that it would have been normal procedure to consult or probably even to redirect the question of whom to invite to the organisation. I have not been able to ascertain if Kohnstamm or Langeveld were even approached at the time, but the fact remains that neither of them were selected. At the top of the page of the copy of the letter that came into the possession of the NZAV, two names are written in ink: Waterink and Von der Hake.

This note could have been made by the general secretary of the NZAV or by another prominent member such as Prof. van Winter who also served on the official Dutch committee that was preparing the Cultural Accord. The names of Waterink and Von der Hake would have been a response to the three questions in the letter relating to the suitability of the candidate. Significantly, the chosen candidate became J. Waterink, a professor of education at the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam. The selection of an avowed Calvinist pedagogue has great symbolic significance for the direction that South African pedagogy would take.

Waterink's academic, philosophical and religious orientations varied greatly from those of Langeveld. In contrast to Langeveld's pedagogy, which consciously appealed to people across religious and ideological divides, Waterink was an unequivocal Calvinist pedagogue who rejected many of Langeveld's epistemological assumptions (see also Chapter Two).<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

<sup>21</sup> Apart from their major scholarly disagreements, both Langeveld and Waterink were authoritative and powerful personalities. They disliked each other intensely and behaved as rivals (T. Beekman, in conversation, 26 September 1994).

There is no doubt that the choice of Waterink over Langeveld served the interests of the Calvinist church and Calvinist educators in South Africa who would, like Waterink, reject the atheist and phenomenological basis of Langeveld's education theory. The quest to find 'the most suitable candidate' who would be 'readily accepted here' (see Pont's letter) led to the explicit choice of a Calvinist pedagogue. In choosing Waterink, a long-standing connection between the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam and the University of Potchefstroom was affirmed.

However, another significant point has to be made here: the main pressure to invite Waterink appears not to have come from academic circles, but rather from the NG Kerk in South Africa.<sup>22</sup> When the church learned about the possibility of a visit from a Dutch academic, they used their influence to make sure that a Calvinist would be selected. Given Waterink's Calvinist credentials, he was considered an excellent choice. Although the main focus of this inquiry is on the political and academic (education) realms, this example strongly suggests that the power of the NG Kerk must not be underestimated in any study of Dutch-Afrikaner politics.

The choice of Waterink suited J. Chr. Coetzee from Potchefstroom, whom Nel (1983: 12) identifies as one of the 'two early pioneers in the development of education as a science in South Africa'. The other pioneer was Beyers Nel (her father) from the University of Pretoria (see also Chapter Two). Coetzee was a religious man, and his interest in phenomenology was secondary to his Calvinist principles. Coetzee's beliefs were close to those of Waterink who similarly believed that Calvinist doctrine should determine what happens in education, and therefore that people should give meaning to the phenomenon of education on the basis of the word of God.

Coetzee's most prominent scholar, C.K. Oberholzer, was appointed in 1948 to the Department of Philosophy of Education at the University of Pretoria. Beyers Nel, who was in frequent correspondence with both Kohnstamm and Langeveld, had received a copy of Langeveld's book *Concise Theoretical Pedagogy*, shortly after it was published in 1946.<sup>23</sup> Beyers Nel was suitably impressed, and felt that Langeveld's ideas were of great interest for the Faculty of Education at the University of Pretoria where he was Dean. However, Beyers Nel's own main interests and expertise were in educational

---

<sup>22</sup> Point made by Prof. B.F. (Dinie) Nel in an interview (21 December 1997). An interesting detail here is that before answering my question on this issue, Prof. Nel consulted her mother, who was present at the time. Prof. Nel's widow remembered the controversy around Waterink's visit and that it was the NG Kerk which insisted on inviting Waterink. Beyers Nel had preferred Kohnstamm or Langeveld, but was still fairly junior at the time and was not able to secure preference.

<sup>23</sup> Point confirmed by Prof. B.F. (Dinie) Nel in an interview 21 December 1997.

psychology and ortho-pedagogics (see Chapter Two), and he felt that he needed to appoint someone who could develop a philosophical emphasis on pedagogics. Thus, C.K. Oberholzer, who had studied philosophy and education at Potchefstroom, was appointed and asked to fill this niche in the faculty. Oberholzer was certainly going to have a impact on the development of educational philosophy in South Africa. After his appointment at the University of Pretoria he began to write the first text on fundamental pedagogics (*Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde*) in South Africa, which would be published six years later.

C.K. Oberholzer found himself presented with quite a dilemma. On the one hand, he and Beyers Nel wanted to establish education as an autonomous science, which would mean a shift away from its Calvinist base (and here he drew directly from Langeveld's ideas). On the other hand, however, and given the history of Afrikaner education and its powerful vision of CNE, Oberholzer also had to find a way to accommodate the deeply ingrained link between Calvinism and education. The fact that a personal visit by Langeveld to South Africa (promoting an atheist phenomenological approach to education) had just been rejected in favour of the Calvinist pedagogue Waterink clearly indicated that no one could ignore the role of Calvinism in Education in South Africa in the late 1940s.

The dilemma outlined above was not new to Oberholzer, as he had already shown an interest in phenomenology prior to his reading of Langeveld's book. In fact, he had long struggled to attempt to combine his deeply religious convictions with a scientific and philosophical approach, and had already shown an interest in phenomenology. In Oberholzer's Master's dissertation of 1937 as well as his Doctoral thesis of 1947 (both from the University of Potchefstroom), he referred to the phenomenology of Husserl and Scheler (Roos, 1980:108). With their academic interest in phenomenology, both Oberholzer and Beyers Nel had long rejected the pragmatist and empiricist views traditionally held by English-speaking South African academics in favour of continental phenomenologically-oriented philosophy. They wanted to build such an academic tradition in South Africa. Beyers Nel's inspiration was generated when he had the opportunity to study in Holland in the 1930s, and thus had first hand exposure to European philosophy, even though his main interest was in educational psychology. It was C.K. Oberholzer's task to develop educational philosophy. He, however, never had the opportunity to study abroad. Apart from reading German philosophical works, his main exposure had been to Coetzee's Calvinist Pedagogy at Potchefstroom. This reality

must have restricted Oberholzer in his attempt to interpret European continental philosophy.

An invitation to Langeveld in 1948 would have been very timeous in the context of Nel's and Oberholzer's attempts to 'eliminate the traditional ideas of education as an "applied" science ... and to establish education as a science in its own right' (Nel, 1983:13). Langeveld had just produced a scientific work that legitimated such a move (see Chapter Two). To have him discuss these ideas personally in South Africa surely would have boosted Nel's and Oberholzer's efforts. Significantly, this was not to be, as the balance of power of those in charge of such a invitation (and those in the NG Kerk in South Africa behind the scene!) tipped the scales towards affirming Calvinism in the study of education. The politics that surrounded Waterink's invitation to South Africa gives us a sense of the limitations of the Dutch-Afrikaner linkages that would be promoted in the context of the Cultural Accord. For education, it certainly signalled that promoting a Dutch secular route would not be acceptable.

### **5.5 Waterink Prepares to Visit a South Africa in Political Turmoil**

Whilst the NZAV and the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika* were pondering who to invite, the whites-only elections of 1948 ushered in a new era in South Africa. The 1948 annual report of the NZAV devoted one paragraph to the election victory of D.F. Malan (HNP) and N.C. Havenga (Afrikaner Party) in South Africa. There was – at least in its official reporting – no more reference to Malan's war-time support for the Nazis. The NZAV's policy principle, that had been adopted in the context of its 1945 decision not to create a Nazi blacklist, still stood: there should be organised cultural contact between the Dutch and Afrikaners regardless of who was in (political) power in South Africa. Although it was mentioned that the NZAV were surprised by the outcome of the elections, they did not expect that the efforts to formalise a Cultural Accord would come to an end:

Against many expectations, Gen. Smuts' party was defeated in the elections ... (in favour of) ... a coalition between (D.F. Malan and N.C. Havenga, who will) form a new government. (This situation) has caused a delay in the procedures (leading up to the formation of a Cultural Accord), because, understandably, the new Ministers want to carefully study (the proposals). We assume that this is the reason why the Cultural

Accord has not been (formalised) yet.... we do hope however that the desired decisions will be taken soonest.<sup>24</sup>

In a letter to Prof. van der Leeuw, dated 28 September 1948, Prof. D. Pont of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika* wrote: 'the situation is complex, and there is suspicion everywhere'. He also informed van der Leeuw that D.F. Malan had turned to the *Suid Afrikaanse Akademie* (the Afrikaner academy) for advice on how to proceed with the Cultural Accord.<sup>25</sup>

In the midst of all these delays, the NZAV and the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika* decided not to wait, but to go ahead and invite Waterink for an extended visit to South Africa. In their invitation they expressed their belief that cultural and intellectual linkages between Holland and South Africa would enrich both countries. They explained:

During the war, ... (these) ... contacts were severed, and during those years, South Africa developed in ways ... that differed from Holland. (Our aim) is to restore linkages (between the two countries, so that) ... both nations can help and complement each other, as they used to do in the past. Our organisation believes that particularly in your scientific field, (i.e.) education and upbringing (*onderwijs en opvoeding*) of young people, these renewed linkages (between Holland and South Africa) need to be encouraged. In view of this, we invite you to come to South Africa.<sup>26</sup>

Waterink accepted the invitation, and the Dutch government agreed to finance his trip. As his visit drew near, Waterink received two letters from the *Genootskap Nederland - Suid Afrika*, both dated 27th December 1948. The first letter was an official one; it spelled out some of the practicalities of his travels, and briefly explained that he was expected to deliver formal lectures as well as to participate in informal discussions. The second letter was labeled 'confidential', and seemed to be a response to some of Waterink's erroneous assumptions about mainstream Afrikaner images of the Dutch which Pont was quick to correct. His letter is worth discussing, because it captures some of the important dilemmas during this time of political transition and adjustment:

---

<sup>24</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1948 Annual General Report, p.5 (my translation).

<sup>25</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, personal letter from D. Pont, secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation). The letter is dated 28 September 1948.

<sup>26</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, official invitation, dated 28 September 1948, to Prof. J. Waterink, signed by Prof. F.E.J. Malherbe, Chair Stellenbosch branch; Prof. W.F.J. Steenkamp, Chair Pretoria branch and D. Pont, secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika* (my translation). A copy of this letter was sent to Prof. van der Leeuw, together with the letter mentioned in the previous footnote.



In South Africa, we find an interest in Dutch cultural life amongst a particular section of the Afrikaner population. Not amongst all of them. By no means. Such an assumption could lead to accidents. What we can be sure of is a general interest in Dutch spiritual life, or, to be more specific: ... (they are interested) ... in Dutch Protestantism. It is not Dutch politics or (issues of) the State that interest people here. On the contrary, I'd almost say.<sup>27</sup>

Waterink was extensively warned about not appearing to be too pro-British. Instead, he was asked to stress the value of the Dutch heritage in the development of Afrikaner culture. This was the driving vision of the *Genootskap*. In order to help Waterink to work with this kind of vision, Pont also offered his personal, almost poetic, opinion:

...I personally believe that, without an ongoing transfusion ...(of Dutch culture)... the Afrikaner culture is doomed to disappear as an independent culture, only to become an Afrikaner (version of a) superficial British-colonial or American culture. This has actually already started to happen ...(this process can be reversed if Holland is acknowledged as)... the root through which the life juices can be absorbed ...(and)... the open window through which the liberating breeze of Western civilisation can freely flow...

As Pont soberly noted, these views were definitely not widely accepted.

Another interesting point was raised in the letter. Waterink must have inquired about the possibility of an agreement between the Calvinist Free University of Amsterdam and a to-be-selected South African university that would arrange for the exchange of honorary doctoral degrees. Pont by no means dismissed this idea, but again cautioned him and tried to sensitise Waterink to the particular situation at the time:

Cape Town and Johannesburg are in essence bastions of British-South African culture.... (By contrast)... Stellenbosch and Pretoria are bastions of Afrikaner culture, so we should concentrate on those two. However, both these universities are under the powerful influence of Nationalist, i.e. Republican politics ... and in the past few months, they have blown small incidents that relate to official Dutch positions, completely out of proportion, partly driven by their antipathy towards Dutch citizens living in South Africa.<sup>28</sup>

---

<sup>27</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, personal letter from D. Pont, secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. J. Waterink (my translation). The letter is dated 27 December 1948.

<sup>28</sup> *Ibid.*, p.3

These were all sensitive issues, argued Pont, that needed a low-key response for the time being.

## 5.6 Broederbond Politics enter the Negotiations around the Cultural Accord

As Waterink prepared himself for his trip, aided by Pont, a sticky issue arose in diplomatic relations between Holland and South Africa. Shortly after its election victory, the new Malan government had decided to replace the then South African official representative in Holland with Dr. Otto du Plessis, a former spokesperson for the HNP who had openly sympathised with Nazi ideology during the war (see 5.2). Holland refused to accept this appointment, and diplomatic relations became strained. In order to address these and other problems, the Dutch government eventually decided to invite Malan for an unofficial visit to Holland (Holsappel, 1994:46-54).<sup>29</sup> Whilst his visit in 1949 was not altogether without difficulties, Malan left Holland saying that he wished that the two countries would soon finalise a Cultural Accord.<sup>30</sup>

The Dutch advisory committee on South Africa, led by the above-mentioned van der Leeuw, had meanwhile prepared a draft Accord. This was built on the preparatory work that had been done by the Beelaerts van Blokland committee in 1939 (see 4.5). The new proposals had been submitted to the Smuts administration, and were now under consideration by the new South African government which had turned to the *Suid Afrikaanse Akademie* for advice on how to proceed. The whole process had become more and more complex, as Pont described to Van der Leeuw in a personal, handwritten letter, dated 12 March 1949. Pont was very worried about some of the latest developments in the *Suid Afrikaanse Akademie* at Board level:

The Academy used to be all but dead ... (but was recently revived and permission was given) ... to employ a general secretary. Dr. F.C.L. Bosman has been appointed in this position.... He, as well as some other

---

<sup>29</sup> Initially, the Dutch government intended to invite him formally, but when Malan deliberately included Otto du Plessis in his official entourage, the Dutch no longer wanted to extend an official invitation (see: Holsappel, 1994:54-55).

<sup>30</sup> Apart from discussing the political and moral dilemmas that surrounded Nazi support, one of the most important topics of discussions between D.F. Malan and the W. Drees-led Dutch government, had undoubtedly been the fact that both countries could well do with each others' support in the context of United Nations politics. In what seemed a clear deal in foreign diplomacy, morality would take a back seat when D.F. Malan pledged South African support for Dutch policies towards its colony, Indonesia, and in return Holland would vote against UN condemnation of South Africa's fast-emerging apartheid laws, on the grounds that this was an internal affair (Rozenburg, 1986:14).

Board members, are no friends of Holland. They (are) Afrikaner Nazis and are positively hostile.... This group is now trying to gain control over the committee that will see to the execution of the Cultural Accord. Should they succeed, then we can say good-bye to our *Genootskap*.... We can be reasonably sure that they will at least be partly successful, because they are pawns of the Broederbond, and the Broederbond governs the Government.<sup>31</sup>

Pont expected that the South African government could not completely ignore the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, but believed that there could very well be a majority of Broederbonders on the committee that would decide about the Cultural Accord. 'In that case,' said Pont, 'I shall feel compelled to withdraw'. Amidst all these uncertainties, Pont recommended that the Dutch government should stall the negotiations on the Accord, and concluded by saying:

I would like you to consider all of this. It is certainly not good news, but I feel that our case is better served without an Accord than (it would be with) ... an Accord that is executed by Afrikaner Nazis ... because (then it will be) ... a case of bend or break.<sup>32</sup>

At the same time, things were not going so smoothly with Holland's first 'cultural ambassador' to South Africa, J. Waterink. In spite of Pont's lyrical encouragement to provide a 'liberating breeze of western civilisation', Waterink's behaviour managed to upset several people who were involved in the organisation of his trip. Pretoria-based Board member of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, B. Gemser, decided to write a personal letter to Prof. G. van der Leeuw about some of his concerns.

