EDUCATING THE NEW NATIONAL CITIZEN:
EDUCATION, POLITICAL SUBJECTIVITY, AND DIVIDED SOCIETIES

Lynn A. Staeheli
School of GeoSciences
Institute of Geography
University of Edinburgh
Drummond Street
Edinburgh EH8 9XP
Scotland
Lynn.staeheli@ed.ac.uk

and

Daniel Hammett
School of Geography, Archaeology and Environmental Studies
University of Witwatersrand
Johannesburg 2050
South Africa

EDUCATING THE NEW NATIONAL CITIZEN:
EDUCATION, POLITICAL SUBJECTIVITY, AND DIVIDED SOCIETIES

ABSTRACT: *This paper explores the ways in which citizenship education is used in an effort to create particular kinds of citizens as part of a larger effort at nation- and polity-building. The paper addresses the purpose of citizenship education and its role in creating political subjectivities for citizens. We argue that policies and programmes often attempt to heal social divisions by fostering a common linkage between citizens and nation, but in ways that may be ineffective, and in some cases, deeply problematic. This argument is developed through a consideration of the ways in which different agents involved in citizenship education use their own experiences to develop and interpret citizenship education programmes. Through this, both the meaning and teaching of citizenship may be reworked. This conceptual argument is supplemented through a consideration of citizenship education programmes in South Africa.*

In 2007, an adaptation of the play *Class Enemy* premiered in Sarajevo. The original, 1978 version of the play by Nigel Williams is set in a classroom in Brixton, an area of London that had a large Afro-Caribbean population. In the play, the teachers fail to appear one day, and while waiting, the students gradually organise themselves and create a classroom that reflects their experiences of the dysfunctional society that has cast them off. They barricade themselves into their room, and teach "lessons" of brutality and tragedy. The adaptation in Sarajevo focuses on the violence that permeates the city and schools, and on attitudes shaped by ethnic cleansing, war, and massacre. In preparation, actors and the director spent time in Bosnian schools, picking up stories and language to insert into the adaptation. The result is a reflection of the horror that has infused Bosnian life and culture and of the experiences of young people who do not recall life before the war. An article about the play in *The Guardian* quotes a man from Tuzla who was ten years old when the war began:

> "Lots of families have someone whose bones were never found. I went to a psychologist to ask what I could do about my anxiety attacks – I see pictures in my head of the war, the bloody bodies. She said I would just have to live with it." He brought his mother, a secondary school teacher, to see the play. "My ma was shocked by the rudeness of it and said she couldn't feel her legs after. But what most shocked her was how close to her experience of the classroom it was." (Connolly, 2008, p. 27)

This example illustrates what is at stake in citizenship education in the context of divided societies. What seems to be rather straightforward – teaching basics of civics, democracy, and the values and behaviours associated with citizenship – inevitably has to confront the histories that children, parents, and teachers have lived. Many traditions of

democracy implicitly assume that democracy and citizenship are built around core elements or core principles that are unchanging from place to place, from context to context. But how would students in Brixton, the original setting of the play, interpret and make sense of lessons about equality, confronting as they do racism and material *in*equality? How would students in Sarajevo make sense of lessons about respect and deliberation after living through a brutal war and the on-going difficulties of forging a sense of mutuality and community?

Our focus in this paper is on divided societies and the ways in which citizenship education is used – and perhaps manipulated – in an effort to create particular kinds of citizens that suit the national stories and imaginations that governments and other agents hope to foster. In this way, citizenship education should be seen as a tool in nation- and polity-building; it is one component of a suite of practices associated with social reproduction and citizenship formation (Marston and Mitchell, 2004). The paper begins with a discussion of the purpose of citizenship education and its role in creating political subjectivities for citizens. We then address the relationships between citizens and states as they are often conceptualised in and mobilised by citizenship education theory and programmes. Policies and programmes often use citizenship education in an attempt to heal social divisions by fostering a common linkage between citizens and nation, or in Rogers Smith's (2003) terms, to tell "stories of peoplehood." These stories, however, may be deeply problematic in divided societies. We explore this possibility through a consideration of the ways in which different people involved in citizenship education – policy makers, non-governmental organisations, communities and young people – use their own experiences as citizens and as members of society to interpret and shape citizenship education programmes. Through this, we argue that while education may be intended as a means of moulding national citizens, individual citizens and communities will bring their own capacities, experiences, and subjectivities to the education process,

and in so doing, may contest or rework both the teaching of citizenship education and the ways in which it is received. Our argument is primarily conceptual, but we also draw on preliminary research on citizenship education programmes in South Africa. By way of conclusion, the paper addresses a set of issues that pose challenges for citizenship education in divided societies.

Why Citizenship Education?

Citizenship education is delivered in a variety of ways. In some countries, it is an explicit part of the curriculum and there is a subject or content area with that label. In other countries, there might not be a specific content area, but policies direct schools to teach certain principles. In still other circumstances, educational practices are justified in terms of the things citizens (including youth and adults) should know; in these circumstances, it is sometimes easier to think about education *for* citizenship, rather than to conceptualise citizenship education as being about government and politics. Two characteristics unite these diverse practices. The first is the central role that education broadly understood is held to play in the construction of citizenship and of a citizenry. The second is the ways that citizenship education provides an insight into the negotiations between abstract theories and ideals about democracy and the nitty-gritty of fostering citizenship in real places, with real histories of division, and real problems.

