

PROGRESS OF THE PAST?:
HISTORY IN NEW SOUTH WALES
SECONDARY SCHOOLS, 1972–1999

Anna Clark

The responsibilities of the State in educating children at school are positioned problematically between the goals of State management and the objectives of personal development. Socialisation and individuation occur simultaneously. Ideally, the two are reconciled in the learning process of Education years K–12, but in reality they jostle against each other in significant theoretical opposition. Examining the development of History syllabuses in New South Wales secondary schools over the last three decades, this article will investigate the play between these competing educational imperatives. It will do so within a wider analytical context of attitudes to education and history in Australia generally.

The schooling of youth is concerned with the education of future society as well as the more personal intellectual growth of the individual. How History syllabuses position History in relation to this will be the major focus here. Teaching the core responsibilities of citizenship, such as voting, understanding political institutions and how they work is the effective educational role of the State. Individuation—the development of the individual from the general—is a process of affective personal development. Students learn and grow intellectually in a way which cannot necessarily be categorised or measured.

I want to examine the background of changing attitudes to education and the teaching of History. There is a real sense of ideological progression that comes through in literature from the late 1950s onwards about the importance of the learning process, rather than simple accumulation of knowledge. ‘Learning how to learn’ became the catch phrase of modern cognitive theory. But its structuralism, whilst suiting aspects of personal growth, measured stages of students’ educational development in a way that runs somewhat against the qualitative and immeasurable aspects of learning.

This will lead into the second part of the piece: the negotiation between the affective and effective education of children and adolescents in school. In educational documents, the two strands of learning run parallel throughout school life. History syllabuses position the subject of History uniquely between these strands, bringing them together, to complement one another, in the fostering of student intellect. I will also critically examine

the crucial position History puts itself into in child development. History has a unique location in the context of the territorial and defensive tendencies of History teachers and syllabus developers to rationalise and justify the importance of History as a subject, taught in its own right. I will also look at how the State views History in relation to teaching future citizens how to act responsibly, and knowledgeably, in a democracy.

The rationalisations of History's importance as a subject in Secondary Schools utilise and reinforce a rhetoric of civics or literacy of the nation. Such rhetoric is used by both teachers and the State and has in fact become the dominant justification for teaching History in New South Wales. The final part of this article will examine the introduction of mandatory 'Civics and Citizenship' study in NSW Secondary Schools as part of this rather conservative and at times alarmist discourse about the nation and its past. Indeed, recent History syllabuses have placed active citizenship as one of the aims in the attitudinal development of the individual.¹ The institutional goals of the State have become part of the personal goals of the History student. Effective has become affective development.

CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

The value of history is in its lessons, and in its philosophy, and not in the knowledge of the bare succession of events.²

Changes to History teaching have closely followed the development of educational theory generally. But as the above quote from the 1876 *Sydney Morning Herald* demonstrates it cannot be neatly followed or studied as a comprehensive linear advancement. Commonly assumed as progressive, the idea of History-as-process, rather than a series of mundane, endless facts, is not a new phenomenon. While education in the 1950s has been referred to as monotonously obsessed with obedience, efficiency and uniformity,³ the 1957 Syllabus encouraged 'imaginative reconstruction rather than purposeless memorisation.'⁴ In 1958, Lloyd Evans asserted that:

It will not matter if they afterwards forget most of the facts of history studied in any one school year ... and it will not matter if they have not all reached the same level of attainment in their study and understanding of the past.

What does matter is that the lives of the children should have been put into some sort of perspective in time so that they see themselves as part of the historical process.⁵

Of course, it remains important to remember that there are also extremely narrow ideas contained in these documents. Chronology remains important, British institutions are emphasised and Aboriginal people are looked at only in passing.⁶ Nevertheless, I do want to stress that ideas about History cannot necessarily be looked at as part of an ideological progression. Nominally progressive ideas about History have been around for a significant period of time. Conversely, curriculum change, cloaked in a language of reform and development, can also be conservative.

The growth of tertiary education after World War II led to a proliferation of theory in psychology, sociology, philosophy and history. The study of education also became increasingly professional.⁷ It was an expanding discipline with complex theories that required proficiency to study and disseminate. Consequently, syllabus development increasingly demanded academic expertise.