A peculiar dilemma had arisen: Waterink's conservative, Dutch Reformed and anti-Communist views had generally been well received by his Afrikaner audiences, but not in the way that the *Genootskap* had intended. What must have delighted the *Nederlands Gereformeerde Kerk* (which had after all encouraged Waterink's trip to South Africa), certainly did not please the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*. Waterink had not at all presented a broad picture of Dutch culture, and so they found him unsuitable as a Dutch cultural representative. Gemser explained the situation:

Waterink draws good crowds and impresses them, speaks easily and manages to hold an Afrikaner audience captive. However, generally

---

<sup>31</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, personal letter from D. Pont, secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation). The letter is dated 12 March 1949, pp.7-8.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, p.12

speaking, he takes a typical Kuyperian, Free University and ... (narrow) ... party political stand. It seems that he regards himself as an apostle of his own sectarian (Calvinist) group, rather than a cultural ambassador who represents the ... (whole spectrum of) Dutch culture. He doesn't even hesitate to place the current Dutch government (particularly the Labour Party<sup>33</sup>) in a very unfavourable light.... He accuses ... (many Dutch authors) ... of Communist (leanings) and claims that 25 to 30 percent of Dutch Professors are Communists. He makes it seem as if he will be indispensable in Holland, in the advent of a change of government (supposedly as the new Minister of Education!). It is unpleasant to have to tell you about (all this), but I think (you ought to know). So, when you receive a diplomatically stated report from the secretary of our organisation, you'll know to read between the lines. My only hope is that elsewhere he may have behaved differently, since all the praise he received here from Afrikaners, may have gone to his head.<sup>34</sup>

A second Board member, S.P. Engelbrecht, expressed very similar concerns:

Waterink seems to (have worked on the narrow assumption) that (representing) Holland meant (representing) the Dutch Reformed Church and the Anti-Revolutionary Party, and no one else.... I don't think Waterink should be further involved in the South Africa movement in Holland.<sup>35</sup>

As Gemser predicted, Pont's report-back<sup>36</sup> on Waterink's visit was indeed more diplomatically worded. Although Pont mentioned that he was aware of and shared 'many of Gemser's and Engelbrecht's concerns and objections', he was 'also grateful for all the good that had occurred'. He did suggest, however, that in future it should be made clear that Dutch cultural representatives should officially represent all of Holland, and not come to South Africa in order to 'make propaganda for one particular church or political party'. In spite of the misgivings, Pont significantly concluded:

---

<sup>33</sup> The *Partij van de Arbeid* (PvdA), the main Dutch Labour Party

<sup>34</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, personal letter (marked 'strictly personal and confidential') from Prof B. Gemser, Board member of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation). The letter is dated 11 May 1949.

<sup>35</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, personal letter (marked 'very confidential') from Prof S.P. Engelbrecht, Board member of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation). The letter is dated 12 May 1949.

<sup>36</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, letter from Prof D. Pont, General Secretary of the *Genootskap Nederland-Suid Afrika*, to Prof. G. van der Leeuw (my translation), p.1. The letter is dated 16 June 1949.

...what Waterink's visit has clarified however, is that having a Protestant-Christian speaker is a significant factor in making (such) visits a success.<sup>37</sup>

Van der Leeuw was asked to keep this in mind when recommending future visitors.

With regard to the Cultural Accord, Pont had been trying to ascertain what progress had been made at official level on the South African side. He mentioned that there had been some 'peculiar developments'. The government officials to whom Pont had spoken had been evasive when asked for an acknowledgment of the fact that a draft Accord had been submitted for commentary to the South African government. Instead, Pont wrote, the officials claimed that they were working on their own alternative draft Accord. Pont was under the impression

...that they want to stay one step ahead of the Dutch, and keep the initiative on their side ... possibly because they want to say to the people: we make Holland an offer and not the other way around... (when pressed about the Dutch draft, they admitted receiving one), but said that it was too long (and detailed) and that theirs, whilst saying the same things, is much more concise.<sup>38</sup>

## 5.7 An Ambiguous Accord as an Expression of an Ambiguous Relationship

Finally, at the beginning of 1950 the Dutch Government declared that, in principle, they would be willing to sign the South African version of the Cultural Accord (Holsappel, 1994:87). However, it was to take another year of squabbling before both governments would approve the final version of the Accord.<sup>39</sup> Even then, it would take until 1953 for all the formalities to be accommodated.<sup>40</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, pp.2-3

<sup>39</sup> Apart from squabbling over semantics in the context of the Cultural Accord, there were negotiations at other levels that may have played a role in the slow pace of reaching a Cultural Accord. Firstly, South Africa was pressed to relax some stringent immigration rules in order to make it easier for Dutch unschooled labourers to emigrate to South Africa, and secondly, the Dutch National airline (KLM) was trying to negotiate favourable landing rights.

<sup>40</sup> The 1951 mutual approval coincided with a decision to elevate the foreign missions in both countries to the status of Embassies. On 31 May (Union Day in South Africa at the time) 1951, the first official announcement of the Cultural Accord came from D.F. Malan, at an official social function in the new Dutch Embassy. At the same time, the official signing of the Accord took place in The Hague in Holland. Dutch Law prescribed that the Accord could not officially operate before Parliamentary ratification. In 1952, this approval was achieved, with an overwhelming majority of votes as only the Dutch Communist Party voted against. The final step was to see to a number of legalities required for

We can conclude that in the first five years after the Second World War, the outrage over the war-time Nazi occupation and its fascist ideology had steadily faded from the central focus of Dutch public opinion. It was replaced by a joint focus on anti-Communism in the context of the Cold War.<sup>41</sup> It is also clear that a deep-rooted sense of white superiority stood in the way of acknowledging the parallels between Nazi Fascism and the rapidly emerging system of apartheid under the Malan government. In 1950 – the same year in which Holland agreed to formalise the Dutch-South African Cultural Accord – some of the most significant apartheid laws were adopted in South Africa: the Immorality Act, the Population Registration Act, the Group Areas Act and the Suppression of Communism Act.

The main emphasis of Dutch foreign policy had shifted to anti-Communism. Although apartheid did not meet official approval, it became labeled as an ‘internal affair’. This stance became particularly clear in the context of the United Nations, where, with one exception, Holland abstained from voting on resolutions that condemned apartheid. In addition, new Dutch needs emerged when the forces of decolonisation threatened Dutch interests in Indonesia, and intensified Holland's search for new destinations for its emigrants.<sup>42</sup>

It was this context that set the stage for a bilateral agreement on the Cultural Accord. Previous historic frictions, estrangement and disagreements between the Dutch and the Afrikaners were ignored, and the main aim of the Accord was stated as a ‘continuation of the favourable relations’ that ‘have always existed between both nations’. Its goal was to encourage ‘mutual cultural exchanges and co-operation in religious, intellectual, artistic, scientific, educational and technical fields’, in the service of ‘the broadest possible developments in the history, morality, and customs of both countries’ (Rozenburg, 1986:112).

The preamble of the Accord made it implicitly clear that the cultural exchanges were meant to involve only Dutch and Afrikaner (as opposed to other South African)

---

the practical execution of the Accord. This was achieved 1953, when the Cultural Accord finally became official.

<sup>41</sup> In an opinion poll conducted in Holland just after the Second World War, the vast majority of people believed that Germany still posed the main threat to their safety and security. However, after the Communist occupation of Prague in 1948, the majority felt that the Soviet Union had become the main threat. In another opinion poll, the percentage of those who felt that Communism should be actively opposed rose from 67% in 1948 to 82% in 1950 (cited in Kuitenbrouwer, 1994:38).

<sup>42</sup> From 1947 to 1960 an approximate 30,000 Dutch immigrants settled in South Africa (quoted in Harlaar, 1994:44).

individuals and organisations. In the Accord itself, there was no mention of how other South Africans could benefit from the Accord. In fact, the attaché for press and cultural affairs at the Dutch Embassy in Pretoria explained that the Accord had to be seen in the context of 'two nations with comparable cultural worlds'. He went on to say that 'strictly speaking', the Accord did not extend to 'other peoples in South Africa: the Negroids, coloureds and Indians'. Practically speaking, according to the attaché, this 'didn't really matter, because audiences at cultural events were seldom mixed, because, with few exceptions, black people were not interested' (quoted in Rozenburg, 1986: 112-113). There was no reference at all to white South Africans of British or other European descents.

In effect the Accord brought nothing essentially new, but simply formalised what had been in existence for a long time. The 1951 annual report of the NZAV mentioned:

The text of the Accord is kept sober and does not ... (essentially differ) from accords that the Union has reached with some other countries.... We further note that the machinery for the practical execution of the Accord has been in place for years and years. In our view, the Cultural accord is more of an official confirmation of our ties, rather than the beginning of (a new programme) of cultural linkages.<sup>43</sup>

The Accord stipulated that both governments would appoint committees to oversee its implementation. On the South African side, Malan appointed the so-called 'Van der Walt committee', named after its chair. On the Dutch side, G. van der Leeuw stepped down as the chair of the advisory committee that had guided the preparations for the Accord. He was replaced by Prof. J. Donner who had served on the committee since its inception. The significant role of the NZAV in terms of the execution of the Accord and its day-to-day management continued as before. Prof. van Winter, the NZAV Board member who in 1945 had warned against blacklisting Nazi supporters because he foresaw that it could block co-operation between the Afrikaners and the Dutch, moved into an influential position. He continued to serve on the Van der Leeuw – turned Donner – committee, but also took over as Chair of the NZAV in 1951.<sup>44</sup> In that same year, in spite of all the earlier misgivings communicated to van der Leeuw, J. Waterink joined the Board of the NZAV.

---

<sup>43</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1951 Annual General Report, p.1 (my translation from Dutch)

<sup>44</sup> One of the first tasks of the NZAV under van Winter's leadership became the organisation of the van Riebeeck commemorations in 1952, three centuries after van Riebeeck had landed in the Cape. These celebrations played on historical Dutch-Afrikaner kinship sentiments, reminiscent of the stirring up immediately after the first Boer War (see Chapter Four).

The NZAV continued to do what it had done for many decades: they screened and supported South Africans who came to Holland to study for their Masters or Doctoral degrees. All of these students, without exception, were Afrikaners and almost all of them were men.<sup>45</sup> It was the NZAV who made recommendations to the Dutch Ministry of Education which provided their bursaries.

The 1952 Annual Report mentioned:

In all our meetings in which we discuss ... bursaries, the Ministry of Education is represented by an observer. A very pleasant form of cooperation has come about through this contact.<sup>46</sup>

To some degree, the Cultural Accord brought about a new era for the NZAV. However, the new situation also meant that the more things changed, the more things stayed the same. The organisation had started in 1881 as an NGO rallying pro-Boer support in Holland, and they were in fact still doing exactly that in the 1950s. However, what had changed over the years was that their private organisational policy objectives became increasingly intertwined with official Dutch foreign policy. This was particularly so since 1929, after Holland entered into official diplomatic relations with South Africa (see Chapter Four).

After the Second World War, major political changes had taken place globally (the Cold War and the process of decolonisation), as well as in the national contexts of both South Africa (apartheid) and Holland (post-war reconstruction and modernisation). Significantly, these political changes were, even if contentious, made subsidiary to a combination of kinship sentiments and economic interests. The political changes did not overrule their desire to strengthen cultural or academic linkages, which were projected as relatively autonomous fields of interest divorced from politics.

By signing the Cultural Accord, both the Dutch and the South African National Party government acknowledged their desire to create an avenue for dialogue in a context of

---

<sup>45</sup> The 1952 Annual Report of the NZAV mentions that in that year there were 58 students, all male and Afrikaner. In 1953 there were 55 students, all Afrikaners and all but one male. The majority of them were either studying at the University of Leiden (where Law was popular) or the Free University of Amsterdam (where many pursued Theology or Language/Literature studies). Furthermore, there were students at a variety of universities pursuing degrees in Mathematics, Engineering, Architecture and other majors.

<sup>46</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1952 Annual General Report, p.26 (my translation from Dutch)



their (perhaps contested but) common social origins. On both sides, economic interests undoubtedly played a significant role, but there were numerous ideological motives as well. Firstly, and initially, these motives were religious-expansionist, since both the majority of Afrikaners and the Dutch were Protestant Christians. Secondly, whilst the Dutch and Afrikaners had sharply diverged in terms of their views on Fascism, a common anti-Communist stance had reunited them in a relatively short space of time after the Second World War. Thirdly, whilst the Afrikaners were openly racist, the Dutch, by denying the parallels between Nazism and apartheid, did not break with a deep-seated belief in white superiority.

The NZAV played a crucial role in shaping and managing Dutch foreign policy, particularly in the realm of cultural and academic exchanges. Their narrow, historically-based focus on Afrikaners as opposed to other South Africans symbolised the relationship. However, from the mid-1950s onwards, in a context of a growing human rights awareness, the exclusive focus on Afrikaners on the part of both the NZAV and the official Dutch foreign policy became increasingly untenable and was criticised by more and more groupings in Dutch society.

The NZAV, however, continued to present itself as impartial, and promoted the idea that a circumscribed dialogue with those in power as well as an academic and cultural exchange programme was better than no contact at all. The NZAV believed that through dialogue their arguably 'errant' Afrikaner distant 'cousins' would somehow come to their senses and change their ways. In return, the Dutch population would have to learn to accept that the distant and foreign circumstances of South Africa demanded a different approach, and that one should refrain from quick judgment.

## **5.8 Fundamental Pedagogic's Critical Dilemma**

In the years between the publication of Langeveld's book in Holland (1946) and the development of the Cultural Accord (1946-1953), C.K. Oberholzer wrote the first text on Fundamental Pedagogics in South Africa; it was published in 1954. These in-between years are worthy of some reflection as they saw a major shift in the political dispensation in South Africa, with the National Party coming firmly into control. The shift also affected Dutch-Afrikaner relations, which had to accommodate further strains and ambiguities when the Broederbond entered the negotiations around the Accord. Another significant factor in Dutch-Afrikaner politics was the influence of the NG Kerk. In South Africa, the NG Kerk (whose influence can of course not really be separated from the

Broederbond given their extensive connections) had made its weight felt by influencing the invitation of Waterink instead of Langeveld (see 5.4).

Waterink's official letter of invitation had expressed the hope that both nations could 'help and complement each other as *they used to do in the past* ( my italics) ... in the field of education and schooling' (see 5.5). Chapter Four of this thesis has demonstrated that 'used to in the past' refers to the historical linkages in education and schooling between the two countries, which were almost exclusively framed in a Calvinist mode. As a result, there was an established tradition of Dutch Calvinist influence on Afrikaner education, where Holland had initially attempted to transplant a Dutch CNE ideology to South Africa but where CNE eventually was accommodated in its own unique way, in a context in which it was propelled by Afrikaner Nationalism. The CNE legacy became the ideological basis for the education policies of the post-1948 National Party government. This historical background also explains why the National Party would have wanted to stress the Calvinist connection between Holland and South Africa, as opposed to other connections.

The arrival of Langeveld's theory in South Africa just after the war, where it was introduced by Beyers Nel and taken up by C.K. Oberholzer at the University of Pretoria, came at a very opportune time. The timing was perfect, as it presented Afrikaners with the opportunity to develop educational thinking in such a way that their long-cherished ideal of CNE could be implemented. What was needed was an academic justification for CNE, especially in the field of teacher education, as teachers now needed to be groomed in a new CNE mode. Significantly, a year before Oberholzer's book came out, the notorious Bantu Education Act of 1953 had been passed, officially introducing apartheid education to South Africa. The Bantu Education Act effectively forced the closure of the mission schools which up to that time had been responsible for the education of most black South Africans. In addition, the Act meant that teacher training (an important activity of mission schools) could only take place in training centers which were run by the Department of Native Affairs (Christie 1985:79). This development created a gap, where a new and government-sanctioned curriculum for teacher training became necessary.