This section of the paper explores these issues through a discussion of the role of citizenship education programmes in creating political subjects with the skills and the sense of solidarity required to form an effective citizenry at a given moment. As the latter implies, citizenship education must be understood as reflecting particular temporal and national contexts. Yet citizenship education is not something that is simply "delivered" or taught to abstract (and perhaps passive) students. It is actively reworked and sometimes challenged as teachers, parents, communities, and students match what is

supposed to be taught against their lives and experiences, including social inequality, division and conflict. In the acts of receiving and contesting what is taught, the implications, or the meanings, of citizenship education can diverge from what states and others might have intended, and the kind of citizenry that emerges may be contrary to what was envisioned.

Education, Nation-Building and Citizenship Formation

The importance of education in fostering a democratic citizenry is hard to overstate. If, as many would argue, the goals of democracy are self-development, well being, and the good life (Young, 2000; Gould, 2004), then education is critical (see Dewey, 1916; Gutmann, 1987; Osler and Starkey, 2005; Bridgehouse, 2006; Crick, 2008). Yet states have more than a normative interest in an individual citizen's well being; they also seek to shape and maintain a political community capable of being governed. In divided societies, this may involve creating a national story of peoplehood that minimizes, or even overlooks, division and conflict in order to promote a form of association in which the claims of "the people" or nation take primacy over the claims of groups or over histories that might divide the people (Smith, 2003). While such stories may be a powerful tool in providing a new basis for thinking about political membership that is not based on domination and oppression, Goldberg (2008) argues there is a tendency to leave residues of oppression unexamined, and thereby to bury division and conflict, rather than address them directly[1]. Burying conflict, however, does not eliminate ongoing problems; it only makes the political grounds for addressing them more difficult to identify, as the politics of memory erase the memory of politics (Edkins, 2003; Oglesby, 2007) As such, lofty goals of creating political subjectivities as citizens are, in

---

[1] This is an explicit element of some subject-specific teaching guides in post-conflict Bosnia, for example. See Stradling, 2003.

practice, combined with efforts to resolve problems from across the society; actual programmes reflect negotiations between conflicting claims and are often internally inconsistent as a result. In short, the relationships between economic, political and social contexts influence the meaning of and potential for citizenship and the kinds of polities that educational systems are intended to shape (Mitchell, 2003).

We can see this argument in the development of American and South African citizenships at different historical moments. American education was from the very beginning part of a project that linked citizenship formation and the development of the polity to individual self-development and nation building (although those terms would not have been used). The goal was to ensure that a new kind of political subject capable of functioning as a democratic citizen would be formed through an educational system open to all (or at least all white males). The most important skills for these subjects did not involve political and moral philosophy, however, so much as they involved animal husbandry, the ability to do sums, and other skills that would enable Americans to function as autonomous subjects (Shklar 1996). Moral values were not completely ignored, of course, as moral and character education have been linked to citizenship in one way or another since Confucius and Aristotle. The intent of the system of public education was to create a citizenry with the requisite skills to behave according to a particular vision of democracy and a shared public morality (Dewey 1916; on the importance of a shared morality, see also Callan, 1997; Althof and Berkowitz, 2006; Bull, 2006).

Over time, and as the US began to be populated with people from a wider range of backgrounds, and as former slaves, Native Americans and women gained more of the rights of formal citizenship, new "political" skills were required for a diverse and divided citizenry, including those related to how one lives *as* an American citizen. The educational programmes of the Americanisation movement, for instance, included

classes in hygiene, cooking, child-rearing, and so forth, with the argument that fitting into – assimilating into – the American community was a component of citizenship (Hoy, 1995; Spain, 2001). While some of these programmes were comparatively benign, there was an element of coercion in many.

Yet for all of this, there have always been tensions in American education policy as a tool for overcoming difference and creating social solidarity. When the Americanisation movement was taking hold early in the 20th century, there were also advocates for cultural pluralism and a certain kind of cosmopolitanism in education. A notable – and very contemporary sounding – intervention came in Randal Bourne's 1916 article "Transnational America." Shunning what he called the "romantic gilding of the past" (p. 97), he argued that recognising the ideas and voices of new immigrants was not a threat to America, but rather an opportunity to explore what Americanism means and to build a stronger, more democratic America. Three decades later, and ignoring the internment of Japanese citizens, the country experienced a resurgent American nationalism in which the greatness of the country was argued to rest on its foundation on universal principles of democracy that were somehow uniquely American (Adamic, 1945). Impulses toward both pluralism and nationalism rested easily amongst many. For example, in an early call for cosmopolitanism, Bourne ended his 1916 article with the claim that "Only America, by reason of the unique liberty of opportunity and traditional isolation for which she seems to stand, can lead this cosmopolitan enterprise" (p. 96). What may seem to be contradictions were nevertheless accepted as unremarkable in the formation of an American citizenship that met the changing needs of a nation.