In the 1960s and 1970s, structuralism emerged in educational theory and had a substantial impact. Behavioural objectives, rather than quantities of information, were emphasised.⁸ The work of Jerome Bruner, an American educational theorist, was particularly influential in the changing direction of education in NSW. Bruner stressed that education was not only about the 'coverage' but also the 'structure' of subjects.⁹ By grasping the structure of educational processes, students would be able to grasp the knowledge of the very subject itself.¹⁰

Invoking Bruner in 1971, W.J.A. Vaughan, Deputy Director of Primary Education, wrote in the *Sydney Morning Herald* that there is

a practicable and exciting alternative to mind-stocking. This is education through discovery, with all its interesting and non-terminating quality ... Knowledge is of value, but of greater value is the development of the process whereby knowledge may be acquired, organised, retained and applied to the problems of the future.¹¹

Building on the idea of knowledge, another influential theorist, Paul Hirst, interpreted education as drawing together the knowledges of specific subject areas.¹² Forming History was a knowledge structure which provided the key to grasping the subject itself. In these ideas, learning is about understanding the concepts which underlie cognition. By studying the processes themselves, students would move beyond superficial data to an awareness and desire to learn how to learn.

Teacher-centred methods would ideally be avoided as the processes of self education and discovery were implemented.¹³ Learning historical skills, such as reading sources, rather than memorising facts, was prominent in the 1972 and subsequent syllabuses.¹⁴ A substantial influence for this came from The British Schools Council's 'History 13-16' project, which played an important role in spreading the notion of history as enquiry in Australia during the 1970s.¹⁵ Writing in *Teaching History*, the Journal of the History Teachers' Association of New South Wales, David Kent argued that teachers 'have been encouraged to see that the content of history, necessary though it is, is less important than an awareness of the processes by which history is made.'¹⁶

Some teachers and academics commented strongly against the move in History away from content and certainty. The 'Survey and Depth' studies, introduced in the 1972 Syllabus, emphasised the themes of history, illustrating them with in-depth, source-based analyses of specific sites and events.¹⁷ But these broad thematic guidelines lacked educational direction, argued critics, and their opposition to 'discontinuous' history teaching grew.¹⁸

Writing for the *Sydney Morning Herald* in 1971, Professor Leonie Kramer argued that theories of 'knowledge acquired in active process' were too vague and would lead to lower standards in a system 'already afflicted with problems of literacy'.¹⁹ In 1976, *The Bulletin* ran the cover story, 'Australia's Education Scandal: we're turning out millions of dunces.' Inside, it lamented that whilst spending for education had increased, 'the output of real education has declined'.²⁰

Prominent education historian, Alan Barcan, has referred to the new educational ideology as a collapse in the liberal-humanist tradition of the first half of the twentieth century.²¹ Ideals of increasing equality between teachers' and students' knowledge were accompanied by what he felt were declining traditional academic standards: the 'age of relativism' emphasised personal, rather than wider, social concerns.²² Looking critically at this ideological shift, Barcan saw the declining emphasis on mastering intellectual skills as part of a general decline in educational quality.²³ Yet he misjudged the changing nature of education. Broad educational aims changed to reflect a changing society, but they did not disappear. Whilst structuralism emphasised processes of education, rather than content, the processes themselves existed in a structured framework. The development of students could be categorised into explicit results. History was very much contextualised by this structuralist, quantifiable framework of education.

In 1962, H.S. Wyndham, Director-General of Education in NSW, introduced the Wyndham System. Under it, High School education was extended to six years and areas of study were generalised.²⁴ History in year seven was amalgamated with Geography to produce a compulsory Social Studies course. This move reflected the shift towards broader thematic study which Bruner and Hirst had emphasised and encouraged. The paradigms of study moved to a greater focus upon the socialisation of students. The development of Social Studies is significant because it reflected the increasing influence of structuralism. But its encroachment upon the traditional domain of History forced subsequent syllabuses to explain the necessity of History as a subject taught in its own right. In order to maintain the status of History in the face of this amalgamation, History teachers and syllabus developers had to employ a common language of social relevance to show how History played a vital role in society.