Understandably, it would have been undesirable and in fact even impossible to rely on Anglo-American educational theories to provide an appropriate academic support base for CNE. Langeveld's work signaled an opportunity to introduced new thinking in the field of education by Afrikaners, along avenues that were not that accessible (or

interesting) to English-speaking South African academics. By using Langeveld's theory, Afrikaners stood to gain in the battle between Afrikaans-speaking and English-speaking academics. As the title of Chapter Two – 'An Anglo-Boer War in the Arena of Pedagogy' – suggests, a fierce struggle for dominance was waged between these two groupings. In this battle, the adoption of Langeveld's theory would have surely provided some heavy artillery.

Nel (1983:13) endorsed this view when she concluded that the promotion of education as an autonomous science (Langeveld's main premise) should be seen in the light of 'a deep-rooted opposition to pragmatist and empiricist views traditionally held by English-speaking colleagues'. That these differences of opinion between Afrikaner and English-speaking (white) South African academics were not only philosophical, but also linked to ideological (and political) divisions, has been discussed in Chapter Two and will not be repeated here. It seems obvious, though, that in asserting their newly gained political power, Afrikaner Nationalists were eager to support their long-awaited changes in the education system with a sound theory that could be taught to student teachers in a CNE context.

However, the problem with Langeveld's theory for the South African context at the time was that – if adopted unconditionally – it would have signified a departure from religious doctrine in favour of an essentially atheist and phenomenologically-based theory of education. Langeveld had suggested that instead of looking to religion for guidance in a scientific study of what does (but also what *should*) happen when children are raised, we should acknowledge the existence of a pedagogic reality which can be scientifically captured in pedagogy as an autonomous and practical science. This pedagogic reality contained a set of norms which preceded any moral or religious norms with which parents could identify. Hence, it was a field of interest which was related to social and human sciences, but was indeed also seen as an autonomous field with objectives and assumptions which were distinctly pedagogical.

Langeveld's ideas had great significance in Dutch society which, particularly after the Second World War, began to change from a being a religious 'pillarised' nation to one where new post-war secular identities emerged. Langeveld's idea of pedagogic autonomy offered a solution to those parents who looked for non-religious moral guidelines when raising their children. His theory redirected their search to distinct pedagogic norms that could replace the guidelines that had been offered by religious doctrines. At the same time, those parents who felt comfortable with religion as their

main source of inspiration in raising their children could now also rest assured in the knowledge that their actions could be sanctioned not only by their religion, but also in a 'neutral' and 'scientific' way.

When transferred to the South African context after the National Party election victory of 1948, it could not possibly be expected that the Afrikaners – who were finally in a position to implement their long-cherished ideal of Christian National Education – would embrace a scientific approach that was based on secular education theory – a theory, furthermore, which could well legitimate diverse religious doctrines and secular ideological perspectives which would be at odds with the politics of apartheid. Here we see Oberholzer's (and fundamental pedagogics') idiosyncratic dilemma: the CNE policy context demanded of him a reconciliation of two irreconcilable ideas, i.e. Langeveld's concept of pedagogic autonomy (with distinct *pedagogic* norms,) and Calvinist doctrine as expressed in CNE ideology (in other words, distinct *Calvinist* norms).

When C.K. Oberholzer's book was published in South Africa, the Dutch journal *Pedagogische Studieen* (on the editorial board of which Beyers Nel served) asked Langeveld to review it. In his review, Langeveld (1955:253) suggested that Oberholzer had misinterpreted some of the central features of his theory. A comprehensive philosophical analysis of Oberholzer's adaptation of Langeveld's theory falls outside the scope of this inquiry, but Langeveld's main critique of Oberholzer will be outlined insofar as it sheds light on the dilemma described above.

Whilst Oberholzer claimed to base his theory on Langeveld's ideas, Langeveld found the interpretation highly questionable. In his review, Langeveld (1955:252) implied that Oberholzer did not really conceive of pedagogy as a *practical* science in the way that he claimed to do. Although Oberholzer claimed that he had adopted Langeveld's ideas, Langeveld concluded that Oberholzer's pedagogy remained a derivation from theory and therefore also remained an *applied* science. The difference between a practical science and an applied science had been crucial in Langeveld's theory. Langeveld believed that one could only analyse the phenomenon of education by participating in it. By this he meant that one could not see theory as a separate abstraction that one could apply from above or from outside of the phenomenon itself. This, concluded Langeveld, was essentially what Oberholzer had done.

Oberholzer posed (in my opinion, in highly philosophical and convoluted ways) an artificial separation of *facts* (essentials in the education reality; that is, education practice)

and *norms* (philosophical presuppositions; that is, education theory). In this way Oberholzer left the door open to accommodate the possibility of Calvinist norms (coming from outside) instead of pedagogy's 'own' norms (coming from the 'inside' and brought out through phenomenology) to guide the study of education. Langeveld insinuated that given the above Oberholzer had, despite resolute claims to the contrary, transplanted a natural science model into pedagogy, and thus contradicted the main philosophical assumptions of the human sciences.

Curiously, and in spite of his fierce critique, Langeveld also concluded that Oberholzer had written a very important book. Perhaps his praise is best explained by Langeveld's approval of Oberholzer's determined rejection of Anglo-American education theory. Since Langeveld saw his own continental human science philosophy as far superior to that of the Anglo-American tradition, he probably did not want to estrange a likely ally in South Africa whose views, while flawed, could potentially be corrected by himself. However, with hindsight we can conclude that this 'correction' never occurred, as the critics of fundamental pedagogics have convincingly demonstrated the symbiotic link between CNE and fundamental pedagogics (see Chapter Two).

### **5.9 Fundamental Pedagogics: Don't Interfere with our Internal Affairs?**

The last part of this chapter demonstrates that a critical dialogue between academics from Holland and South Africa was impossible under the conditions created in the context of the Cultural Accord. The Accord was so constrained by apartheid politics in South Africa and conservative politics in Holland that critical and alternative voices were not given a platform. This meant that Afrikaner academics in education, and particularly those who were developing fundamental pedagogics in South Africa, became academically isolated internationally and only had each other's ideas from which to draw. This left the emerging meanings of fundamental pedagogics (more and more entrenched in CNE and apartheid education) largely unchallenged, other than those challenges that came from South African critics. The critique that came from this latter group, predominantly white English-speaking individuals, was rejected for ideological reasons, as has been discussed elsewhere in this thesis.

As a result, fundamental pedagogics developed its own ideological meaning within apartheid South Africa, unaffected by any substantial and critical interventions which could have come from proponents (or critics) of its Dutch counterpart – Langeveld's

theoretical pedagogy. In order to demonstrate the above assumptions, I have explored two sources of data: (1) the reports of a number of academics in the field of education who visited each other's countries; and (2) the minutes of a set of meetings of the committees in charge of the Cultural Accord: the Dutch 'Donner Committee' and its South African counterpart, the 'Op 't Hof Committee'.

The first report of an academic in education after Waterink's pre-Accord visit was made by the Dutch educator, F.W. Prins, who came to South Africa in 1958. It is easy to see why the authorities would have considered him a welcome visitor as his attitude towards the political situation in the country reflected 'uncritical approval' (Levering, 1991:156). Prins noticed that his Afrikaner host educators were struggling to find concepts which they considered relevant to South Africa's particular and unique educational context. Prins (1959:42) noticed that:

...It is clear that many South African academics in Education have studied in the U.S.A. or Europe. One can easily detect the Anglo-Saxon, German and Dutch influences. However, the more they are aware of such (foreign) influences, the more they (are determined) to find their own solutions to their own problems.

Prins sympathised with Afrikaner educators and wished them well in their search for 'solutions in education that would emphasise (their) own national character' (read: apartheid education). Other than the above global comments, Prins did not directly comment on the status of fundamental pedagogics in his report.

In the following year, 1959, Beyers Nel was invited to come to Holland, whilst Langeveld, who had been rejected ten years prior, would be given an opportunity to go to South Africa. Both would be official representatives, operating under the auspices of the Cultural Accord. Strangely enough, the time of their visits almost entirely overlapped, so they did not have a chance to host each other. Nel's attitude resonated well with the Accord's objective to cultivate kinship ties:

If there is one thing that I am grateful for, then it is the fact that in the 1930s I was given the opportunity to study with the well-known Prof. Th. Kohnstamm. This experience has left me with a deep insight into the language and culture of Holland. As Afrikaners we can never get away from the fact that our language, culture and religion has Dutch origins.<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV XXIV: 'Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa' (C.A). 'Report Back Prof. B.F. Nel'. Beyers Nel visited Holland between March 1 and May 3 1959.

Nel visited a number of education faculties across Holland. This experience convinced him of the necessity to foster close contact between Dutch and South African academics in Pedagogics. Admiringly, he said,

...once more, I have been struck by the fact that in Holland (this academic discipline) is so much further developed that it is in South Africa. It is essential that we should focus on what is thought, written and done in the field of pedagogy in Holland. This is especially true for the sub-disciplines Theoretical Pedagogics and its philosophical foundations, Didactics and Psychology of Education, where we are far behind.<sup>48</sup>

Several times during his visit, Nel met with resistance and criticism of South Africa's racist policies. The South African Embassy in Holland came to his rescue and supplied him with the necessary propaganda material. This helped Nel in his efforts to foster sympathy for 'South Africa's problems'. He found that

...if one poses the problems in such a way that you acknowledge that humanly speaking we may have made mistakes, and then you give them an objective picture of our difficulties, then one develops a favourable attitude. On several occasions, members of the audience have assured me that they came to the lecture feeling hostile but left with a better understanding of all the complexities of our problems in South Africa. I must add to this that the films which were made available by the South African Embassy have certainly contributed to the success of my presentations.<sup>49</sup>

Whilst Beyers Nel was in Holland, Langeveld went on his first (and only) visit to South Africa. From a cautiously phrased preamble to his report we can read his determination to tread carefully. As an official representative of the Cultural Accord he obviously had to acknowledge the main objective of the Accord, which was to nurture cultural ties with Afrikaners. Langeveld (1959a:246) wrote:

...I am thinking of the enormous racial problems in the country of my destination. For a foreigner who travels around in this country, it is not possible to pass judgment, even on the basis of one's own (conversations and observations... because one can not be sure that one fully understands) the context in which one makes such assessments.... However, let me make one thing clear: it is not possible to tell a nation how things should be done. (However) ... it is just as silly to do the

---

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid.*, p.8

<sup>49</sup> *Ibid.*, p.6

opposite, and simply confirm: 'Things went the way they should have gone.'

Levering (1991:157) concludes that Langeveld showed neither approval nor condemnation of the situation in South Africa. His critique came cautiously disguised, as Langeveld (1959a:247) expressed 'surprise' rather than denouncing the effects of apartheid (education):

It is surprising for a Dutch national to come to a society in which the whole 'lower social strata' is formed by Bantus. This actually means that the small – and very divided! – white community will employ even its own dumbest and unsuitable individuals over the Bantu. The English-medium press suggests that IQ tests privilege Afrikaner children. As a European, ... (I then become) ... interested in what the Natives would say about these tests which, in all likelihood, assess them with a White yardstick.

One of Langeveld's general experiences was that those people with whom he came in contact in South Africa had not been very open to criticism. He described their attitude as follows:

Here in this far, rich and isolated country, one often gets the feeling that they think they are all alone in the world: 'People should not interfere with our internal affairs'. We, in Europe, know all too well that the 'internal affairs' of one nation can have an impact on other countries. When one (expresses) admiration for the *good* things that are happening in this country, one is *not* told that this may be a quick and uninformed opinion (Langeveld;1959b:317).

Although Langeveld withheld moral comments, he stressed above all the impracticality of racial prejudice. He was, for instance, amazed by the treatment of so-called 'coloured' South Africans:

With regard to the 'coloureds', most people say that they are intelligent and ambitious. (However), they too are not absorbed into the world of Whites. Yet, they do want to belong to (this White world) – and when one estranges such a group from the Whites, then (this group) is pushed towards the Natives. Wouldn't they then, filled with anger, become the leaders of the Natives? The number of Coloureds is half of that of the Whites, the Whites could well do with 50% reinforcement. This is a serious problem for the proponents of apartheid. First rejecting and then reconciling is a dangerous procedure (Langeveld, 1959b:317-318).



Langeveld agreed with Beyers Nel on the comparatively low quality of scientific research and academic programmes in education at South African universities. He felt that:

The academic field of education is seriously hindered by the dominant view that university authorities have of (academia). A professor who has to teach something like 15 hours a week and ... see to all the organisational and administrative aspects of (departmental work), obviously has no time left (for research). He will – what else can he do – endlessly repeat lecturing from the same notes. In this country, one also feels the need to consult primary sources. (Most academics) only have some rudimentary knowledge of (classical) works from translations ... and ... the official libraries are stocked with books that have been outdated for 25 years (Langeveld, 1959b:318).

In his report-back to the Donner Committee, Langeveld advised them to broaden their selection pool of South African academics who would benefit from the Cultural Accord. He suggested that English-speaking academics should also be included as ‘the state of the Union of South Africa warranted such a stance’. In addition, Langeveld recommended Prof. Le Grange, who taught Educational Psychology at the University of Stellenbosch, because

...he is very open to Dutch influences and – given the current circumstances in South Africa – he is one of the very few academics – together with Prof. Schmidt<sup>50</sup> – who has reached a high academic standard in his field.<sup>51</sup>

Langeveld's reference to Le Grange's ‘openness to Dutch influence’ and his ‘high academic standards’ could be interpreted as a hint to the proponents of Fundamental Pedagogics whom Langeveld, by contrast, would not have credited with such an attitude or academic status.

Langeveld also felt that it was ‘of very great importance’ to allocate study grants to candidates from the so-called ‘coloured’ community. In this way, he argued, Holland could help to reduce ‘the fast growing bitterness amongst Coloured intellectuals’. As we

---

<sup>50</sup> Prof. W.H.O. Schmidt taught Educational Psychology at the University of Natal in Pietermaritzburg at the time. According to Langeveld, Schmidt's German-Afrikaner origins made him a suitable candidate for an invitation to come to Holland in the context of the Cultural Accord, because, wrote Langeveld, he occupied a suitable middle position between English and Afrikaans speaking candidates.

<sup>51</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV XXIV: ‘Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa’ (C.A). ‘Report Back Prof. M.J. Langeveld’, p.3; Langeveld visited South Africa between March 16 and May 23 1959.

will see later, this suggestion was only discussed and approved (in principle) two years later.

Considering the above reports, it is far more interesting to reflect on what Langeveld *did not* write, rather than on what he *did* write. It is enormously puzzling that Langeveld makes no specific mention at all of the proponents of fundamental pedagogics. In fact, he doesn't even use the term once in all of his reports. At the time of Langeveld's visit to South Africa, Oberholzer was working at the University of Pretoria. It would have been reasonable to expect the two men to have met to discuss the state of pedagogics and to debate the different directions that their education theories had taken. However, it appears that he completely ignored fundamental pedagogics, and chose not to comment other than in general terms, for example, when he mentioned the low academic and intellectual standards at universities. The most obvious explanation lies in Langeveld's apparent decision not to offend anyone during his trip – not to be judgmental nor to offer outright condemnation of anything he saw or anyone he met during his visit. With hindsight, we can conclude that Langeveld's visit was a lost opportunity for a serious and critical dialogue between himself and the proponents of fundamental pedagogics who acknowledged his work as crucial to their own theory of education.