Just as the vision of American citizenship has changed through history, so too have official conceptions of South African citizenship. The ideals of citizenship during the colonial and apartheid periods were broadly premised upon the development of white citizens and black subjects; these imperatives were evident in colonial government

education projects, which sought to balance the need to 'civilise' the 'non-white' populations with the necessity to maintain a separate and superior 'white' identity and privilege (Keto, 1990). Subsequent development of Mission-based education in the 18th century emphasised conversion and the moral development of black populations, which meant the mission schools were often at odds with government policy. The colonial and religious authorities were caught in a contradiction, as they promoted citizenship and civilisation while also entrenching subjecthood and subjugation in a racially hierarchical society (Cross and Chisholm, 1990; Comaroff, 2001).

Legislation in the 19th and early 20th centuries introduced *de jure* racial segregation in schooling, separate curricula and differential educational expenditure. The rationale for these developments was that education should be "for one's position in society", which positioned whites as citizens and blacks as un-/semi-skilled subjects (Verwoerd, 1954). Policies in the 1950s and 1960s provided for racially-differentiated education that reproduced class and racialised positions; a liberal education that promoted national belonging was provided to white students, while 'non-white' education emphasised vocational skills (Chisholm, 1987). Attempts to paper over these contradictions through the introduction of Afrikaans as the compulsory medium of instruction in 1976 were met with riots in black schools, whose learners and teachers resented the imposition of the 'language of the oppressor' upon them.

Education policy anticipated the ending of apartheid, with shifts towards a democratic, non-racist, non-sexist, equitable education being made from 1990 onwards. The democratic transition extended the status of a new citizenship to all South Africans, with attendant imperatives to develop the skills of citizenship, both amongst populations previously denied citizenship *and* those whose understandings of citizenship did not match the demands of the transformed nation. Education policy provided the 'pedagogical blueprint,' and was grounded in the Constitutional values of social justice,

equality, egalitarianism and respect for human rights (Soudien, 2007). While education policy documents contained gestures toward different theorisations of citizenship (Swartz, 2006), they generally reflected broader nation-building imperatives that expanded citizenship to all South Africans and attempted to build a coherent nation from a divided society (Asmal, 2003).

Contexts of Citizenship Formation

As the above examples demonstrate, citizenship is not some enduring category or status constructed to reflect universal ideals. Rather, citizenship is formed in relation to political, economic, and social processes that operate within particular geographical and temporal contexts. Marston and Mitchell (2004) argue, therefore, that we should conceptualise citizenship through the processes by which it is formed and given meaning, and not simply focus on the ways it is reified through law or theory. From this perspective, procedural and substantive aspects of citizenship become meaningful in light of the contexts and processes through which they are animated.

Returning to the example of American citizenship formation, we can reinterpret the potted history just provided in terms of the specific challenges to and competing visions of citizenship that the country seemed to face and the state's response to them. Whereas initially, providing productive skills and a common set of values that would constitute an American identity may have seemed the primary need, political and economic leaders later came to fear the break down of social solidarity caused by massive immigration and urbanisation; the primary task changed to one of making people learn and conform to the day-to-day practices of being an American. Contemporary debates over immigration and the promotion of an ethos related to work and self-sufficiency in constructing a citizenry need to be similarly contextualised in terms of concerns over shared values and the ability of citizens to rise to contemporary economic and

geopolitical challenges (see Sandel 1996, Rose 1999). Similarly, the educational system in South Africa both reflected and reinforced ideas about how the nation was constituted and the role of racialised populations within it. Yet the history is different to (and more recent than) that of the United States[2]. For a considerable period in South Africa, national solidarity was defined in racially exclusionary terms, and a complex legal and education system was designed to sustain it. As the legal and political systems have changed in the post-apartheid period, the legacy of racial oppression continues and is manifest in the extreme poverty and inequality of the country. Contemporary education policy confronts the obvious divisions in the country, while still narrating a national story of peoplehood based on respect, international norms of human rights, and equality (Enslin, 2003).

Lest this argument seem too functionalist (i.e., the "optimal" form of citizenship at any time or any place is directly related to the needs of the state and economy), it is important to remember that citizenship formation is itself an outcome and a reflection over struggles regarding the very meaning of citizenship and what a "good" citizen would be. Furthermore, processes of citizenship formation reflect gaps between philosophical arguments and the requisites of governance at particular moments, in particular contexts, and in support of particular goals. Thus while they perhaps rely on moral and political philosophy as guides in imagining citizenship, various institutions and agents associated with governing and ruling (whether in the state, economy, or civil society) may have their own interests in governing in particular ways and in furtherance of particular ends. These interests are as likely to be implicated in ideas about citizenship and education as are the more abstract goals and ideals articulated through theory and philosophy; this is what Ranciere (2006) talks about as the School and its use by elites in closing down impulses and mobilisations that might otherwise challenge the structures and relations of

---

[2] The US has its own history of racialised oppression, of course.

power. In the gap between philosophy and practice, therefore, we find agonism and politics.