Thus, the study of History, whilst becoming more thematic, and more concerned with the learning of historical skills rather than historical facts,²⁵ remained very consciously aware of its role in the education system and society generally. Structuralist education principles were broadly oriented but were also very much about the ability and need to measure students' progress. This, combined with the necessity to rationalise History's legitimacy in school curricula due to the rise of Social Studies, meant that the categorisation and measurement of the subject grew. Whilst History syllabuses moved further away from quantitative knowledge, its educational concepts were themselves becoming increasingly quantifiable.

More and more, the syllabuses focused on the rationale, aims and objectives of studying History which became as, if not more, important than content in educational priority.²⁶ By the 1981 History Syllabus, 'Knowledge Objectives', 'Skills Objectives', and 'Attitude Objectives' were given considerably more weight than the 'Suggested Content Outlines'.²⁷ Teachers were given greater scope with the direction of teaching content but the rationale, aims and objectives of History became more prescriptive.

The direction of History in the 1960s and 1970s shifted its focus from content to process. But in doing so, the parameters of History in school became constricted in another way: the measurement of intellectual development.

HISTORICAL IMAGINATION AND ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP

Eliminate Australian History or study it in a different context. We did it in years 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. It was boring. I would rather watch paint dry.²⁸

Brooke Peterson, 13, said she particularly liked the history classes because she had a lot more choice. 'In our last assignment me and Rebecca chose to do Aboriginal rights,' she said. 'We learned all about how they were treated, how their land was taken away from them, how their children were taken away from them.'²⁹

If History is not interesting, students will not study it. Yet the justification of History's place in schools is not because it might be of interest. Rationalisations of teaching History centre on its ability to inform and remain relevant to the citizens and society of tomorrow.

In a study commissioned by the History Teachers' Association of New South Wales (HTA), forty-four per cent of students answering the survey said they chose History out of interest or enjoyment, and only three per cent did so in order to better understand society—that is less than those who chose to study it due to timetable constraints (five per cent).³⁰ But there was a high degree agreement of amongst all students that the long-term advantage of history was its capacity to develop their intellectual processes and skills.³¹ And History teachers were 'in strong agreement that the study of History makes a substantial contribution to the development of citizenship'.³²

Answering the questions 'why do history?' and 'why is history good?', then, produces quite different responses. Students mostly study History because they find it interesting, but do not regard it as 'good' because it is interesting. Rather, it is good because it fosters an informed citizenry.

Students choose History because they find it interesting, but the acceptable rationale for why it may be good is found outside subjective explanations. Being 'interesting' is not enough; History's worthiness must be its relevance, expressed in a common discourse about the function and necessity of active citizenship.

Through increasing measurement of cognitive development, the value of History could be articulated along the rational lines defined by educational experts. History has been under pressure from the Social Studies course, but also more recently from the growth of apparently vocational subjects such

as Commerce and Legal Studies. In a society where growing importance has been attached to vocational skills, and study ought to be *useful* for later life, History has had to somehow maintain its legitimacy. By measuring the intellectual development of History students, structuralist theory gave History weight in social climate decreasingly concerned with abstract intellectualism.

Yet by making learning concrete, History syllabuses neglect the uncertain, often tentative, and deeply individual experiences contained in its process. The compulsion to rationalise History's utility along such structured lines reinforces the power of cognitive assessment. But in doing so, the value of History to society becomes increasingly narrow.

Whilst Alan Barcan associates structuralist educational theory with a decline of citizenship values, Bruner described education as a means for 'training well-balanced citizens for a democracy'.³³ In the midst of the Wyndham System, Wyndham attributed to History the means of providing 'a background for competent citizenship'.³⁴ At the same conference, in 1965, C.W. McLaren, Inspector of Schools, maintained that by the end of Form IV

those studying history will have been brought up to date with at least the basic history of Australia and its institutions as well as its relations with other countries. As a result, these students will leave school much better qualified as men and women of the future...³⁵

The views here are of the importance of History in civic public life. They are views which rationalise History's role in contemporary society and they become stronger in the syllabuses of the 1980s and 1990s.

According to the 1981 Syllabus, 'History aims to facilitate students' development as effective citizens'.³⁶ In the Queensland Junior Syllabus of 1988, the message was much the same:

The study of history, by reducing the present-mindedness of students, by developing important understandings and skills, and by confronting them with problems of values, helps students take their place as active citizens in democratic society.