The Donner Committee discussed Langeveld's suggestion to invite English-speaking academics and agreed in principle, but stated that such people should be bilingual (that is, speak both English and Afrikaans). They acknowledged that politically it could be a sensitive issue which they would take up at a joint meeting with the South African Committee. Again, it is interesting to reflect on what was *not* discussed, as Langeveld's other recommendation, to give bursaries to coloured recipients, is completely ignored.<sup>52</sup>

Twelve days later, a joint meeting between the Donner Committee and representatives from the South African Op 't Hof Committee<sup>53</sup> took place. The Dutch Chair, Donner, asked how invitations to English-speaking South African academics would be received politically. Op 't Hof answered in a straightforward manner, saying that, 'It could become difficult for South Africa, if it would concern individuals who politically are explicitly anti-Afrikaner'. Prof. van Winter (also Chair of the NZAV) understood this position and replied:

---

<sup>52</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV XXIV: 'Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa' (C.A). Minutes Donner Committee meeting 1 September 1959

<sup>53</sup> officially the Committee for Implementation and Advice on Cultural Exchanges between Holland and South Africa

(I) ... understand that (we should not) invite someone who vehemently opposes the government, but there are numerous people who have formed their own opinion, without becoming militant political figures, or public agitators ... such people could surely be invited?<sup>54</sup>

Op 't Hof agreed with this, and said that indeed Prof. Butler also wrote about apartheid, but approached the issue in a scientific way (*sic*). Op 't Hof implied that such a scientific approach would be acceptable to the South Africans. As in the preparatory meeting, the issue of coloured bursars never even got onto the agenda.

In the following year, 1960, F.W. Prins returned once more to South Africa. He was even more full of admiration for the progress that he saw in education for Black South Africans:

... the direction that they have taken with Bantu education leads to the upliftment of the Bantu. A lot of hard work is being done to realise the strategy: 'From the Bantu, by the Bantu, for the Bantu.'

Such observations would be in sharp contrast to those of Ph. J. Idenburg, who travelled to South Africa in that very same year. Idenburg was not constrained by the terms and references of the Cultural Accord, as he was invited by the University of Natal which celebrated its 50th anniversary with a National Conference on Education and Schooling. At the conference, Idenburg came to realise that education in South Africa was inextricably linked to politics:

...I want to warn those readers who get irritated when education is associated with politics. The organisation of an education system is a matter which is predominantly determined by the goals that are set by the authorities of the state. The contradiction lies not (in the question) politics or no politics, but rather in: either this kind or that kind of politics. In South Africa, 'this politics' means the ruling politics of apartheid and the alternative, oppositional politics is that which favours cooperation.... I can't stop thinking of the drama that will unfold in South Africa. They are implementing disastrous policies here...

The NZAV was certainly not swayed by Idenburg's convictions, as they strongly advocated the separation of culture (and by implication academia) from politics. Van Winter reiterated:

---

<sup>54</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut. Archives NZAV XXIV: 'Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa' (C.A). Minutes joint meeting of the Donner and Op 't Hof Committees; dated 12 September 1959, p.2

The NZAV's objective is to promote *cultural* interaction between Holland and South Africa and to encourage *economic* ties between these two countries.... we consider it our task to strengthen the ties with our congenials in South Africa and, in relationship to that, inform (Dutch) public opinion on South Africa ... obviously not by moving in on the realm of politics<sup>55</sup> (my italics).

In reciprocation of the 1959 invitation to attend a meeting of the Dutch Donner Committee, the South African counterpart, the Op 't Hof Committee, invited a number of Dutch representatives to attend a meeting in 1961.<sup>56</sup> The minutes of their meeting reveal that, after a number of polite niceties, the attention shifted to a discussion of the way in which candidates were selected as 'cultural representatives' to each others countries. An interesting discussion unfolded as van Winter noted that it would be a good idea if South Africa would send individuals who 'could explain that South Africa is positively looking for ways to deal with its problems, and not only send people who rigidly represent the Government's opinion'. Op 't Hof responded:

It would be most difficult when you would invite South Africans who are considered *persona non grata* by our Government. The general public would not understand it and they would accuse the Government and the Department (of Education) of sending people to Holland who will make South Africa's case even more difficult.<sup>57</sup>

Donner replied:

We have agreed to view cultural relations as separate from politics, but people should not be muzzled, (as this would) have a negative effect on our treaty (the Cultural Accord).<sup>58</sup>

The meeting agreed that in future the Chairmen of both Committees would informally consult and agree with one another about the choice of candidate before an official invitation was given. In an apparent attempt to soften the Dutch stance, Donner reassured the Op 't Hof Committee that their position did not stem from criticism, but

---

<sup>55</sup>Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV, Annual Report 1960, p.1

<sup>56</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV XXIV: 'Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa' (C.A). Minutes of Meeting Op 't Hof Committee, 22 September 1961 in Pretoria. Under 'Present' in the minutes, we note Dutch representatives Mr. J. Donner himself, Prof. P.J van Winter (Chair of the NZAV), Mr. J. Keuning and Dr. B. de Hoog. There are three additional Dutch Nationals in their various capacities. One of them is the Dutch Ambassador to South Africa, Dr. J. van den Berg. (my translation from Afrikaans)

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid.*, p.2

rather from feelings of 'concern and sympathy' for South Africa's problems. He then assured them that people would never be selected for their politics, but 'only for their professionalism'. This remark pleased those present, and the South African H.W. Snyman echoed these views when he confirmed that professionalism was of primary importance, whereas a person's political views and religious convictions should be merely coincidental (*sic*) when selecting appropriate candidates.

In their official report-back, the Dutch representatives also discussed their meetings with prominent Afrikaner politicians, amongst them H.F Verwoerd and B.J. Vorster. When discussing academic exchange programmes between the two countries, Verwoerd had told them that he felt it was very important for the country that the 'future South African intelligentsia would be shaped by Western European thought'.

In addition Donner noted (unapologetically) that since 'Verwoerd, as the host, had not discussed the existing political differences on apartheid, (the Dutch) delegation had not initiated such a discussion either', although Verwoerd did remark that 'South Africa receives more empathy from the Flemish in Belgium, than they do from the Dutch'.<sup>59</sup> Vorster, however, did initiate a discussion on the 'politics of apartheid'. Donner mentioned that the discussion which started in Vorster's office in the Union Buildings in Pretoria later continued at 'Mr. and Mrs. Vorster's private home, where the Dutch delegation had been invited for lunch'. Donner did not reveal the content of their debate, and only wrote:

The divergent points of view clearly came across, but the tone of the conversation remained courteous and pleasant.<sup>60</sup>

Surprisingly, although it was not captured in the minutes of their official meeting, Donner stated that the Dutch Committee noted 'with interest the fact that the South African authorities had agreed in principle to consider Coloured candidates for bursaries and study grants under the terms of the Cultural Accord',<sup>61</sup> thus acknowledging Langeveld's suggestion in 1959.<sup>62</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV XXIV: 'Committee for the improvement of Cultural Relations between Holland and South Africa' (C.A). 'Report Back Delegation Advisory Committee on Dutch-South African Cultural Relations; September - October 1961', p.3 (My translation from Dutch)

<sup>60</sup> *Ibid.*, p.4

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, p.7

<sup>62</sup> This agreement did not really change their selection of candidates at all. Rozenburg (1986:113) noted that during the almost 30 years in which the NZAV managed and executed the Cultural Accord (from 1953 until its official suspension in 1982), out of the 'hundreds of bursary recipients', there was only one coloured and one Indian candidate who received such financial assistance.

The tenth anniversary of the Accord in 1963 presented an opportunity to look back and reflect. Donner did so in the 1963 Annual report of the NZAV. He stood by the organisation's (and the official Dutch) position that:

One should keep cultural linkages out of the political realm. On the contrary, whenever the relationship becomes more politically difficult, we should focus on nurturing cultural ties.... luckily, both (the Dutch and the South African) committees share this belief, and act accordingly. However, the separation ... (of politics and culture) is not always easy, particularly on an emotional level.<sup>63</sup>

This position continued to be upheld for almost another two decades. In the face of a growing Dutch anti-apartheid opposition, various Dutch governments in co-operation with the NZAV continued to maintain the Cultural Accord. Finally, on 21 October 1977, the Dutch government announced its intention to terminate the Accord.

After a drawn out political and legal process of more than four years, the Accord was finally revoked in 1982. The following reasons were cited: (1) it would be a sign of Holland's aversion to 'the increasingly intransigent attitude of the South African government', and (2) it had become clear that the idea of 'conducting a critical dialogue by means of the Accord had failed' (quoted in van der Watt, 1992:i). The impact of the Civil Rights movement in the United States and the struggle for independence of the former Dutch colony of Indonesia had made the Dutch increasingly aware of racism (Van den Bergh, 1994:123). In addition, the radicalisation of the freedom struggle in South Africa was noted and supported by a new Dutch generation. These developments marked a shift in Dutch-Afrikaner politics and signaled the end of a window of opportunity for the conservative Dutch partners of South Africa to promote their academic and cultural exchanges. Anti-apartheid and (academic) boycott politics effectively challenged the ambiguous and accommodating relationship of the past.

## **5.10 Synthesis and Discussion of the Research Question**

The focus in the second historical narrative was on the later context (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics and their linkages in the field of education. The research question that was at the center of the narrative was:

---

<sup>63</sup> Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Archives NZAV; 1963 Annual General Report, p.5 (my translation from Dutch)

How does the later diverging history (1939-1963) of Dutch-Afrikaner politics explain the differences in the evolving education theories of their two countries?

Pivotal to this chapter was the transfer of Langeveld's theory from Holland to South Africa where it was reinterpreted into fundamental pedagogics.

The narrative begins by showing that during the Second World War, the Afrikaner Nationalist movement drew heavily from the ideas propagated by the Nazi and Fascist regimes in Europe. These ideas were integrated into their existing nationalist ideology, and introduced a new dimension to its political philosophy which had its ideological basis in Christian National Education. CNE had not been an entirely indigenous Afrikaner concept. The previous century had seen the transplantation of CNE, as an imperialist project, from Holland to South Africa where it had been accommodated in its own unique and idiosyncratic way. It had come to emphasise the right of the Afrikaner *Volk* (based on an assumption that the *Volk's* needs were homogenous) to determine its own type of schooling and its own curriculum based on Calvinist principles. The infusion of Nazi ideology radicalised the CNE vision. As a result, the original Dutch (Kuyperian) concept of 'sovereignty in each sphere', which had already been adapted to advance the Nationalist cause, was now further transformed into one of 'totalitarianism in each sphere'.

After the war, Dutch-Afrikaner politics had to accommodate their opposing war-time loyalties. Their ideological disagreement over Nazism introduced a new set of ambiguities into the relationship. However, their long-standing historical ties, reinforced by a sense of kinship solidarity and possibilities for economic growth, facilitated a rapprochement. The two countries entered into negotiations to form a so-called Cultural Accord, which would encourage and regulate cultural and academic exchanges.

On the Dutch side, the NZAV – the same organisation that had been at the center of Dutch attempts to transplant CNE in the previous century – now became central in the negotiations and subsequent implementation of the Cultural Accord. While the negotiations around the Accord were under way the National Party came into power in South Africa. Broederbond politics and the authoritative influence of the Dutch Reformed Church (NG Kerk) in South Africa forced their way into Dutch-Afrikaner politics. One of the first tangible expressions of their power as it affected Dutch-

Afrikaner linkages in education materialised in 1948, when they secured a visit of the avowed Calvinist J. Waterink, over M.J. Langeveld who promoted an essentially atheist phenomenological approach to education. The politics around Waterink's invitation to South Africa signaled the limitations of the kind of educational linkages that would be acceptable to the National Party and the Afrikaner establishment behind the party political scene. The promotion of a Dutch secular route was certainly out of the question.

This reality introduced an insuperable dilemma for the development of education theory in South Africa. This dilemma first presented itself in 1954, when C.K. Oberholzer published a book that sought to accommodate both the contemporary phenomenological academic trends in Europe (particularly in Holland where Langeveld was dominant), as well as the doctrinaire demands of Calvinism as captured in the Afrikaner CNE vision.

C.K. Oberholzer's book became the first publication in the fundamental pedagogics paradigm. Oberholzer's book filled a gaping vacuum in the education policy context, which required an education theory that could make CNE academically acceptable. This was particularly necessary in the field of teacher education, as apartheid policies had shifted this responsibility from the missionary schools to the Ministry of Native Affairs where its teacher education curriculum could be controlled and manipulated to suit the CNE policy context.

Langeveld both criticised and praised Oberholzer's book, as he approved of Oberholzer's rejection of the Anglo-American philosophical outlook. Seemingly, Langeveld did not want to alienate a potential ally in South Africa. Whilst he considered Oberholzer's views flawed, they were at least on the right track and could possibly be 'corrected'.

In order to facilitate this 'correction', a substantial and critical international dialogue was essential. At the same time, this dialogue was unfeasible given the political context of South Africa. This point was demonstrated in what happened with the Cultural Accord between Holland and South Africa. Theoretically this Accord provided a mechanism to facilitate international exchanges; the reality, however, was so constrained by racist and conservative politics that a critical dialogue never took place. This left the proponents of fundamental pedagogics in academic isolation. As a result, fundamental pedagogics developed its own ideological meanings entrenched in apartheid South Africa, unaffected by any substantial interventions that could have come from Holland or elsewhere internationally.



As a result, Langeveld's pedagogy and fundamental pedagogy took on divergent meanings in very different policy contexts. Whereas Langeveld's pedagogy affirmed religious and ideological diversity in a society that had rejected totalitarianism in favour of social democracy (see 2.7), fundamental pedagogics affirmed apartheid in a society which was politically dominated by those who had adopted totalitarianism framed in a CNE mode. The gap between education in the two societies was addressed in ambiguous ways and ultimately became unbridgeable in the context of Dutch-Afrikaner politics.

## Chapter Six

### Fundamental Pedagogics as an Expression of Dutch-Afrikaner Relationships

#### 6.1 An Orientation to the Chapter

The final chapter addresses the main research question of this thesis and aims to pull all previous chapters together in order to discuss the question:

How did the historical and socio-political context of Dutch-Afrikaner relationships in the field of education shape the meaning that fundamental pedagogics took on in South Africa?

In order to discuss the research question, I have chosen to focus on the use of the concept of 'self' in fundamental pedagogics. This concept captures particularly well how fundamental pedagogics took on meanings which differed radically from its Dutch source, i.e. Langeveld's pedagogy. By focusing on the concept of self, I return to the earlier comparison of the two education theories at the end of Chapter Two. There I noted that the Langeveld's idea of self clearly referred to the unique individual who should be taught to take full responsibility for his or her own personal beliefs and actions, whilst fundamental pedagogics' concept of self in the South African context emerged as an ethnic self, placed in a hierarchical framework of apartheid where the presumed collective interests of ethnic groupings were made subsidiary to those of the individual.

The narratives of Chapters Four and Five now allow us to examine how these differences came about historically and how they can be understood as an expression of Dutch-Afrikaner relationships.

Finally, the chapter concludes by outlining some of the implications of this study for contemporary debates in education in South Africa, with a particular focus on teacher education, and is followed by a set of suggestions for further research.

## **6.2 Christian National Education sets the Stage**

This inquiry set out to examine the Dutch origins of fundamental pedagogics by exploring its roots within the Dutch political and educational context, and the historical ties between the Dutch and the Afrikaners in the field of education. This broad research focus was kindled by the fact that fundamental pedagogics claims to have its origins in the pedagogy of the Dutch educator Langeveld. However, as suggested in Chapter One, fundamental pedagogics often *sounds* like its Dutch source but appears to *mean* something quite different.

A review of the literature confirmed that this discrepancy is not adequately explained in the established criticism of fundamental pedagogics in South African scholarship (Beard *et al*, 1981; Gluckman, 1981; Kallaway, 1983; Enslin, 1988; Ashley, 1989; Reagan, 1990; MacLeod, 1995). The main reason for this gap is because fundamental pedagogics has been analysed as if it was a South African invention. Its foreign (Dutch) origins, diffusion and reinterpretation were therefore lost in these analyses, which only challenged the claims of fundamental pedagogics in its immediate South African context. They did not interrogate the international context (i.e. the Dutch connection) within which such claims were made possible.

This study addresses that gap in the literature. The purpose of this inquiry however, was not to discard the established claim that fundamental pedagogics can be understood as an expression of Afrikaner Christian Nationalism. Rather it was based on the assumption that we can advance our understanding of fundamental pedagogics (and its legacy) by exploring the significance of Dutch-Afrikaner connections in education. Based on this premise, the main research question could now be rephrased as: How can we, on the

basis of the historical narratives in Chapters Four and Five, reassess fundamental pedagogics in a way that allows us to understand it as an expression of the historical relationship between the Dutch and the Afrikaners?