Subjects of Citizenship Formation

The discussion to this point has raised the possibility that institutions and powerful agents might have different ideas, politics, and strategies regarding citizenship, and also different resources to effect citizenship formation. But the powerful and the institutional are not the only political agents who intervene in struggles over education and citizenship formation. Perhaps because education is such a fundamental element of social reproduction, a wide variety of agents are involved with and affected by educational practices. In the US and UK, debates over education policies and outcomes are only partly about test scores and league tables; they are also about structural inequalities, about the role of institutional and cultural racism and how (or whether) they should be overcome, about the role of state in mitigating inequality and racism, and over the kind of knowledges that should be valued and taught. In countries such as France, the UK and US, they are also debates over the roles of different rationalities in the production of knowledge and about the role of faith and religion in public life.   In these debates, parents, teachers, students, and communities often play as influential a role as do government officials, corporate leaders, and the educational bureaucracy. These swirling debates and the processes of citizenship formation are complex, because individuals are shaped not just by what is taught in the classroom, but also by what they learn as they move through the world. Students are not just taught by teachers, but are also taught by peers, parents, communities, and the world around them. As such, and as seen in *Class Enemy,* philosophical debates, policy initiatives, and the best intentions of teachers can all be turned upside down in the face of broad social and political currents.   And while

educational systems may be tools to regulate and discipline future citizens, it is not a process that is uncontested and in which the outcome is foreordained.

Conceptualising Citizenship Education in Divided Societies

The processes by which citizenship education is formulated and that shape its reception are complex and contested. Given education's role in shaping social solidarity, national imaginations, and political subjectivities, nothing less should be expected. It is telling that concerns about citizenship and the roles of educational systems in promoting it often surface at moments when solidarity and the need to reinforce national norms and stories are in doubt. In Britain, for example, the emphasis on "Britishness" and the development of a new citizenship test occurred in the context of what seemed to be a fragmenting society that had lost its sense of itself, as witnessed in racial conflicts in the early 2000s, fears of social breakdown as a result of new immigration, and the perceived rise of extremism on the part of nationalist parties and Islamists. In light of what were interpreted as "new" divisions, British values and citizenship had to be inculcated in a new generation of citizens (see Pykett 2007). In other countries, divisions may be firmly entrenched in societies through law and custom or may have been the source of conflict and war. In those cases, creating an identity as a national citizen may be a fraught process. Models of how to create national citizens abound, filling the pages of education journals. They are also evident in documents and programmatic statements issued by politicians and policymakers. In this section of the paper, we explore one model developed by two influential theorists and practitioners of citizenship education. We selected this model – which is one of several that might have been selected – due to the prominence of the authors and because it so clearly collects or assembles ideas from many different theoretical arguments about citizenship. As such, the model provides a

clear linkage between theories of citizenship, a recognition of political and social imperatives, and guidance for educational practise.

In *Changing Citizenship*, Audrey Osler and Hugh Starkey (2005) propose a model that describes the interrelationships between elements of citizenship. They argue that citizenship can be understood as involving three elements or dimensions: status, feeling, and practice (see Figure 1). Citizenship as status is rooted in constitutions and jurisprudence and involves the legal conditions of citizenship, including who can be a citizen and the rights and responsibilities they carry. Citizenship as a *feeling* reflects the importance of an affective sense of belonging to a political community and the sense of solidarity that comes from citizenship (or what is often discussed in developmental discourses as the bonds of social capital (e.g., Muck, 2004)). The *practice* of citizenship draws on the awareness that people have of their relationships with other citizens, which draws them into collective activities. These three elements of citizenship are presented as mutually reinforcing. A legal standing enhances of feeling of belonging, but also provides the basis for claims against exclusion. A feeling of belonging makes people more likely to participate in civic affairs as active citizens, while participation tends to reinforce the feeling of belonging. And holding a legal status often subtly compels people to behave in certain ways *as citizens*. As the above implies, this model of citizenship draws from a wide range of literatures, encompassing debates over liberal and republican theories, procedural and substantive citizenship, and the importance of individuals with respect to the communities and nations in which they are situated. Perhaps most importantly, it provides a guide for teaching about citizenship and is suggestive of different strategies for developing subjectivities as citizens and thereby overcoming division.

----- Figure 1 about here -----

Significantly, each of the elements can be "located" in the sites and institutions with which the elements of citizenship are most closely attached, suggesting both a set of issues to be taught and a set of strategies for adapting to particular stresses and changes[3]. As such, these are sites in which debate and conflict might emerge over the ways citizenship should be formed through education; they are also sites in which one could anticipate that different experiences would affect the ways education programmes are received and interpreted. One could imagine, for instance, that legal status would be associated with the state, indicating the need to teach about government and how to interact with the government as a citizen. Feeling is often discussed in the academic literature and in policy with respect to the political community and/or nation; it could therefore be assumed that enhancing feeling would be accomplished through the teaching of history, and in some cases, reconciliation. Finally, practice is often associated with localities, as the teaching of active citizenship encourages participation in community life, voluntarism, and so forth. Yet such associations could be difficult in the context of deep divisions within a society and could reinforce the tendency to promote national identities and conceptualisations of citizenship that might be counterproductive in a globalising world. Many educators and philosophers of education worry that promotion of national identities and citizenships will hinder the development of a global consciousness or will denigrate the multiple identities and feelings of membership that youth may hold. In response, philosophers such as Osler and Starkey advocate efforts to foster cosmopolitanism as a way of healing rifts or divisions between citizens within a country and to create citizens who will recognise the humanity of all people, regardless of their nationality or background. In this view, cosmopolitanism is a sensibility that links he elements of citizenship such that individuals can imagine themselves as citizens at local, national and global levels. As such, cosmopolitanism can help students process