To be 'present-minded' is to see the world as fixed and inevitable.³⁸ Only History is able to produce a dynamic citizen and so the subject becomes the key to a mature civic state. But the rhetoric used in these texts is mostly inadequate in describing what constitutes learning as a whole. Meanwhile citizenship jargon has become even more prominent and crucial in recent History syllabuses.

The values of society and citizenship tie in with the structuralist aims of cognitive measurement because they are values which can be, and in fact are, endlessly classified, categorised and quantified. The rhetoric of citizenship reinforces a quantitative educational framework. Aspects of affective, or qualitative learning are increasingly ignored by this quite rigid discourse. Civics is relevant, being interested in History is not.

The effective goals of learning History are not bad. And the emphasised skills are certainly useful. But the emphasis upon History as effective education is a distorted one. It downplays the affective experience of learning

History, which I see as equally important and legitimate. And it has the tendency to skew the value system of education by increasingly excluding from public discourse valid affective justifications for studying History.

It is also important to acknowledge that syllabuses have become exceptionally sophisticated, drawing on elements of postmodern and cultural theory to provide the central tenet of 'historical perspective' in the most recent syllabuses.³⁹ With much of this new theory, important historical emphases on white invasion, experiences of women and contested pasts have been brought out through the syllabuses.⁴⁰ But at the same time their sophistication is still situated in a structured process of learning: post-modern concepts of relativity remain embedded in a schooling where child development is being measured and analysed more and more.

For History, this has been through a growing movement to teach civics. Using a language of national literacy, children must understand the institutions and functions of the State. This is not a shift so much as a reflection or extension of the increasing importance of a History that is 'relevant', and experts who help define what is and is not relevant. A State Government Discussion Paper on curriculum reform in 1988 was formulated in response to widespread community concern that young people were not learning 'the right things'.⁴¹ The direction of History syllabuses, in emphasising the practical social benefits of studying History, are responding to such anxieties about perceived irrelevant education.

In 1992, the Junior Syllabus noted that it was

concerned with developing students' knowledge and skills and fostering the attitudes that will empower them to participate as active and informed citizens in our democratic society.⁴²

Similarly, the 1994 Modern History Syllabus proposed that students

should be prepared by their study of Modern History Syllabus to play an active role in a society in which they will soon become eligible to vote.⁴³

These documents place an enormous emphasis on a rational approach to learning. Significantly, the syllabuses do not position History in contradiction to the idea of multiple, contested pasts. In fact, History is strategically placed between the rational rhetoric of citizenship and the different perspectives of individual students. But this does not obscure the increasing reliance upon rational definitions of History's worth as a subject in school.

Students are directed to develop their own attitudes and values at the same time as emerging into society with all the attributes of an active citizen.⁴⁴ History is seen by syllabuses, the History Teachers' Association and the government as a medium for the different directions of effective and affective learning. The Executive of the History Teachers' Association stressed

that recognition be given to ... [history's] unique role in the curriculum as the major avenue through which students can investigate human motivation, actions and conditions over time through a unique framework of inquiry.⁴⁵

History has been given a value both relevant to collective society and the

individual.⁴⁶ In 1992, John Aquilina, then Shadow Minister for Education, said that Labor did not see individual development and employment prospects as inherently conflicting objectives, rather, as 'a fully-rounded view of the nature and purpose of education'.⁴⁷

History has been given an important role here in developing society and the individual. Through the effective framework of civics study and the affective motivations of individual students, History is discussed as an ideal medium for converging the two competing demands. But there is a tension between these educational goals which is generally overlooked. Ideally positioned between society and student, History as a subject is nevertheless totally dependent on the dominant rhetoric of social relevance in order to have legitimacy.