At the core of my inquiry is the idea that fundamental pedagogics, like any other education theory, holds symbolic meaning. It assumes that the qualities of the historical relationships between the Dutch and the Afrikaners are symbolically reflected in the way that Langeveld's theory was transferred to and interpreted in the South African context. This assumption adopts Giroux's (1992:3) conception of pedagogy as a form of cultural production which is 'implicated in the construction and organisation of knowledge, desires, values and social practices'. Giroux's conception is significant for this study in that it presumes that different (cultural) contexts place different demands on the 'construction and organisation of knowledge, desires, values and social practices'.

For this reason, this study discussed the particular contexts in which Langeveld's pedagogy was given meaning in Holland (post-war social democracy) and fundamental pedagogics was given meaning in South Africa (post-1948 apartheid). In order to understand how and why the transfer took place, this inquiry makes a particular examination of Dutch-Afrikaner politics as a site of meaning that could elucidate the divergent interpretations of two seemingly similar pedagogies.

The two historical narratives presented in Chapters Four and Five demonstrated that in order to understand the meaning that fundamental pedagogics took on in South Africa, we need to go back into history and firstly examine the transfer of Christian National Education from Holland to South Africa in the late 19th century. The transfer of CNE from Holland to South Africa was an essential precursor to the transfer of Langeveld's education theory, because the South African rendition of CNE (adapted from the original Dutch version) laid the foundations for the post-1948 South African policy context in which Langeveld's theory would be reinterpreted into fundamental pedagogics.

As with fundamental pedagogics, I established that although similar Christian National terminology was used in both Holland and South Africa, the situated meaning of many key principles differed greatly. An example that clearly demonstrates this claim is the parallel use of the slogan: 'The School belongs to the Parents!' In Holland, this slogan was propagated by a Christian Education movement. Their goal was to achieve the national right of each individual Dutch child to receive Christian education, in protest against the provision of exclusively secular and liberal schooling by the state. Two significant convictions underpinned the Dutch slogan: Firstly, it assumed that all parents had the right to choose a school for their children. Secondly, it assumed that the curriculum in schools holds more than a set of content-driven learning objectives, that it also symbolises a broader set of social, ideological and religious orientations. In affirming the latter principle, the school was presumed to have a distinct pedagogical function as an extension of parental obligations. Both these principles were transferred to South Africa, when the Dutch – with a clear imperialist agenda – attempted to transplant Dutch education to South Africa by forging links with the Afrikaners whom they considered 'blood relations'. However, the principles would develop their own unique meaning in the South African context.

Although many groupings in Holland identified with their Afrikaner cousins, a special and significant link was developed between Dutch and Afrikaner Calvinists. Together they arranged that Dutch Calvinist teachers, (and no secular, Catholic, or any other teachers) would be posted to Afrikaner schools in South Africa to steer the school system away from British control and to strengthen the Afrikaners in their quest for self-determination. Many of these Dutch Calvinist teachers became united in a teachers' organisation which produced the first tangible expression of Christian National Education ideology in South Africa.

In the attempt to transplant Christian National Education from Holland to South Africa, it had gained a significant and powerful new dimension which linked education to an ethnic-nationalist agenda. In Holland, the Christian National Education struggle had been a national issue, but only in the sense that it was conducted nation-wide. It had not been part of a nationalist struggle, in the sense of grafting a nationalist political agenda onto

education. Ethnicity had also not been at issue in Holland, as it was assumed that all Dutch children had their 'Dutchness' in common. Thus, in Holland, the outcome of the Christian Education struggle facilitated religious and ideological diversity in schooling. In South Africa, there was also a call for religious and ideological diversity in schooling, but significantly these notions were inextricably bound up with ethnicity. The slogan mentioned earlier, 'The School belongs to the Parents', therefore had distinct ethnic-nationalist connotations in South Africa.

Christian National Education in South Africa became an integral part of a Nationalist struggle for Afrikaner (ethnic) self-determination, where nationalist collectivism was stressed in tandem with an uncomplicated assumption that all Afrikaner children should receive Christian (Calvinist) Education. Their religious ideas were tied to a curriculum inspired by Nationalist ideology, which was intended to stop Afrikaner children from being exposed to British (secular and liberal) influences in their schooling. The struggle was to force the state to accommodate their assumed homogeneous political and religious interests; they believed – like their Dutch counterparts – that as religious people their covenant with God necessitated religious schooling, but also that as taxpayers they were justified in expecting the state to acknowledge and accommodate their wishes.

The political agendas of the Afrikaners and Dutch initially largely overlapped in their resistance to British curriculum control in schools. However, their co-operation became increasingly strained as relations of power were contested *between* the Dutch and the Afrikaners. First of all, there was the question of language, where the Dutch pushed their own language as the medium of instruction in schools. Tensions also arose when it became clear that most of the important functions in the Department of Education were allocated to Dutch nationals who entered the system with better qualifications. These Afrikaner-Dutch political divisions contributed to the Afrikaners' perception that schools were sites of religious, nationalist and political struggle.

In the early 1930s, the escalating growth of Afrikaner Nationalism became inspired by the National-Socialist movement in Germany. This development further strained the relationship between the Dutch and the Afrikaners. The Dutch noticed disapprovingly

that their influence on the Afrikaners was waning. Their response was to explore the possibilities of introducing a so-called Cultural Accord in order to encourage but also to formalise and regulate cultural linkages between the Afrikaners and the Dutch.

The impact of Nazism on the development of Afrikaner Nationalism holds some important keys to our understanding of Christian National Education, and by extension to our understanding of fundamental pedagogics. The Nazi influence signaled a further twist in the way in which Afrikaners used Dutch Kuyperian social thought. Nazism radicalised the Afrikaner CNE vision, and as such also indirectly impacted on fundamental pedagogics. To substantiate this claim, I will first elaborate on how Nazism affected the CNE philosophy in South Africa and then I will show how this influence is evident in fundamental pedagogics. As announced earlier, the discussion will largely center around the treatment of the concept of self.

### **6.3 The Infusion of Nazi Tenets**

In order to examine the influence of Nazism on Afrikaner Nationalism, and by extension on Christian National Education as one of its policy visions, I turn to O'Meara (1983) who distinguished two groups of Broederbond intellectuals who were seeking new ideological forms in the 1930s. The first group, which he identified as Kuyperians, consisted predominantly of Potchefstroom academics who dominated the Broederbond in the early 1930s. According to O'Meara their *Weltanschauung* was rooted in the Kuyperian doctrine of 'sovereignty in each sphere' (see 2.7). O'Meara (1983:69) argues:

For these Kuyperians culture was a divine product which, together with race, history, fatherland and politics distinguished the various nations from each other. As a divinely created entity, each *volk* was a separate social sphere (*kring*), each with a God-willed structure, purpose, calling and destiny.

However, as discussed in Chapter Two, Kuyper's social theory originated not in an effort to distinguish between different 'nations', but to distinguish between various religious and ideological groupings within Holland. In the South African context, Kuyperian

theory had already been adapted to emphasise an ethnic-national identity as the main qualification of separate spheres.

In the 1930s and 1940s, these already-amended Kuyperian ideas would be further challenged within the Afrikaner community. O' Meara found that Kuyperian Christian Nationalism became refined in extensive debate with a second group of Broederbond intellectuals. This group, which consisted of academics and intellectuals outside of Potchefstroom, introduced a more secular form of nationalism. Their leadership included individuals such as Nico Diederichs, Piet Meyer, Hendrik Verwoerd and A. Hertzog, all of whom would later emerge as dominant leaders in the mainstream Afrikaner Nationalist movement.

These more secular intellectuals were significantly influenced by Nazism (O'Meara, 1983:69-70). For instance, Nico Diederichs (who later would serve as a Minister in Verwoerd's and Vorster's cabinets between 1961 and 1975) urged Afrikaners to unite, since he believed that '...only in the nation as the most total, most inclusive human community can man realise himself fully...to work for the realisation of the national calling is to work for the realisation of God's plan. Service to the nation is therefore part of service to my God' (Diederichs, quoted in Furlong, 1991:92).

Furlong suggests that Diederichs thus broke with the language of Neo-Calvinism, which had been promoted by the Dutch theologian and politician Abraham Kuyper. In contrast to Diederichs, Kuyper had always indicated a clear sense of boundaries among the various spheres of life: family, church and state. In this way, Diederichs' views were a 'distinct part of the world view of the new Germany' (Furlong, 1991:92). Such ideas were readily adopted in the Afrikaner Studentebond, which became increasingly powerful in the Broederbond. These new and refined nationalist ideas were also supported by Piet Meyer (see Chapter Four), whose ideas on Christian Nationalism were, according to Furlong, a 'curious mixture of Nazi ideas, Kuyper's neo-Calvinism and ideas inherited of the old Boer republics' (Furlong, 1991:95). Meyer openly admired the new Fascist European regimes. In a 1937 speech on Italian Fascism, he said:



Dictatorship is actually the real form of democracy.... The freedoms of the individual are not negative, as in liberal democracy, but positive. The *Volk* rules itself through bringing to the fore its own leader and is not ruled by a little minority group (Meyer, quoted in Furlong, 1991:96).

Such statements reveal a significant shift from Kuyper's ideas on the relationship between God, the individual and the state. Kuyper's doctrine taught that only God was the supreme ruler, and that no individual could rightly demand obedience from another. Kuyper, therefore, saw the authority of some people over others as a privilege granted by God in a duty to serve God and fellow human beings. Sin alone necessitated government, according to Kuyper, who believed that by contrast

...doctrines like those of popular sovereignty imply that government is natural and that men have the right to delegate to other men the power to rule over them. This act of delegation gives rulers the right to demand obedience of fellow men. It also forces those who question rulers' authority to obey them. Popular sovereignty thus creates a form of political life (which is) ultimately based upon sheer power ... and is thus unacceptable to the Christian (Kuyper, quoted in Hexham, 1981:114).

Such Kuyperian principles were repudiated when Afrikaner Nationalism used totalitarian ideas to suit an agenda where the *Volk's* interests would override those of the individual. An extreme Nationalist group known as the Greyshirts fiercely propagated such ideas, which expressed the subsidiary role of the individual to the greater good of the People. In their programme, we find – following a first principle which stressed religious freedom – an important aspect of Calvinist society.

We stand for the welfare of each member of the state where the national interests of South Africa are placed before self or party interests. The interests of the state must always precede the individual (from *Die Waarheid*, 23 February 1934, quoted in Furlong, 1991:96).

Research by Simson (1980), Hexham (1981) and Furlong (1991) clearly indicates that these ideas, which elevated the importance of the state, were not marginal but were readily adopted by respected Afrikaner intellectuals and student leaders, and found a receptive audience in the broader Afrikaner community.

The fusion of Kuyperian Christian Nationalism and Nazi-inspired totalitarianism had a significant impact on the way in which the role of the individual within the state was projected. The individual was there to serve the state and to protect the national identity of its people. The interests of the individual self became subsidiary to those of the collective nationalist self.

Nazi ideology rejected ideas of universalism in favour of a 'communalistic stress on *Gemeinschaft*', stressing that which is 'specific in cultures rather than what is all-human' (Gellner, 1994:148). Nazism also accepted the 'closed and hierarchical nature of community in which men found true fulfillment'. Their notion of community was 'seen as biological as well as cultural (or rather, the two were to be linked to each other), and conflict and ruthlessness were the conditions of excellence and perpetuation of the community so conceived' (Gellner, 1994:148). The influence of such ideas in the development of Afrikaner Nationalism can easily be recognised. These ideas were also reflected in Christian National Education ideology, which in turn impacted on the development of fundamental pedagogics.

I have so far traced fundamental pedagogics to Afrikaner Christian Nationalist ideology, which was significantly influenced by Nazism in ways that altered the original Dutch Kuyperian ideas. We can now conclude that both fundamental pedagogics and Langeveld's education theory share some common origin in Kuyper's Christian Nationalism. The template that was first introduced in Chapter Five to explain how Kuyperian social thought can be seen as the foundation of the divergent Dutch and Afrikaner versions of CNE now needs to be extended to include the transfer of Langeveld's education theory to South Africa. The process is summarised in Figure 6.1 below.

The contrast between the role of Langeveld's theory in Holland and the meaning that fundamental pedagogics took on in South Africa will now be further examined through the lens of a comparison of their different interpretations of the concept of self.

Figure 6.1

### Kuyper's Christian Nationalism

#### CNE in Holland

Stresses the individual (parental) right to choose a system of religious and ideological diversity (see Chapter Four)



Transplanted in a Dutch imperialist mode in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century (see Chapter Four)



#### CNE in South Africa

Stresses the parental right to choose schooling for their own language/ethnic group in an anti-British imperial drive (see Chapter Four)



#### War Two

Afrikaner Nationalist identification with Nazi ideology impacts on CNE vision (see Chapter Four, Five and Six)



Transplanted and adapted to provide an academic base for a CNE policy context and becomes fundamental pedagogics (competing with Anglo-American education theory) (see Chapter Five)



Fundamental pedagogics affirms apartheid in a society which is politically dominated by those who have adopted Nazi tenets (post-1948) (see Chapters Two and Five)

#### Nazism and World

Holland occupied by hostile Nazi ideology. Dutch rejection of Nazi ideology



Langeveld introduces his education theory (1946) (challenging Anglo-American education theory)



Langeveld theory affirms diversity in a society that has rejected totalitarianism in favour of social democracy (see Chapter Two)



International dialogue constrained by a controversial and largely ineffective Cultural Accord (see Chapter Five)

## 6.4 Suit Your Self?

Langeveld's idea of self is best demonstrated in his concept 'self-responsible self-determination' (see also 2.7), which he saw as the ultimate goal of education. The proponents of fundamental pedagogics did not use the same terminology to describe what they saw as the ultimate goal of education, but they did use many related terms which also appear in Langeveld's work. Fundamental pedagogics emphasised the importance of 'moral self-determination' (*sedelike selfbepaling*), and related this to their 'pedagogic aim structures' (see 2.4.2) when they insisted that children should learn to (a) be true to their decisions, regardless of the consequences, (b) make independent choices, and (c) take full responsibility for these choices (adapted from Van Rensburg & Landman, 1988:xxix).

In order to compare Langeveld's notion of 'self-responsible self-determination' with 'moral self-determination' in fundamental pedagogics, I need to return to the fusion of Kuyperian Christian Nationalism with ethnic-Nationalism, later reinforced by Nazism. The transformation of Kuyperian ideas significantly impacted on the way that the concept of self was given meaning. The Kuyperian Calvinist self had been an individual self, with only God placed above it (see also Chapter Five). In the Nationalist mobilisation of the Afrikaner *Volk*, the notion of the individual self had shifted in such a way that the assumed collective interests of the *Volk* took precedence over the interests of the individual. The individual's main goal in life would – ostensibly – still be to serve God, but at the same time it was also made abundantly clear that God was best served by promoting the cardinal need of the *Volk* for *self-determination*. This principle became firmly entrenched in the ideology of Christian National Education, and thus signals a shift in the notion of self.

For purpose of clarity, we now return to Figure 6.1, focusing on the left side of the diagram which represents historical developments in Holland. Moving vertically, I imply that there is a connection between Kuyperian thought and Langeveld's education theory. Langeveld's education theory is presented here as an expression of social thought in a political and educational policy context which had already firmly established the right to

political and educational policy context which had already firmly established the right to ideological and religious diversity.

In this context, Langeveld had built on the work of his mentor Prof. P. Kohnstamm. Kohnstamm frequently referred to Kuyper's work as a significant source from which to understand 'modern democracy'. He saw in Kuyper's concept 'sovereignty in own sphere' a pre-eminent expression of modern democracy (Vermeer 1987:41). Kohnstamm presented 'modern democracy' in contrast to 'ancient democracy' such as existed in Athens, Greece. The latter form of democracy he typified as 'quantitative democracy' (Vermeer, 1987:116) which operated on a simplistic notion of half plus one as majority opinion. Vermeer (1987:116) quotes from a 1947 publication (*Tweeërlei democratie*, pp. 52-54) by Kohnstamm:

In (a quantitative form of) democracy, the majority of the people (demos) have the right and the duty to determine the rules by which the community shall be governed ... (this form of democracy)... is rooted in the idea that those who possess power should... determine (the rules). (This notion)... is based on a principle of equality of all who are recognised as part of the people (demos). However... it is easily possible to adapt these (basic) ideas in such a way that not all people shall have a say, but only those who belong to a particular race group or have a particular skin colour.