---

[3] It should be noted that this is not something Osler and Starkey do, however.

their identities and experiences in ways that do not dwell on differences, but rather highlight their connections to other students, to people who might have different racial backgrounds or religious beliefs, and to see them as humans with shared aspirations (see also Gutmann, 1987; Turner, 2002; Bridgehouse, 2006; Benhabib, 2007; Kiwan, 2008). These connections should provide a way to work together in a "learning society" (Jarvis, 2000) and perhaps a global citizenship (Roman, 2003). Significantly, these practices may lead to selective decisions as to what should be taught (Strandling, 2003), which may ultimately constrain the ability to change social foundations (Goldberg, 2008). In the near term, however, cosmopolitanism offers a way to promote the *practice* of citizenship in localities, but while also emphasising the global level in teaching about *status* (e.g., by talking about human rights) and *feeling*.

This is, in many ways, an optimistic account of citizenship and how it can be fostered, and it carries an assumption that the state, or perhaps international organisations, can effect meaningful – and perhaps uncontested – change in national stories. The promotion of cosmopolitanism, however, would seem to be at odds with another state goal for citizenship education: to instil a national story and identity. History, for example, is commonly included as one of the subject areas comprising citizenship education, because it is a way to highlight the shared history that shapes the political subjectivity of citizens. From a practical perspective, it is not clear why governments would want to promote a post-national or non-national form of citizenship associated with cosmopolitanism where allegiance to the state is downplayed[4]. In unravelling this puzzle, it is worth remembering that governments are fragmented, rarely consistent, and have multiple goals that *are* contradictory. These contradictions may be seen in the variety of ways that citizenship is promoted in educational systems; there

---

[4] It should be noted that Osler and Starkey state that there is no necessary contradiction between fostering a sense of cosmopolitanism and national citizenship.

should be no expectation of coherence in either governments' goals or in the ways that citizenship education is implemented or received. The broader point, however, is that there is a *politics* that surrounds decisions about citizenship education, curriculum, and practice. Rather than attempting to construct a coherent, seamless narrative about citizenship education, then, it is instructive to examine the policies and practices in the classroom to identify its multiple, and sometimes contradictory goals. Furthermore, it is important to examine citizenship education as it is implemented, not just conceptualised, and as it is received and internalised. Policy statements and curricula, in this perspective, may be important, but do not comprise the totality – or even the most important parts – of education (Bridgehouse, 2006). The processes by which the curriculum is implemented and received are laden with politics, as the gap between educational philosophy and practice is a site in which political subjectivities and meanings are formed. In the next section of the paper, we develop this argument based on research in South Africa[5].

Citizenship Formation, Education, and the New South African Citizen

As we have intimated, South Africa presents many of the difficulties that countries encounter as they attempt to use the educational system to foster a new kind of citizen. The post-apartheid government heralded a new democratic nation that would move beyond the racialist policies and laws of the past. The educational system had many responsibilities, not least of which was developing a programme for citizenship education (Unterhalter, 2000; Enslin, 2003). But as should be anticipated from the argument

---

[5] This research is based on national policy documents, interviews with government officials and educators, and classroom observations in five high schools in the Western Cape in February and March, 2009. The schools included a mix of public schools, most of which charged additional fees and one that did not; one independent school was also included. Regardless of revenue streams, all schools follow the national curriculum. This is part of a larger study that includes schools in the Eastern Cape and KwaZulu-Natal.

presented above, the goals expressed by the government do not necessarily match what is taught in different schools.

The education policies developed at the national level are intended to create citizens who embody particular goals, including: citizens with a sense of social justice; productive citizens with skills for a global economy; and healthy citizens who embody values and behaviours that will stem the onslaught of HIV/AIDS (Department of Education 2001a, 2001b). The policy documents promote a vision of "unity in diversity" and of citizenship rooted in human rights for all. Race and the racialised history of the country are not as prominent in policy documents as might be expected, although they are implicitly acknowledged in the opening statements of goals and values in many documents. Rather, the vision is forward-looking and emphasises the potential of a country in which all citizens can lead fulfilling lives. This strategy and the passage of time has meant that many students did not understand the full implications of the country's racialised history, and so the meaning of South African citizenship may seem unmoored. In this respect, the incorporation of citizenship education into all areas of the curriculum, but particularly into the "Life Orientation" subject area is significant. As one teacher explained, this reflects a belief that citizenship is relevant to all aspects of life.