Even in the 1970s and 1980s there was concern that History was being reduced to quantifiable objectives at the expense of qualitative learning experience. The proliferation of education theory was accompanied by the growing attention given to developing the aims and objectives of History teaching. Writing in 1976, Ian Steele noted that the educational scope of history was 'complicated by the fact that there are different types of objectives', but it 'is possible to categorise these'.⁴⁸ Agreeing with Steele's assertion that categorisation of educational objectives had increased, David Kent nevertheless questioned the benefits of a such a system:

Basic cognitive achievement has proved much easier to reduce to a taxonomy of objectives and it is a feature of objectives-based programmes the world over that they deal very successfully with the measurement of physical skills and the progressive hierarchy of formal cognition but are much less successful when it comes to attainment in affective domain.⁴⁹

From the basis that citizenship rhetoric is an extension of structuralist principles, Kent's analysis of the limitations of structuralist education can be applied to critique the language of civics. Such rhetoric has come to dominate the discourse of History syllabuses. And whilst History is nominally ideally situated between State and individual, the language of social relevance prescribes the utility of the subject: History's value is dependent upon wider benefit of its aims and objectives. Syllabus developers and teachers have been forced to adopt this rhetoric in order to maintain the status of History in a society increasingly obsessed with skills and management.

CENTRALISATION, CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP

I really don't think students are apathetic, they just haven't had the chance to learn.

Professor Winterton, 1994⁵⁰

Young Australians must gain a sound knowledge of the evolution of our pioneering democracy if its success and vigour is to continue in the next century.

Dr David Kemp, 1997⁵¹

In the 1990s there has been a marked increase of State and Federal inter-

vention in the development of History syllabuses and the direction of teaching History.⁵² History teachers have expressed continuing concern over this situation since the 1980s,⁵³ but it has been the scale and publicity of the contest over school History in the last decade which has been so noticeable.

In 1994, an ongoing debate began regarding the use of the word 'invasion' in syllabuses in Australia. In Queensland, Premier Goss argued that a year 5 Social Studies text, which suggested teachers use 'invasion' rather than 'settlement' was unsuitable:

I think just about all Australians would not regard what happened in 1788 as an invasion. There is a world of difference between the arrival of the First Fleet and what most people understand as an invasion.⁵⁴

In New South Wales, the Teacher's Federation threatened a ban on the Primary Syllabus when 'invasion' was removed from some sections of the draft and replaced by more neutral terms such as 'arrival of British people' and 'before 1788'.⁵⁵

Following this, the then Opposition Leader, Bob Carr, charged History teachers with neglecting historical facts and knowledge in favour of 'politically faddish themes'.⁵⁶ Responding to the attack by Carr on the apparent superficiality of History in schools, History teachers pleaded with the government to make History compulsory, saying it was impossible to teach it just two periods a week. Teachers said they needed History to be mandatory for the entire four years (7–10) to allow them to cover more content, both national and international.⁵⁷

Both Carr and the teachers shifted the argument from power and historical discourse to getting History right—teaching the right information. The debate explicitly moved beyond 'invasion' to a quantitative analysis of History. Teachers changed their argument to a common discourse with the hope it of being perceived as publicly relevant. The political agenda of teachers was subsumed into a broader, more acceptable common language of educational utility.

In 1996, the HSC History Course 'People and Events', was dropped from its A-level status in the curriculum because universities concluded that it was not rigorous enough. In its defence, the History Teachers' Association contended that it was popular and relevant to contemporary society.⁵⁸

Defending People and Events, the President of the New South Wales Parents' and Citizens' Association, Ros Brennan, remarked:

It creates the impression that some courses are better than others. It forces young people to choose subjects on the basis of categorisation rather than what really interests them.⁵⁹

Brennan pointed out the primary reason why students choose a subject. Yet its popularity and interest was not the ground for debate between the HTA and the determiners of educational significance. For them, History's discipline and its rigour were more important. The HTA focused on History's

thoroughness as a discipline. Yet retreating to this helped cement dominant definitions of History's status—the measurement of academic, rather than affective, worth.

Increased politicisation and public intervention in the development of History syllabuses has provoked considerable reaction. The impact of political and educational agendas upon the syllabuses has been substantial and has left teachers with decreasing power in developing direction for History in schools.⁶⁰ Writing for *Teaching History* in 1998, Clive Logan maintained that the increasing centralisation and external involvement in the drafting of syllabuses was resulting in minimal consultation and was creating syllabuses that were too prescriptive. In relation to the educational theories of the 1960s and 1970s, he asserted, it appeared History teaching was going backwards.⁶¹

Increasing centralisation and politicisation of History in schools, however, has actually been an extension of the structuralist principles which emerged from the 1960s. Through its focus on standardising cognition, structuralist theory has set up a condition in which measures of education are paramount. Whilst Logan and other teachers rail against what they see as an ideological regression, the whole educational focus on rational, social justifications for History has had forward momentum. Its conservatism has been incremental, rather than retrograde.