Kohnstamm justified this last point by referring to the large number of slaves in Athens who did not have the right to participate in the democratic process and were excluded from democratic decision-making.

In opposition to 'quantitative democracy' Kohnstamm presented the concept of 'personalistic democracy':

(In this form of democracy)... decisions are not simply made by half plus one, but flow from a norm of equality of all people, regardless of their differences in terms of intellectual capacity, aesthetic ability, gender, age, race, skin colour, power and wealth .... Equality, because the essential difference between human beings and (animals and things) is found in the human capacity to distinguish between good and evil.... All people possess a will and are able to make choices, but consequentially will also

have to accept responsibility for their choices (Kohnstamm, 1947, quoted in Vermeer, 1987:116).

Kohnstamm's concept of equality as a basis of democracy suggests a Christian root of democracy. This point is also posed by Bijl (1981:369), who worked with Langeveld in the Faculty of Education at the University of Utrecht. Bijl referred particularly to the introduction of new democratic ideas related to what he considered to be the roots of equality in modern democracy; he believed these to be worthy of further research.

In Kuyper's notion of 'sovereignty in own sphere', Kohnstamm saw possibilities for his 'personalistic democracy' because it facilitated the existence of a multitude of spheres (or circles) in which all people could make their own choices, and thus offered a more sophisticated notion of democracy. The different spheres also allowed the family to be the primary site of pedagogy as opposed to the state. Langeveld's rejection of state pedagogy was built on Kohnstamm's belief that state pedagogy could never be more than a 'schematic uniform education' which could never ever replace the family because of its incapacity to recognise each child's potential (Kohnstamm, 1919, cited in Vermeer, 1987:37)

Although Kohnstamm acknowledged the significance of Kuyper's collective work for the development of his own ideas, it is important to note that Kohnstamm rejected Kuyper's 'antithesis theory', which held that 'the contrast between Christian and non-Christian ... (was) ... identical to the contrast (antithesis) between government and opposition in a Parliamentary state' (Kuyper, 1916, quoted in Vermeer, 1987:52). With his antithesis theory, Kuyper implied that political parties should be religiously homogenous.

Kohnstamm rejected this assumption. He argued that the antithesis theory may have been appropriate at the time of the *schoolstryd* (the Dutch CNE struggle, see 4.2), but was no longer appropriate in post-Second World War Holland. The main social issues in Dutch society after the war – and here Kohnstamm mentions, for example, the democratisation of state organs, the position of women, economic empowerment for the working class, the decolonisation of Indonesia – were not served by religious homogeneity of political parties. Kuyper believed that religious differences made political

and economic co-operation impossible (quoted in Vermeer, 1987:81). Kohnstamm's departure from Kuyper's antithesis theory thus served as an important bridge between Kuyper's notion of own spheres and Langeveld's education theory which presented education thought for all spheres. Kuyper's framework required separate pedagogies for separate spheres, so much so that even Catholic and Protestant education systems would need separate pedagogies. Langeveld's major breakthrough was to develop a pedagogy which appealed to all Dutch 'pillars' of education, whatever their religious (or humanist) source (See 2.7 and 5.8.).

Kohnstamm's (and subsequently Langeveld's) rejection of Kuyper's antithesis theory leads us to the recognition of a very significant difference in the assumptions behind Langeveld's Dutch education theory and fundamental pedagogics in South Africa. The antithesis theory of Kuyper implied that religious morality, more specifically Calvinist morality, should inform education theory and the design of a Calvinist education system. The proponents of fundamental pedagogics seem to have ignored, or not to have understood, the importance of the rejection of the antithesis theory by Langeveld in the context of post-war Holland. This point also helps to clarify the divergent uses of the term Christian National Education in Holland on the one hand and South Africa on the other (see also 4.2).

In spite of Langeveld's rejection of the antithesis theory, both Kuyper and Langeveld advocated the individual's right, if not a sacred (Kuyper) or existential (Langeveld) duty, to make moral choices in life. Kuyper and Langeveld both stressed a parental obligation to make such moral choices on behalf of one's children when raising them. Kuyper had also been clear about the fact that these moral choices should be reflected in the school curriculum, as the school was not a site where children were merely exposed to factual knowledge but was also considered an important pedagogical site. Hence Kuyper's struggle for Christian schools. Langeveld reflected the same underlying principle in his distinction between pedagogy (*opvoedkunde*) and schooling (*onderwijs*).

Any comprehensive philosophical analysis of the connection between Kuyperian thought and Langeveld's education theory falls outside of the scope of this study. What is

important here is that in the Dutch context Langeveld's use of the concept of the unique and personal self (see 2.7) was very much in line with the tradition of Kuyper's ideas on the self. The autonomy of the individual self is considered a key concept in modernist pedagogy (Levering, 1991), and Langeveld's pivotal concept of 'self-responsible self determination' thus reflects a modernist approach. Post-modernists, most notably Lyotard, have since presented the era of modernity as a time when scientific knowledge was seen to serve the promises of the Enlightenment: justice, truth and emancipation. These promises have been described as the 'Grand Narratives' of modernity (Lyotard, 1986). Post-modernists' disbelief in these promises have since challenged their value and meaning. In 1946, however, these promises still held great significance for the Dutch following the Second World War; they were optimistically engaged in the process of rebuilding their society. Justice, truth and emancipation must have had great appeal to a nation which had just been liberated from Nazi occupation. Langeveld's theory articulated the possibility of raising self-responsible and self-determining citizens who could participate in a social democracy and contribute to the economic development of the country.

We can now compare Langeveld's modernist idea of self to the notion of self as expressed in 'moral self-determination' (*sedelike selfbepaling*) in fundamental pedagogics. When we turn to the right side of Figure 6.1, we can contrast the above with developments in South Africa. We notice that the South African political context framed the self in different ways. The original Kuyperian ideas were mediated by at least two significant historical developments. The first was the emergence of Afrikaner Nationalism in opposition to British imperialism around the turn of the century, sharply exemplified by the Anglo-Boer wars. The second development was the fusion of their ethnic-nationalism with Nazism in the 1930s and 1940s. Both developments were captured in the historical narratives of this thesis and have been discussed in 6.2.

The question now becomes: How were these developments expressed in fundamental pedagogics? Chapter Two showed that fundamental pedagogics copied almost verbatim what Langeveld had said about making individual moral choices:



Morality as a mode of human existence implies making decisions or choosing. Independence (as being self-dependent), however, implies taking up a stand, and remaining true to one's own choice despite the worst consequence which may occur as a result of such a choice or action. Judged by this criterion, man is therefore adult when he is not only capable of making an independent choice but also upholding and honouring his choice and accepting responsibility, even under adverse circumstances (Griessel & Oberholzer, 1994:67).

The above statement *appears* to confirm Langeveld's idea of the unique and personal self who has to make moral decisions. However, the level of independence in making these moral choices seems highly dubious as the concept of self in fundamental pedagogics was framed in a political context where ethnic-nationalist collective identities were cultivated. In order to demonstrate this point, we can go back to section 2.4.3, where we find numerous examples of the fact that when it came to making moral decisions in life the collective interests of the *Volk* were clearly spelled out. Landman, as a dominant figure in fundamental pedagogics, had no doubts that different ethnic groups had their own collective cultural heritage to turn to when moral decisions had to be made when he outlined:

Just like any other people (*volk*), the Afrikaners can claim their own national character (*volkskarakter*) of which they can rightfully be proud. Some of the essences of the Afrikaner National principles are: religion, fatherland, community, blood-ideology, history and tradition, mother tongue and education policy (Landman, 1979:179).

When it came to religion, an Afrikaner individual did not have to ponder where to turn to, as Landman (1979: 179) proclaimed that 'the Afrikaner is preeminently a Church-being, who accepts the Bible as the infallible and guiding word of God'. Fundamental pedagogics claimed that it endorsed Langeveld's idea of the individual having to make his or her own moral decisions and take full responsibility for the enactment of these decisions. However, these claims become dubious when fundamental pedagogics' proponents combine such claims with proclamations that reveal that collective ethnic groups are predestined to look no further for their own moral basis than the established collective norms and values. This principle can be demonstrated in Roos' (1973:94) declaration that

the Christian-Afrikaner knows that he works best in the place where God meant him to be, and if he works with his own people. (...In such

circumstances...) he can – through a bond of mutual love, care and understanding – achieve voluntary and willing co-operation. Because an Afrikaner realises that he can best serve God and his fellow human beings in his own community, he does not begrudge others their own communities and space, so that all people can live peacefully together in their own ethnic groups or nations.

The same principle was confirmed by Van der Walt (1983:156) who wrote about ‘the dangers lurking in a pluralistic or multiracial society ...(where)... one of the cultural or ethnic groups may feel it is busy losing its identity’. He illustrated his point by suggesting that ‘the Swazi people’, living next door to the ‘culturally powerful Zulu Nation’ ran the risk of ‘having their cultural identity impaired’, unless they took ‘deliberate measures to counteract the Zulu influence’.

The role of education in acquiring the correct norms and values was clearly outlined by Griessel (1983:168) who suggested that in order ‘to arouse the national sentiment in the child, we must make sure that he is familiar with the religion, traditions, customs and history of his people’. In section 2.4.3 we saw that Griessel, even as late as 1994 (the year of the first democratic elections in South Africa), restated this idea but accommodated the anticipated new political dispensation when he wrote with M.O. Oberholzer (1994:75):

To become a South African neither the Afrikaner, English-speaking South African, Jew, Indian nor Black need become something other than what he is, yet they must all give meaning and significance to their national co-existence.

It becomes clear that whilst the self in fundamental pedagogics looks – at first glance – exactly like Langeveld's self and even explicitly claims to refer to an individual self, its contextualisation in Christian National Education policy and apartheid politics effectively made that an impossibility. Instead, fundamental pedagogics implies the existence of an ethnic-nationalist and collective self. This has tremendous consequences for education, as the emphasis shifts from raising an individual and unique child (Langeveld's idea) to raising a child whose identity is pre-fixed in ethnic-nationalist style (as implied in fundamental pedagogics).

Locked into the imagery of a predestined and collective self, the pressures on the individual to conform must have been overwhelming. This point is well illustrated in the fate of prominent Afrikaner individuals such as Bram Fisher and Beyers Naude who – ironically in true Langeveld style – showed their tremendous capacity for ‘self-responsible self-determination’! When they followed their personal and deepest convictions and then fully accepted the consequences of their moral decisions, no one in the field of fundamental pedagogics was there to point out that Fisher and Naude had in fact satisfied all the criteria of adulthood as proclaimed in their own theory!

The dangers of conformism and its implications for education were recognised by Langeveld, who warned against undiscerning collectivism as it would ‘replace the capacity for moral self-determination of the individual person, and as such preclude (authentic) education’ (see also 2.7). In this sense, fundamental pedagogics conveniently missed one of the central features of Langeveld's theory. So whilst they frequently invoked Langeveld as their chief authority, and seem to use his name as a way of legitimising their own theory, they did not seriously consider the implications of the glaring differences between their own work and its Dutch original source.

In conclusion, the political history as presented in this thesis allows us to see fundamental pedagogics as an adaptation, arguably a distortion, of Dutch education theory, mediated largely by politically conservative and racist forces in a convoluted and multi-layered context of international relations between South Africa and Holland. The largely indiscriminate adoption of the rhetoric of Dutch social theory or thought showed a disrespect for the complexity of the relationship between pedagogical theories and their site of production, and left the meaning of fundamental pedagogics in South Africa introspectively unchallenged.

The divergent meanings of Langeveld's education theory, developed in the context of post Second World War Holland on a modernist and social democracy ticket, and fundamental pedagogics in apartheid South Africa on an ethnic-nationalist and racist ticket, clearly expose pedagogy as a political as well as an educational project. The attempt to legitimise fundamental pedagogics by invoking its European (Dutch) roots

failed, because its proponents made no attempt to comparatively analyse and acknowledge that in the transfer of Langeveld's theory to South Africa some of the central claims and assumptions of the original theory were abandoned to accommodate apartheid conditions. This was done in ways that were profoundly irreconcilable with the original theory, which could therefore no longer be legitimated by such invocations.

## 6.5 Implications for Contemporary Debates in (Teacher) Education

*The only thing to be learned from history is that men learn nothing from history.*

*Hegel*

With the humility that the above statement demands, I will consider some of the implications of this research for contemporary debates in South African education, with a particular emphasis on teacher education.

The information booklet *Curriculum 2005*, which was issued by the National Department of Education in February 1997, tells us that education is always the key to change. It continues:

For most South Africans, their values and attitudes were formed in the old, divided South Africa. Education is the key to changing many of the old commonly held values and beliefs (Dept. of Education, 1997:2-3).

The Department also predicts that the central principles of the new education system ('critical thinking, rational thought and deeper understanding') will 'soon begin to break down class, race and gender stereotypes...(and)... soon all South Africans will be active creative critical thinkers, living productive and fulfilling lives' and finally concludes: 'These are the types of citizens who will lead South Africa to great heights'.

The statement reveals a notion of curriculum as 'an agenda for social reconstruction' (Schubert, 1986:32) and makes the implied assumption that schools should provide an

agenda of knowledge and values that guide students to improve society and the cultural institutions, beliefs and activities that support it. The statement also reveals a tremendous optimism in the potential of social engineering and the role of the school in that process. There is no doubt that a similar kind of optimism played a significant role in the adoption of fundamental pedagogics in the context of Christian National Education as the policy vision of the National Party after its election victory in 1948. At the time the need arose to involve teacher education in the implementation of Christian National Education, and fundamental pedagogics was employed as a vehicle in this process. This study gives us an historical example of the co-opting of teacher education as an area of human resource development for a political and ideological agenda.

Similarly, the major contemporary changes in the education system will affect teacher education, as it has to develop new ways of preparing teachers who are willing and able to translate national policy visions into tangible classroom practice. Chapter One established the predominance of fundamental pedagogics in teacher education in the past, particularly in the colleges of education, where it was the only education theory which was made available to student teachers. The new policy documents indicate the need for a radical shift from fundamental pedagogics – termed an ‘inappropriate philosophy of education’ (Hofmeyer & Hall, 1995) – to new philosophies and theories of education which are deemed to be in line with the ‘values, goals and principles of education reconstruction and a democratic society’. The importance of teacher education is emphasised by the National Education Ministry which ‘regards teacher education as one of the central pillars of human resource development strategy’ (Dept. of Education, 1995:29).

Policy developers and teacher educators should recognise the deep, often invisible (or what I have called symbolic) ideological legacies of apartheid education, one expression of this being fundamental pedagogics. Policy often makes gestures recognising ‘the legacy of apartheid’ but simply does not take adequate account of what this means in the way in which teaching and learning have been ideologically infiltrated and sustained. The structural prerogative in current policy might falter because of its non-attendance to the ideological legacy of curriculum policy and practice.

At least one development in teacher education appears to support this claim.<sup>1</sup> In September 1995, the National Committee on Teacher Education Policy produced a document that spelled out new 'Norms and Standards for Teacher Education'. The document, popularly referred to as the COTEP document, was meant to direct colleges of education in their process of transformation. It contained a set of new policy directives which gave a great degree of latitude and flexibility to the colleges in redesigning their curriculum. One proposed field of study was named 'Professional Studies'. The key objective in this area of study was to challenge the compartmentalised way in which knowledge had previously been taught in colleges. As actual curriculum proposals are currently submitted to COTEP for accreditation, it is becoming clear that whilst the new terminology that is internationally associated with Professional Studies is enthusiastically used throughout these submissions, the main assumptions of what knowledge is and how one acquires it are still based on the old logic of fragmented knowledge that can be presented in part-disciplines. These part-disciplines were introduced by fundamental pedagogics, which divided education into sub-disciplines such as psycho-pedagogics, socio-pedagogics, didactics and so on (see 2.3). This example highlights the danger that the adoption of new rhetoric does not automatically imply alternative practice on the basis of a new model of teacher education. There are numerous other examples which could reveal the ideological infiltration of fundamental pedagogics into teacher education.