The policies can easily be seen as promoting a kind of cosmopolitanism; the issues, as Katharyne Mitchell (2007) has argued, are whose cosmopolitanism and for what ends. The policies are intended to foster a citizenry capable of functioning in a global economy and that will see itself as bound to a framework of universal human rights. Business interests are pleased with the emphasis on skills for the international economy and have lobbied hard against policies that would redress historical disadvantage through affirmation action. The emphasis on human rights is consistent with the rhetoric of the anti-Apartheid struggle that highlighted the responsibility of the international community to take action. This history may be one reason that the South

African government promotes what, on the face of things, seems to support cosmopolitanism: the recognition of human rights of all people was the basis of their claim to be reintegrated into international organisations and the global community. Given this history, a discourse of human, as compared to national, rights is inextricable from the national story and identity. Indeed, government officials and teachers argued that human rights are essential to South African citizenship, and are written into the South African constitution and are thus at the core of the nation, with the implication that they are built into the very status of "citizen". Nevertheless, none of the teachers talked about human rights or anything that might be associated with cosmopolitanism when they defined citizenship, and the idea of training students to be competitive in a global economy seemed very distant from the reality of grinding poverty in which many of the students from the townships and informal settlements lived. In the poorest high school, for instance, there were no posters on the walls alerting students to opportunities for further education, either in universities or in technical institutes. For these students, passing matriculation examinations seemed to be the most that any one hoped they would achieve; given the challenges many learners and schools face, matriculation is itself a major accomplishment. Yet in a country with an estimated unemployment rate of 22% and where 50% of the population lives below the country's poverty line (World Factbook 2009), the idea that students would become part of a globally competitive labour force seems very remote.

Rather than cosmopolitanism, teachers typically discussed citizenship in terms of practice: knowing rights, obeying the laws of the country, acting responsibly, and being a good member of the community. The country's history of racial division and its current reality of socio-economic inequality makes it important – yet difficult – to instil a sense a meaningful citizenship, commonality, or community. But that history and current experience also means that it is necessary to remind some students that they do have

rights and responsibilities *as equal citizens* and that they need to know the structure of government in order to make claims upon it. As such, some teachers told learners where and how they could protest. Yet teachers conceded that there was a large gap between what they were teaching and what students experienced. The disjuncture between education policy and practice in different contexts has emerged as a key challenge to educational reform. For one education NGO, the challenges are so great as to lead the director to comment that communities, teachers, and learners were not "ready" for citizenship education and that other issues should take priority. He commented on the poor training of many teachers, the difficulty of providing textbooks in the 11 languages of instruction, and the lack of family and community support in sending learners to school ready for instruction. In this context, he felt citizenship education was a luxury that most schools could not afford.

Some aspects of the citizenship education curriculum could simply not be implemented. While the policy documents call upon teachers to promote the practice of active citizenship, in which students would engage in projects in their own communities and across different communities, this was nearly impossible to implement.   As in many countries, active citizenship is promoted, in part, as a way to bridge divisions between communities by bringing students from different backgrounds into contact with each other. Yet active citizenship was implemented in ways that might reinforce social distance, rather than bridge it. Two of the schools that charged high fees (including the private school) engaged in school-based community service activities intended to assist students from disadvantaged schools. Students in one school brought in books that were donated to children in the informal settlements surrounding Cape Town and students in another school made lunches for AIDS orphans. In neither case did students come into direct contact with other students, as the books and lunches were picked up by staff from the beneficiary schools.   At least one teacher worried about the way these acts

were interpreted by students, believing that these were acts of condescension, rather than acts of citizenship rooted in equality and shared purpose. While believing the activities were inadequate, however, teachers believed any effort to bring students in direct contact with students from disadvantaged backgrounds would be opposed by parents who were worried about the safety of their children; one teacher confessed that she would not have allowed her daughter to go into the townships while she was a high school student. Despite a commitment to active citizenship as a way of bridging social division, it is hard to see how the way active citizenship is practiced would create a meaningful sense of citizenship that could overcome the divisions within South African society.

The different situations and contexts of education and of participants make clear the difficulty of instilling a national sense of "unity through diversity" in the curriculum. In one township high school, many of the windows were broken (and had been broken for a long time), feral dogs roamed through the school grounds, there was no custodial staff, some classes had over 50 students, and there were not enough teachers, textbooks, or even tables and chairs for all the students. "Passing periods" involved more than the movement of students from room to room. They also involved the movement of tables and chairs through the hallways, as late arriving students had to find and then move furniture. The educational landscape, thus, was not one that matched the discourse of equality promoted in the curriculum and in human rights discourses. While these students were living the effects of apartheid, other students seemed not to have much knowledge about it. In a school in which most of the students came from middle and upper income backgrounds but who would have been classified as "coloured", students did not know that their parents and grandparents would have been unable to vote for the national government. For these learners, teaching about rights as though they were something special was a curious thing to do. That they could assume that they had equal rights is both an indication of the advances that have been made, and an indication that

class and economic privilege (which do not map directly onto race, although there remains a strong correlation between race and class) have supplanted the racialised privilege of the past; the history of apartheid may seem irrelevant to the current situation they experience. Struggles around the meanings of race and class are, however, addressed in the schooling environment and continue to frame young people's experiences, and in part, reflect the experiences of teachers. Many teachers were involved in anti-apartheid struggles and they negotiate their own histories as they teach South African history and as they prepare learners for a different future (Hammett 2007). In this context, it is hard to imagine a national story that links learners and teachers to each other and to the broader world, that builds connections across difference, or that confronts – never mind heals – the challenges of the past and future.