Although Logan and others argue against what they see as regressive tendencies in the latest syllabuses, teachers have long been caught in an educational structure which is ideologically narrow and has subsequently narrowed the scope of History teaching. Cognitive measurement gears education towards quantifiable learning processes. Affective development is a legitimate educational aim, but goes without real acknowledgement or influence in public debate. Thus teachers, needing to increase the status of History, or arrest its decline, are forced into a language of public goals and community relevance.

In a Sydney University survey of five hundred year 12 students in 1994, the results found them lacking in general political awareness. Dr Murray Print, the research team's leader, said that in-depth interviews had found many of those eligible to vote in the 1993 Federal election had failed to register. Furthermore, many students lacked a good general knowledge of State and Federal governments. 'One of the reasons for the research,' he explained, 'is that we are concerned about the lack of political knowledge among students.'⁶²

Worried about a general ignorance of Australian history and politics, the Federal government formed the Civics Expert Group. Comprised of academics such as Stuart Macintyre and John Hirst, the Group advised the Federal government that Australians had a very limited understanding of the workings of government and the responsibilities of citizenship.⁶³ It concluded that:

In the absence of an adequate understanding of how our society works, without the skill and confidence to participate effectively and the encouragement to do so, they simply cannot be effective citizens.⁶⁴

The Civics Expert Group provided the foundation with the impetus to implement compulsory Civics and Citizenship in New South Wales and indeed across Australia generally.

In NSW, mandatory Civics and Citizenship in years 7–10 is concluded with an examination on the area as part of the School Certificate. This is in spite of calls from some sections of the community that the School Certificate is irrelevant because most students go on to complete year 12.⁶⁵ The move has strengthened the reliance on testing students as a means for ascertaining their educational development in History. It has coincided with the introduction and expansion of other state-wide tests on literacy, numeracy and basic skills.

The introduction of Civics and Citizenship prompted critical responses from Teachers' groups. The President of the HTA, Denis Mootz, was concerned that 'it will just be "here's the information you have to know for the exam" and students having that information rammed down their throats'. The Acting General Secretary of the Independent Education Union, Patrick Lee, claimed that 'students will be required to rote learn a range of facts which are perhaps relevant to civics, but that is it. That doesn't pass for education in the 1990s.'⁶⁶ The move towards a greater emphasis on civics, therefore, has not been without some public concern. But the dominant trends in teaching History have certainly been those which can be specified and articulated in a rational discourse of educational standards.

Mandatory Civics and Citizenship has increased History's role in the New South Wales Curriculum. Compulsory History has placed the subject in the core of the curriculum, but it has been at the expense of a side of History—its affective side—which is equally important. The fostering of creativity and imagination is a valid educational ideal. Yet the report of the History Teachers' Association recommended that 'Civics education'

be integrated into the mandatory study of Australian History to provide students with a foundation in the content, processes and issues of citizenship within the context of the historical development of contemporary Australia.⁶⁷

History has been caught in a system of education where the dominant values are prescribed. In the syllabuses since 1992, the desired outcomes in the attitudes of History students include 'an appreciation of the rights and responsibilities of citizenship' as well as values and attitudes 'about active and informed citizenship in the contemporary world'.⁶⁸ The effective goals of the State have been projected onto the affective desires for individual development of History students. The legitimacy of History now firmly depends upon it being perceived as relevant.

Reflecting apparently progressive educational ideas, the direction History has taken since the 1960s has in fact constrained its scope in schools. Whilst improving on rote learning, such ideas have at the same time imposed upon the ideals of education quite rigid signifiers of cognitive development. Personal, unquantifiable aspects of education carry much

less weight than citizenship goals in the discourse of what constitutes useful learning.

In developing the individual student within a social context, both affective, personal and effective, common educational aims should be addressed. History, especially, has been widely assumed to be in a unique position between the effective goals of citizenship and affective aims of personal development. Yet increasing reliance upon concrete rationalisations of History's worth in schools has placed the equally valid affective qualities of this education in lesser standing. Structuralism moved the processes of education to the fore, abandoning the reliance on content which had stifled imaginative development. But structuralism also crucially depends upon a measurable education system. The study of cognitive development relies upon classification and quantifiable results. In aiming to cement the validity and utility of History using cognitive measures, historical imagination itself is put at risk.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to thank Paula Hamilton for providing me with some invaluable source materials.