The COTEP example brings us to another point that has relevance for this study: As South Africa's political and economic isolation has come to an end, we have seen extensive international consultation in education, particularly in the education policy realm. This consultation, predominantly conducted in North America, Europe, Australia and New Zealand, has introduced a plethora of policy frameworks as options for South African education. The importation of foreign policy models has a number of implications for the development of the education sector in South Africa. Three examples are demonstrated here.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Michael Samuel who provided me with this example of 'Professional Studies' in the COTEP document, during an interview at the University of Durban-Westville on 2 December 1997.

As a first example, the COTEP framework bears significant resemblance to its Scottish origins.<sup>2</sup> Further research could examine the contextualised meaning of Professional Studies and its intended conception and treatment of knowledge as a form of cultural production in Scotland. A comparative analysis with the historical treatment of knowledge in South African teacher education in general and fundamental pedagogics in particular would surely foreground significant differences. My research suggests that such comparative differences should be openly acknowledged and accommodated in specific and localised responses.

A second imported shift in the South African Education and Training sector was introduced as the National Qualifications Framework (NQF). Small and Greybe (1997) compare South Africa's NQF with its counterpart in New Zealand and conclude that both countries similarly 'embraced a neoliberal programme of market reforms'. The introduction of the NQF requires, according to the authors:

...not only reorienting economic structures but also redefining ideologies and conceptions of citizenship that underpin them, a process that calls into question existing educational aims (Small & Greybe, 1997:2).

Small and Greybe poignantly named their paper 'Different questions, same answer: a comparison of the New Zealand and South African National Qualifications Frameworks', indicating the comparative similarities and differences in both these national contexts. Significant for this study is the recognition that nobody presented a critique called 'Different questions, same answer: a comparison of Dutch and South African Pedagogy' at the time of the introduction of fundamental pedagogics. A critical (inter)national dialogue on the implications of adopting foreign policy models should go some way towards addressing the often not-so-obvious philosophical, political and economic assumptions which are imported alongside the actual policy framework.

This last point should bear particular significance for a third imported policy development in South Africa, namely the wide-scale adoption of Outcomes-Based

Education (OBE) as the dominant approach in the implementation of Curriculum 2005 in the school system. Jansen (1997:66) states that 'OBE does not have any single historical legacy. Different interpretations trace OBE back to either 'behavioural psychology associated with B.F. Skinner', the 'curriculum objectives of Ralph Tyler', or alternatively it could be traced to 'competency education models associated with vocational education in the United Kingdom'. In South Africa, the 'most immediate origin of OBE is in the competency debates followed in Australia and New Zealand' (Christie, 1995, cited in Jansen, 1997:67). There are numerous complicated aspects to outcomes-based education and its implementation in South Africa which are dealt with elsewhere (Jansen, 1997; de Clercq, 1997; Parker, 1997). What seems indisputable is that OBE means different things to different people in different (historical, political *etc.*) contexts. A particular – and arguably somewhat bizarre – form of support for OBE came from a representative of the South African Democratic Teacher's Union (SADTU), who claimed that OBE already had a long history in South African education. He said that 'in the 1980s ... OBE was known as People's Education for People's Power'.<sup>3</sup> All that was new, so he claimed, was the 'question of terminology'.

OBE as a model seems remarkably accommodating to diverse ideological perspectives, a point which was recently confirmed by one of the United States gurus on OBE, William Spady. At a recent seminar at the University of Durban Westville (UDW), he explained that 'OBE, as a framework is apolitical', and that as a consequence any coveted particularism could be determined in setting the desired educational outcomes.<sup>4</sup>

Such assumptions are not new and have a dangerous precedent in South Africa, as fundamental pedagogics claimed the exact same principle! The dubious nature of such supposed neutrality in fundamental pedagogics was challenged by Morrow (1989:35, see 2.5.4) who questioned the validity of the proposition 'framework by Pretoria, filling by locals'. Morrow (1989:61) correctly claimed that 'fundamental pedagogics, like any

---

<sup>2</sup> point made by Michael Samuel in interview, 2 December 1997

<sup>3</sup> This view was presented by Mfundu Sibiyi, SADTU representative at the National Conference on Outcomes Based Education, held at the University of Durban-Westville (UDW) on 20 March 1997.

<sup>4</sup> Prof. W. Spady in a response to a question during a seminar on OBE held at the University of Durban-Westville on 12 November 1997.



other framework, places restraints on what filling it can accommodate'. The 'local filling' (if this ever existed) to which Morrow referred was in any case by no means a filling that was expected to emerge locally, but was prescribed by Pretoria and was based on racist and stereotypical images of ethnic groups, as captured in an ethnic-nationalist image of self. New education policies should attend explicitly to the conception of self embedded in policy and to what extent this challenges inherited conceptions which bring with them particular notions of authority, achievement, assessment and numerous other notions relevant to changing educational practice in South African schools.

## **6.6 Suggestions for Further Research**

The previous section has already indicated a number of suggestions for further research on the basis of contemporary debates in education (policy) in South Africa. Below I will outline some suggestion which relate more directly to the content of this study:

1. The historical narratives in this thesis particularly explored the conservative forces that shaped historical relationships between the Dutch and the Afrikaners. Further research could start where the second narrative left off, i.e. in 1963. As mentioned in Chapter Five, the early 1960s saw the beginning of a shift in the ideological and political focus as the dominant emphasis in international relations between Holland and South Africa. There were a number of parallel connections that emerged between the two countries which challenged the conservative interests that were served in the execution of the Cultural Accord. These alternative relationships could broaden our understanding of progressive interests in the historical relationship between the two countries.
2. As mentioned in the methodology chapter of this study, the main data sources for the historical narratives were collected in Holland. It would be useful to uncover relevant data sources in South Africa which could complement this study and challenge its particular bias. It would be interesting, for instance, to trace Langeveld's Afrikaner graduates, who came to study at the University of Utrecht

in Holland and subsequently returned to South Africa to work in the field of education. Levering (1991a:156) broadly refers to ‘a considerable number of South African Ph.D. graduates’, but as far as I know there has never been a comprehensive study that traces and analyses the impact of Langeveld on their educational practice in South Africa.

3. This study could also be the basis for further research on the multiple processes by which South African academics reinterpreted Langeveld in the local context. A critical ‘inside’ history of fundamental pedagogics would also expose local contestations and thus challenge the often-implied unity amongst its proponents. My study indicated that there would have been such local contestations, and there are indications that the dominant role of Prof. Landman from the University of Pretoria could well have blocked alternative interpretations and directions in the development of fundamental pedagogics. The fact that both Beyers Nel and C.K. Oberholzer seemed to feel disillusioned about the development of fundamental pedagogics towards the end of their careers may be related to Landman's dominant interpretations. Such research could elucidate the changes in fundamental pedagogics over time, particularly as it sought to adapt to the changing political circumstances in South Africa.
4. Whilst this study focused on the political history of fundamental pedagogics, the comparative analysis of the concept of self in the final chapter of this thesis suggests that there is much scope for a more in-depth philosophical study that compares Langeveld's theory with fundamental pedagogics.
5. This study could also serve as a basis from which to explore the ways in which schools and classrooms engaged fundamental pedagogics – that is, to what extent was the symbolism of fundamental pedagogics actually realised in the teaching and learning, as well as the organisational processes, of educational institutions, including colleges and faculties of education where fundamental pedagogics was taught. Further research could also explore the legacies of the way in which the teacher-child relationship was framed in fundamental

pedagogics. Related to this, a study on the role of authority in teaching could also present some interesting dilemmas still present in the highly authoritative schooling context of South Africa today (Suransky-Dekker, forthcoming).

6. In 1997, following the political changes in South Africa which brought an African National Congress government, Holland and South Africa signed a new Cultural Accord. It would be most interesting to investigate if and how the legacy of the previous Accord (as discussed in this study) has been acknowledged and addressed in the formulation and execution of this new Cultural Accord between the two countries.

## References

### Primary Sources

#### **Archival Material<sup>1</sup>**

(The following collections are housed at the Suid Afrikaans Instituut, Amsterdam)

Collection Nederlands Zuid Afrikaanse Vereniging (NZAV)

Collection Hoofd Comité

Collection Fonds ten Bevordering van het Hollandsch Onderwijs in Zuid Afrika (FHO)

Collection H.J. Emous

Collection NZAV Activiteiten

Collection Comité ten Bevordering van de Culturele Betrekkingen tussen Nederland en Zuid Afrika (CA)

#### **Interviews**

Professor A.J. Beekman: (formerly at the) University of Utrecht

Dr E. van den Bergh: Kairos, Utrecht

Dr S. Ellis: University of Leiden

Professor V. February: University of Leiden

Professor P. Higgs: University of South Africa (UNISA)

Dr H. Hughes: University of Natal-Durban

Dr E. Jansen: University of the Witwatersrand

Ms H. Koopman: Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs

---

<sup>1</sup> Each of these collections contains a large number of individual documents. For details of the specific documents referred to by the researcher, see the footnotes in Chapters 4 and 5.

Mr K Koster: Komitee Zuidelijk Afrika (KZA), Amsterdam

Mr F. Lander: Dutch Ministry of Education

Professor J. Nederveen-Pieterse, Institute for Social Studies, The Hague

Professor B.F. Nel: (formerly at the ) University of Natal-Durban

Professor M.O. Oberholzer: University of South Africa (UNISA)

Mr M Samuel: University of Durban-Westville

Ms A Steeman: (formerly at the) Komitee Zuidelijk Afrika (KZA), Amsterdam

Dr S.B.I. Veltkamp: The South African Institute (Zuid Afrikaanse Instituut), Amsterdam

### **Secondary Sources**

- Altheide, D.L. and Johnson, J.M. 1994. Criteria for Assessing Interpretive Validity in Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Ashley, M. 1989. *Ideologies and Schooling in South Africa*. Rondebosch: S.A.T.A.
- Babbie, E. 1995. *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA.: Wadsworths.
- Barrett, M. 1991. *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Stanford University Press.
- Basson, A.J. 1982. Kommunisme, neo-Marxisme en Liberalisme: Bondgenote in die Aanslag op die Jeug? *Die Unie* 79(4):88-91.
- Beard, P.N.G. 1981. Problems of Existential Phenomenology in Pedagogics. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Beard, P.N.G., Enslin, P.A. and Morrow, W.E. 1981. Pedagogics: Its Influence on Educational Policymaking in South Africa. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Bertyn, L.I. 1983. Little Pedagogics Monsters. *Perspectives of Education* 7(1):1-2.
- Bijl, J. 1981. Over democratie en haar wortels. In *Pedagogisch Tijdschrift* 6(8):368-374.
- Botha, H. 1988. Fundamental Pedagogics. *Education Study Guide 1 for EDU 100-K*. Pretoria: University of South Africa.

- Bunting, B. 1964. *The Rise of the South African Reich*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Chisholm, L. and Randall, P. 1983. Which History of Which Education? A Critique of Metagogics. *Perspectives of Education* 7(2):102-110.
- Christie, P. 1985. *The Right to Learn: The Struggle for Education in South Africa*. Johannesburg: SachedTrust/Ravan Press.
- Coetzee, J.C. 1983. Metagogics: A New Discipline. *Perspectives in Education* 7(3):94-101.
- Cook, T. and Campbell, D.T. 1979. *Quasi-experimentation: Design and Analysis Issues for Field Settings*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Davis, O.L. Jr. 1991. Historical Inquiry: Telling Real Stories. In Short, E.C. (ed), *Forms of Curriculum Inquiry*, New York: State University of New York Press.
- De Clercq, F. 1997. Policy Interventions and Power Shifts: An Evaluation of South Africa's Education Restructuring Policies. *Journal of Education Policy* 12(3):127-146.
- De Graaff, B.J.H. 1993. *De Mythe van de Stamverwantschap: Nederland en de Afrikaners 1902-1930*. Amsterdam: Suid-Afrikaanse Instituut.
- De Vries, C.G. 1977. Die Teoretiese Pedagogiek van M.J. Langeveld. D.Ed. thesis, University of Stellenbosch.
- De Vries, C.G. 1978. *Orientering in de Fundamentele Opvoedkunde*. Stellenbosch: Stellenbosch Universiteits Uitgewers.
- Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. Introduction: Entering the Field of Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Diederichs, N. 1936. *Nasionalisme as Lewensbeskouwing en sy Verhouding tot die Internasionalisme*. Bloemfontein: Nasionale Pers.
- Du Plooy, J.L., Griessel, G.A.J. and Oberholzer, M.O. 1983. *Fundamentele Pedagogiek vir Gevorderde Studente*. Pretoria: HAUM Opvoedkundige Uitgewery.
- Du Toit, A. 1983. No Chosen People: The Myth of the Calvinist Origins of Afrikaner Nationalism and Racial Ideology. *The American Historical Review* 88(4):920-952.
- Du Toit, J.J. 1955. Die CNO styd in Nederland en in Suid-Afrika, Ooreenkoms en Verskil. *Feesbundel vir Prof. B.F. Nel*. Pretoria: Van Schaik.
- Duminy, P.A. 1968. The Components of the Didactic Situation. *Bantu Education Journal* 14:19-23.
- Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 1994. *Het Beleid Ten Aanzien van Zuid Afrika*.

- Elphick, R. and Giliomee, H. (eds). 1989. *The Shaping of South African Society, 1652-1840*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Ely, M., Anzul, M., Friedman, T., Garner, D., McCormack-Steinmetz, A. 1991. *Doing Qualitative Research: Circles within Circles*. London: The Falmer Press.
- Enslin, P. 1988. The State of Pedagogics. *Perspectives in Education* 10(1):67-74.
- Enslin, P. 1990. Science and Doctrine: Theoretical Discourse in South African Teacher Education. In Nkomo, M. (ed), *Pedagogy of Domination: Towards a Democratic Education in South Africa*, Trenton, New Jersey: Africa World Press.
- Enslin, P.A. 1981. The Notions of 'Validity' and 'Truth' in Fundamental Pedagogics. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- February, V. 1991. *The Afrikaners of South Africa*. Monograph from the African Studies Centre. Leiden: Kegan Paul International.
- Feinberg, W. 1983. *Understanding Education: Towards a Reconstruction of Educational Inquiry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge* (trans A.M. Sheridan Smith). London: Travistock.
- Fouché, F. 1982. Pedagogics: A Philosophical Method or a Parasitic Ideology? *South African Journal of Education* 2(4):159-166.
- Furlong, F.J. 1991. *Between Crown and Swastika: The Impact of the Radical Right on the Afrikaner Nationalist Movement in the Fascist Era*. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press.
- Gellner, E. 1994. *Encounters with Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Giroux, H. 1992. *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. London: Routledge.
- Gluckman, H. 1981. The Extent to which Calvinism and Christian National Education have influenced Pedagogical Findings in South Africa. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Gluckman, H. 1983. Metagogics: Its Meaning? *Perspectives in Education* 7(2):111-115.
- Greyling, J.A. 1960. Godsdiensonderrig en die Christelike Karakter van Bantoeskole. *Bantu Education Journal* 6(10).
- Griessel, G.A.J. 1983. Die Skool as Vergestaltung van die Pedagogiese. In du Plooy, J.L., Griessel, G.J. and Oberholzer, M.O. (eds), *Fundamentele Pedagogiek vir Gevorderde Studente*, Pretoria: HAUM.