Rather, citizenship education – as all education – is affected by the broad social contexts, personal histories and communal histories in which it is delivered and received. Education policies may have a goal of fostering new kinds of subjectivities, but as in the play *Class Enemy*, they may sometimes reproduce the status quo. Whether intentionally (as Ranciere (2006) implies), or just by virtue of the scale of problems affecting South Africa, School and the educational system may be sites of agonism, but they are not at this point sites of mobilisation or radical change. Instead, the interplay between citizenship's constituent elements – status, feeling, and meaning – seems incapable of providing the foundation for a new kind of citizenship in South Africa that will redress the divisions of the past. Whether a post-racial vision of the nation is capable of ever doing so is an open question.

Conclusions

All transitions are complex and fraught, but transitions that involve attempts to overcome division through promotion of a new national story and a citizenry may be

particularly difficult. Histories and geographies are implicated in the problems transitions confront and affect the resources that individuals, communities and nations can bring to the process. Citizenship education can be thought of as an attempt to remake those histories by teaching students new stories of peoplehood and giving them the tools to live as a new kind of citizen. But as the example from South Africa demonstrates, this is a difficult process with an uncertain outcome. There are three issues in particular that contribute to both the difficulty and uncertainty in creating new citizens.

The first issue revolves around the role that memory and history play. Programmes to make a new kind of citizen cannot simply wipe away the memory of conflict and oppression in divided societies. Truth and reconciliation comissions and memorialisations have been common strategies to recognise suffering, but their effects are not clear. Furthermore, many educators worry about the efficacy of those strategies for young people, whom it is hoped can be raised without the burden of past conflicts. Yet as the two versions of *Class Enemy* and the audience reception to them suggests, youth have their own experiences of conflict and the aftermath of conflict. Those experiences are further interpreted by their parents and teachers, and by interactions in their communities and daily lives. To be effective, calls to cosmopolitanism, active citizenship and a new national identity have to be reconciled with the experiences and subjectivities of youth.

Second, but related, citizenship education programmes in and of themselves are not sufficient to overcome the inequalities and processes of marginalisation that seem endemic to all countries and that limit inclusion in the democratic public (Lister, 2008). The bases of inequality and the feelings of exclusion that often accompany inequality are many, including poverty, gender, religion, sexuality, and processes of racialisation. Furthermore, the bases of marginalisation are interlinked, positioning subjects in webs of

relative privilege and marginalisation within a complex public sphere (Fraser, 1990; Warner, 2002). Adding another layer of complexity to this, however, are the different ways of understanding both marginalisation and inclusion. This issue is particularly important as non-governmental organisations, community leaders and other agents work with governments as they try to conceptualise and consolidate citizenships that reflect the histories, cultures and needs of different countries and as they respect the human rights and well-being of differently positioned citizen subjects (Benhabib, 2007; Gould, 2004; Phillips, 2007).

Finally, and coming full circle, it remains to be seen whether cosmopolitanism provides the antidote to nationalism or to deeply rooted social divisions, and can therefore be the basis for a new democratic identity. Sears and Hughes (2006) argue that simply promoting citizenship in the educational system without providing evidence that it can be transformative or meaningful reduces citizenship education to a form of indoctrination. This may be particularly ominous in the context of societies where students need to see and to believe in democratic citizenship if the society is to make fundamental moves to a more just future. Teaching patriotism and national identity easily slides into nationalism (Bridgehouse, 2006), and there is some evidence that promoting ideas about global citizenship actually reinforces nationalism in students (Roman, 2003). Yet it is difficult to see how any of the different forms of cosmopolitanism can, on their own, counteract the experiences of violence and inequality that students and communities in divided societies have confronted. Both versions of *Class Enemy* point to the linkage between what is experienced and what is learned, as distinct from what is taught. Citizenship and citizenship education programmes seem unlikely to be meaningful if they do not provide a framework for reconciling experience and philosophy. That framework is crucial for the sustainability of democracy and new citizenship in societies marked by histories – and current experiences – of social division.

References

Adamic, L. 1945. *A nation of nations*. New York: Harper.

Althof, W. and Berkowitz, M., 2006. Moral education and character education: their relationship and roles in citizenship education. *Journal of moral education*, 34(5), 495-518.

Asmal, K., 2003. *Preface to revised national curriculum statement, grades R-9*. Government of South Africa, Department of Education. Pretoria: Government Printers.

Benhabib, S., 2007. Twilight of sovereignty or the emergence of cosmopolitan norms? Rethinking citizenship in volatile times. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 19-36.

Bourne, R., 1916. Transnational America. *Atlantic monthly,* 118(July), 86-97.

Bridgehouse, H., 2006. *On education*. London: Routledge.

Bull, B., 2006. Can civic and moral education be distinguished? In D. Warren and J. Patrick, eds. *Civic and moral learning in America*. New York: Palgrave, 21-31.

Callan, E., 1997. *Creating citizens: political education and liberal democracy*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Chisholm, L., 1987. Class and colour in South African youth policy: The Witwatersrand, 1886-1910. *History of Education Quarterly*, 27(1), 1-27.

Comaroff, J., 2001. Reflections on the colonial state in South Africa and elsewhere. In A. Zegeye, ed. *Social identities in the new South Africa*. Cape Town: Kwela Books, 37-80.

Connolly, K., 2008. And the lesson today is how to shoot, *The Guardian,* 7 July, pp. 26-27 G2.

Crick, B., 2008. Democracy. In J. Arthur, I. Davies, and C. Hahn, eds. *Education for citizenship and democracy*. London: Sage, 13-19.

Cross, M. and Chisholm, L., 1990. The roots of segregated schooling in twentieth-century South Africa. In M. Nkomo, ed. *Pedagogy of domination.* Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 44-74.

Department of Education, 2001a. *Human resource development strategy for South Africa: a nation at work for a better life for all.* Pretoria: Government Printers.

Department of Education, 2001b. *Manifesto on values, education and democracy.* Pretorial, Government Printers.

Dewey, J., 1916/1997. *Democracy and education.* New York: Free Press.

Edkins, J., 2003. *Trauma and the Memory of Politics.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Enslin, P., 2003. Citizenship education in post-apartheid South Africa. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 33(1), 73-83.

Fraser, N., 1990. Rethinking the public sphere: a contribution to actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26, 56-79.

Goldberg, D., 2009. *The threat of race.* Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Gould, C., 2004. *Globalizing democracy and human rights.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gutmann, A., 1987. *Democratic education.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hammett, D., 2007. Disrespecting teacher: the decline in social standing of teachers in Cape Town, South Africa. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 28(3), 340-347.

Hoy, S., 1995. *Chasing dirt: the American pursuit of cleanliness.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jarvis, P., 2000. Globalisation, the learning society and comparative education. *Comparative education*, 36(3), 343-355.

Keto, C., 1990. Pre-industrial education policies and practices in South Africa. In M. Nkomo, ed. *Pedagogy of Domination*. Trenton, NJ: Africa World Press, 19-42.

Kiwan, D., 2008. *Education for inclusive citizenship*. London: Routledge.

Lister, R., 2008. Inclusive citizenship, gender and poverty: some implications for teaching for citizenship. *Citizenship Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 3-19.

Marston, S., and Mitchell, K. 2004. Citizens and the state: citizenship formation in space and time. In C. Barnett and M. Low eds. *Spaces of democracy: geographical perspectives on citizenship, participation and representation*. London: Sage, 93-112.

Mitchell, K., 2003. Educating the national citizen in neoliberal times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers,* 28(4), 387-403.

Mitchell, K., 2007. Geographies of identity: the intimate cosmopolitan. *Progress in Human Geography*, 31(5), 706-720.

Muck, W., 2004. Global institutions and the creation of social capital. In J. O'Loughlin, L. Staeheli, and E. Greenberg, eds. *Globalisation and its outcomes*. New York: Guilford, 337-360.

Oglesby, E., 2007. Educating citizens in postwar Guatemala: Historical memory, genocide, and the culture of peace. *Radical History Review*, 27, 77-98.

Osler, A. and Starkey, H., 2005. *Changing citizenship: democracy and inclusion in education*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Phillips, A., 2007. *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pykett, J., 2007. Making citizens governable? The Crick Report as a governmental technology. *Journal of education policy*, 22(3), 301-319.

Ranciere, J., 2006. *Hatred of democracy*. Translated by S. Corcoran. London: Verso.

Roman, L., 2003. Education and the contested meanings of 'global citizenship.' *Journal of educational change*, 4, 269-293.

Rose, N., 1999. *Powers of Freedom.* London: Routledge.

Sandel, M., 1996. *Democracy's discontent: America in search of a public philosophy.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Sears, A. and Hughes, A., 2006. Citizenship: education or indoctrination? *Citizenship and Teacher Education*, 2(1), 3-17.

Smith, R., 2003. *Stories of peoplehood: The politics and morals of political membership.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Soudien, C., 2007. *Youth identity in contemporary South Africa.* Cape Town: New Africa Books.

Spain, D., 2001. *How women saved the city.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Stradling, R., 2003. *Multiperspectivity in history teaching: a guide for teachers.* Council of Europe.

Swartz, S., 2006. A long walk to citizenship: Morality, justice and faith in the aftermath of Apartheid. *Journal of Moral Education*, 35(4), 551-570.

Turner, B., 2002. Cosmopolitan virtue, globalization and patriotism. *Theory, culture and society*, 19(2), 45-63.

Unterhalter, E., 2002. Education, citizenship and difference in the South African transition: Policy, politics and practice. *The Curriculum Journal*, 11(1), 551-570.

Verwoerd, H., 1954. *Bantu education: Policy for the immediate future.* Pretoria: Information Service of the Department of Native Affairs.

Warner, M., 2002. *Publics and counterpublics.* Brooklyn, NY: Zed Books.

World Factbook (2009) South Africa. www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/print/sf.html. [Accessed 2 March 2009].

Young, I.M., 2000. *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Figure 1:

Elements of Citizenship

```
                    ┌──────────────┐
                    │    Status    │
                    └──────────────┘
                   ↗                ↘
      ┌──────────────┐          ┌──────────────┐
      │   Feeling    │ ◄──────► │   Practice   │
      └──────────────┘          └──────────────┘
```