- Griessel, G.A.J. 1985. *Orientation in Fundamental Pedagogics*. Goodwood: Via Afrika.
- Griessel, G.A.J. and Oberholzer, M.O. 1994. *Philosophy of Education: A Study Manual for Beginners*. Pretoria: Via Afrika.
- Groen van Prinsterer, G. 1860. *The Anti-Revolutionary Principle*. (tr J. Faber, 1956). Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Guba, E.G. and Lincoln, Y.S. 1994. Competing Paradigms in Qualitative Research. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Harlaar, M. 1994. Overschat u vooral de mogelijkheden in Nederland niet. In Van Lakerveld, C. (ed), *Nederland tegen Apartheid*, Amsterdam: Sdu Uitgeverij.
- Hartshorne, K. 1992. *Crisis and Challenge: Black Education 1910-1990*. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Hexham, I. 1981. *The Irony of Apartheid: The Struggle for National Independence of Afrikaner Calvinism against British Imperialism*. New York: Edwin Mellen.
- Hexham, I. 1983. Dutch Calvinism and the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism. *Afriacan Affairs* 82:97-120
- Higgs, P. 1994. Towards a New Theoretical Discourse in South African Education. *Perspectives in Education* 15(2):299-312.
- Higgs, P. 1994. Towards a Paradigm Shift in Fundamental Pedagogics. *South African Journal of Education* 14(1):13-21.
- Hitchcock, G. and Hughes, D. 1995. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. *Research and the Teacher: A Qualitative Introduction to School-based Research*. London: Routledge.
- Hofmeyr, J. and Hall, G. 1995. *The National Teacher Education Audit Synthesis Report*. (Johannesburg: CEPD).
- Holsappel, E. 1994. Herfsttij van een Stamverwante Vriendschap: Het Nederlandse beleid ten aanzien van Zuid Afrika 1945-1960. M.Ed. thesis (unpublished), University of Utrecht.
- Huberman, A.M. and Miles, M.B. 1994. Data Management and Analysis Methods. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Idenburg, P.J. 1960. Reisindrukken uit Durban (Z.A.). *Pedagogische Studien* 37(9):385-402.
- Jansen, E. 1983. Inleiding en verantwoording. In Hoogeveen, J., *Lieve Vrouw en Kinders: Brieven van een Urker Onderwijzer op zoek naar een Nieuwe Toekomst in Zuid-Africa*, Baarn: Bosch & Keuning.



- Jansen, J.D. 1991. Knowledge and Power in the World System: The South African Case. In Jansen, J.D. (ed), *Knowledge and Power in South Africa*, Johannesburg: Skotaville.
- Jansen, J.D. 1997. Why OBE will Fail. In Goolam, F and Khumalo, L (eds), *Perspectives on Outcomes-Based Education*, Proceedings of the National Conference on Outcomes-Based Education, Durban: University of Durban-Westville.
- Kallaway, P. 1983. Meta What? *Perspectives in Education* 7(3):162-165.
- Killian, C.J.G. 1974. Fundamental pedagogics. In Killian, C.J.G. and Viljoen, T.A. (eds), *Fundamental Pedagogics and Fundamental Structures*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Killian, C.J.G. and Viljoen, T.A. 1974. *Fundamental Pedagogics and Fundamental Structures*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Klinkers, A.A. and Levering, B. 1985. Over de Eenheid in het Wetenschappelijk Werk van M.J. Langeveld. *Pedagogische Studieen* 62:449-458.
- Kruger, M.M. 1979a. The Principle of Moulding in Teaching. *Educamus* 25(4):30-31.
- Kruger, M.M. 1979b. The Concept of Science. *Educamus* 25(7):30-32.
- Kruger, T. 1979. Philosophy of Science: A General Orientation. *Educamus* 25:29-30.
- Kuitenbrouwer, M. 1994. Drie Eeuwen Nederlandse Betrokkenheid bij Zuid-Afrika: 1652-1952. In Van Lakerveld, C. (ed), *Nederland Tegen Apartheid*, Amsterdam: Amsterdams Historisch Museum.
- Lammers, J.C. 1985. Kent Gij dat Volk vol Heldenmoed? Nederlandse Onderwijzers en Boeken in Transvaal. M.Ed. thesis (unpublished), Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.
- Landman, W.A. 1972. *Leesboek vir die Christen-opvoeder*. Pretoria: N.G. Kerkboekhandel.
- Landman, W.A. 1979. Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Voorlichtingsprogram. In Landman, W.A., Roos, S.G. and Ments, N.J. (eds), *Fundamentele Pedagogiek: Leerwyses en Vakonderrig*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Landman, W.A. 1983. Die Fenomenologiese Metode. *Journal of Pedagogics* 4(2):44-64.
- Landman, W.A. and Gouws, S.J. 1969. *Inleiding tot die Fundamentele Opvoedkunde*. Johannesburg: Afrikaanse Pers Boekhandel.
- Landman, W.A., Roos, S.G. and Liebenberg, C.R. 1971. *Opvoedkunde en Opvoedingsleer vir Beginners*. Stellenbosch: Universiteitsuitgewery.

- Langeveld, M.J. 1955. Een Belangrijk Werk uit Zuid Afrika. *Pedagogische Studieen* 32:252-256.
- Langeveld, M.J. 1959a. Een Reisbrief uit Zuid Afrika. *Pedagogische Studien* 36(5):246-248.
- Langeveld, M.J. 1959b. Tweede Reisbrief uit Zuid Afrika. *Pedagogische Studien*. 36(3):316-319.
- Langeveld, M.J. 1972. *Capita uit de Algemene Methodologie der Opvoedingswetenschappen*. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Langeveld, M.J. 1979. *Beknopte Theoretische Pedagogiek*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Lawrence, M. 1984. Fundamental Pedagogics: It's not what they say so much but who says what and why. *Perspectives in Education* 8(2):80-93.
- Le Roux, A. 1996. Towards a new Teacher Education Policy: A Critical Analysis of COTEP. Collection Research Seminar Papers 1996. Macro Education Policy Unit, University of Durban-Westville.
- Levering, B. 1991a. De Betekenis van M.J. Langeveld voor de Naoorlogse Nederlandse Pedagogiek (met het accent op de periode 1945-1960). *Pedagogisch Tijdschrift* 16(3):147-160.
- Levering, B. 1991b. Zelfverantwoordelijke Zelfbepaling kan echt niet meer. In Heyting, F., Mulder, E. and Rang, A. (eds), *Individuatie en Socialisatie in Tijden van Modernisering*, Amsterdam: SISWO.
- Lijphart, A. 1977. *Democracy in Plural Societies*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Lubisi, C., Wedekind, V. and Parker, B. 1997. *Understanding Outcomes-Based Education: A Pilot Study of the SAIDE Study of Education Projects*. (Series Editor: John Gultig). Pretoria: SAIDE/Department of Education.
- Luthuli, P.C. 1981. *The Philosophical Foundations of Black Education in South Africa*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Luthuli, P.C. 1982. *An Introduction to Black-Oriented Education in South Africa*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Luthuli, P.C. 1985. *What Ought to be in Black Education*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Lyotard, J.F. 1979. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (trans G. Bennington and B. Massumi). Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- MacLeod, C. 1995. Transforming Pedagogy in South Africa: The Insertion of the Teacher as Subject. *Perspectives in Education* 16(1):63-82.

- Malherbe, E.G. 1977. *Education in South Africa. Volume II: 1923-1975*. Wynberg: Juta.
- Margetson, D.B. 1981. Pedagogics in South Africa: The Mystification of Education? In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- May, T. 1993. *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*. London: Open University Press.
- Meyer, P.J. 1942. *Die Toekomstige Ordening van die Volksbeweging in Suid Afrika*. Stellenbosch: ANSB.
- Moodie, T.D. 1975. *The Rise of Afrikanerdom: Power, Apartheid and the Afrikaner Civil Religion*. Berkely & Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Morrow, W.E. 1981. Margetson on Pedagogics. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Morrow, W.E. 1982. The Voice of the People? *Perspectives in Education* 6(2):81-107.
- Morrow, W.E. 1989. *Chains of Thought: Philosophical Essays in South African Education*. Johannesburg: Southern.
- Nel, B.F. 1983. Education: A Social Science. Inaugural Address, University of Durban-Westville, 17 June 1983.
- Nel, B.F. and Nel, B.F. 1975. Aktuele Denkrigtings in die Wysbegeerte en in die Pedagogiek. Opvoedingswetenskap as Sosiale Wetenskap. *Fokus* 11(March).
- Nicholls, G. 1990. Particular Perspectives on Fundamental Pedagogics. *University of Durban-Westville Bulletin for Academic Staff* 11(1):24-42.
- Oberholzer, C.K. 1954. *Inleiding in die Prinsipiele Opvoedkunde*. Pretoria-Brugge: J.J. Moreau.
- Oberholzer, C.K. 1968. *Prolegomeno van 'n Prinsipiele Pedagogiek*. Cape Town: HAUM.
- Oberholzer, M.O. 1983. Die Pedagogiese Verhouding. In du Plooy, J.L., Griesel, G.J. and Oberholzer, M.O. (eds), *Fundamentele Pedagogiek vir Gevorderde Studente*, Pretoria: HAUM.
- Olivier, F.B. 1964. Ons taak as Opvoeders. *Bantu Education Journal*. 10(4):190-193.
- O'Meara, D. 1983. *Volkskapitalisme: Class, Capital and Ideology in the Development of Afrikaner Nationalism 1934-1948*. African Studies Series 34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O'Meara, D. 1996. *The Apartheid State and the Politics of the National Party, 1948-1994*. Johannesburg: Ravan.

- Pampallis, J. 1991. *Foundations of the New South Africa*. Cape Town: Maskew Miller Longman.
- Parker, B. 1981. Freedom and Authority in Fundamental Pedagogics. In Beard, P.N.G. and Morrow, W.E. (eds), *Problems of Pedagogics: Pedagogics and the Study of Education in South Africa*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Parker, B. 1997. Understanding the Philosophical Foundations of OBE. In Goolam, F and Khumalo, L (eds), *Perspectives on Outcomes-Based Education*, Proceedings of the National Conference on Outcomes-Based Education, Durban: University of Durban-Westville.
- Polkinghorne, D.W. 1995. Narrative Configuration in Qualitative Analysis. In Hatch, J.A. and Wisniewski, R. (eds), *Life History and Narrative*, Qualitative Studies Series 1, London: The Falmer Press.
- Prins, F.W. 1959. Een Nationale Vereniging voor Pedagogiek in Zuid Afrika. *Pedagogische Studien* 36(1):41-42.
- Prins, F.W. 1960. Mededelingen over het Onderwijs aan de Bantoes in Zuid-Afrika. *Pedagogische Studien* 37(3):136-137.
- Rajah, D.S. 1992. Curriculum Theory and Teacher Education. M.Ed. thesis, University of Durban-Westville.
- Reagan, T. 1990. Philosophy of Education in the Service of Apartheid: The Role of Fundamental Pedagogics in South African Education. *Educational Foundations* 4(2):59-71.
- Robson, C. 1994. Analysing Documents and Records. In Bennett, N., Glatter, R. and Levaciç, R. (eds), *Improving Educational Management through Research and Consultancy*, London: Open University Press.
- Röling, H.Q. 1982. Onderwijs in Nederland. In Kruithof, B., Noordman, J. and De Rooy, P. (eds), *Geschiedenis van Opvoeding en Onderwijs: Inleiding Bronnen Onderzoek*. Nijmegen: SUN.
- Roos, S.G. 1973. Die Verhouding: Wysgerige Antropologie: Fundamentele Pedagogiek/ Pedagogie. In Landman, W.A. and Roos, S.G., *Fundamentele Pedagogiek en die Opvoedingswerklikheid*, Durban: Butterworths.
- Roos, S.G. 1980. Die Ontplooiing van die Pedagogiekdenke in die Verskillende Diieldisiplines van die Faculteit Opvoedkunde oor die Afgelope Vyftig Jaar: Fundamentele Pedagogiek. *Journal of Pedagogics* 1(2):101-121.
- Rozenburg, R. 1986. *De Bloedband den Haag-Pretoria: Het Nederlandse Zuid Afrikabeleid sinds 1945*. Amsterdam: KZA.
- Salmon, C.M.R. and Woods, C.A. 1991. *Colleges of Education: Challenging the Cliché*. Durban: Education Research Unit, University of Natal.

- Schoeman, P.G. 1975. *Grondtrekke van de Fenomenologiese Pedagogiek in Suid Afrika*. Bloemfontein: Sacum.
- Schubert, W.H. 1986. *Curriculum: Perspective, Paradigm and Possibility*. New York: Macmillan.
- Schutte, G.J. 1987. The Netherlands, Cradle of Apartheid? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 10(4):392-414.
- Segal, S. 1993. The Arbitrariness of Fundamental Pedagogics. *Perspectives in Education* 14(2):181-190.
- Simson, H. 1980. *The Social Origins of Afrikaner Fascism and its Apartheid Policy*. Uppsala Studies in Economic History (21). Uppsala, Sweden: Uppsala University Press.
- Small, D. and Greybe, S. 1997. Different Questions, Same Answer: A Comparison of the New Zealand and South African National Qualifications Frameworks. Paper presented at the 1997 Oxford Conference on Education and Geopolitical Change.
- Smooha, S. and Hanf, T. 1992. The Diverse Modes of Conflict-Regulation in Deeply Divided Society. In Smith, A.D. (ed), *Ethnicity and Nationalism*, Leiden: Brill
- Stellwag, H.W.F. 1973. *Gezag en 'Autoriteit'*. Groningen: Tjeenk Willink.
- Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. 1994. Grounded Theory Methodology. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Suransky-Dekker, A.C. 1998 (forthcoming). Portraits of Black Schooling in South Africa. *The International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*.
- Tuchman, G. 1994. Historical Social Science: Methodologies, Methods and Meanings. In Denzin, N.K. and Lincoln, Y.S. (eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Turkstra, J. 1978. Een onderzoek naar de invloed van Waterink en Langeveld op het pedagogiek-denken in Zuid Afrika. D.Ed. thesis, University of South Africa.
- Van den Bergh, E. 1994. De Heere ziet op zulke Dingen: Nederlandse Kerken en Zuid Afrika. In Van Lakerveld, C. (ed), *Nederland Tegen Apartheid*, Amsterdam: SDU.
- Van der Walt, J.L. 1983. Christian National Education is Misunderstood. Why? *Journal of Pedagogics* 4(1):155-168.
- Van der Watt, S.E. 1992. Die Opsegging van die Kultuur Verdrag Nederland/Suid Afrika: 'n Kritiese Ontleding. Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of the Orange Free State, Bloemfontein.

- Van Koppen, C.A.J. 1992. *De Geuzen van de Negentiende Eeuw: Abraham Kuyper en Zuid Afrika*. Wormer: Inmerc.
- Van Rensburg, C.J.J. and Landman, W.W. 1988. *Fundamenteel-Pedagogiese Begripsverklaringe: Notes on Fundamental Pedagogic Concepts*. Pretoria: NG Kerkboekhandel.
- Vermeer, A.L.R. 1987. *Phillipp A. Kohnstamm over Democratie*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Utrecht. Kampen: J.H. Kok.
- Viljoen, T.A. 1978. *In Search of an Anthropological Basis for University Curriculum*. Pretoria.
- Viljoen, T.A. and Pienaar, J.J. 1971. *Fundamental Pedagogics*. Durban: Butterworths.
- Viljoen, T.A. and Pienaar, J.J. 1971. *Introduction to Fundamental Pedagogics*. Pretoria: HAUM.
- Weijers, I. 1994. Mondige Burgers, Een Cultuurhistorische Plaatsbepaling van de Pedagogiek van M.J. Langeveld. *Pedagogisch Tijdschrift* 3:189-206.
- Wilkins, I. and Strydom, H. 1979. *The Broederbond*. New York: Paddington.
- Wolff, R.P. 1991. Review: Chains of Thought: Philosophical Essays in South African Education. *Perspectives in Education* 12(2):89-93.
- Yonge, G.D. 1990. Fundamental Pedagogics is a Philosophy of Education in the Service of the Foundations of Education: A Response to T. Reagan. *The South African Journal of Education* 10(5/6):530-535.
- Yonge, G.D. 1991. Fundamental Pedagogics: A Philosophy OF or FOR Education? *Educational Foundations* 5(4):87-99.