NOTES

- 1 Board of Studies, *History Syllabus Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1992, p3; Board of Studies, *Modern History Syllabus*, Sydney, 1994, p5.
- 2 *Sydney Morning Herald (SMH)*, 7 February 1876, p4.
- 3 Stephen Alomes et al, 'The Social Context of Postwar Conservatism', in Ann Curthoys and John Merritt (eds), *Australia's First Cold War 1945-53*, vol 1 *Society, Communism and Culture*, Allen & Unwin, Sydney, 1984, pp19-20.
- 4 New South Wales Department of Education, *Syllabus in History*, 1957, p5.
- 5 Lloyd Evans, *Teaching History*, Melbourne, 1958, pp5-6.
- 6 NSW Dept of Education, *Syllabus in History*, 1957, pp39-41; and Evans, op cit, p14.
- 7 Alan Barcan, *Two Centuries of Education in New South Wales*, UNSW Press, Kensington, 1988, ch. 19; and Brian Simon, 'Education in Theory, Schooling in Practice: The Experience of the Last Hundred Years', *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 1982, p99.
- 8 Alan Barcan, *Two Centuries*, p267.
- 9 J.S. Bruner, *The Process of Education*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1960, pp2-3.
- 10 *ibid*, p7.
- 11 'Education for Understanding', *SMH (Education Guide)*, 2 February 1971, p2.
- 12 Paul Hirst, *Knowledge and the Curriculum*, London, 1974, pp1-3, 29, 96.

- 13 Brian Hodge, 'History in the Senior School', in Norman Little and Judy Mackinolty (eds), *A New Look at History Teaching*, Sydney, 1977.
- 14 Secondary Schools Board, *The Role of History in the Secondary Curriculum*, 1976.
- 15 Gary Johnston, 'An Historical Perspective of the 1980 Syllabus in History for Years 7-10', *Teaching History*, January 1982, pp65-69; and James Fitzgerald, 'History 13-16: Some Australian Applications', *Teaching History*, October 1982, pp36-56.
- 16 David Kent, 'Imagination and Historical Thought', *Teaching History*, January 1981, p40.
- 17 Johnston, op cit, pp65-69.
- 18 Tim McMullen, 'The Origins and Philosophy of the New Modern History Syllabus', *Teaching History*, April 1986, p29; Patrick O'Farrell, 'A Basis of Historical Education: Its Aims and Uses', *Teaching History*, July 1983; Geoffrey Partington, 'The Classification of History Syllabuses', *Teaching History*, July 1983, pp46-47.
- 19 'A recipe for lower school standards', *SMH*, 8 August 1975, p6.
- 20 Peter Samuel, 'Australia's Education Scandal: we're turning out millions of dunces', *The Bulletin*, 15 May 1976, pp30-32.
- 21 Barcan, *Two Centuries*, pp264-89.
- 22 Alan Barcan, *A History of Australian Education*, OUP, Melbourne, 1980, p362.
- 23 Barcan, *Two Centuries*, pp265-67.
- 24 Alan Barcan, 'A History of History Teaching', in Little and Mackinolty, pp44-45.
- 25 James Hagan, 'Introduction', in James Hagan (ed), *Modern History and its Themes*, Croydon, 1966, ppv-vi.
- 26 David Stewart, 'History Textbooks and the New History 7-10 Syllabus', *Teaching History*, October 1982, p58.
- 27 Secondary Schools Board, *History in NSW Secondary Schools Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1981.
- 28 Anonymous Respondent in Christine Halse et al, *The State of History in NSW*, University of Western Sydney, Sydney, 1997, p91.
- 29 'Midnight Oil: they're history', *SMH*, 23 April 1993, p1.
- 30 Halse, op cit, p59.
- 31 *ibid*, p72.
- 32 *ibid*, p5.
- 33 Bruner, op' cit, p1.
- 34 H. S. Wyndham, 'Forward', in New South Wales Department of Education, Inservice Education Branch, *Workshop in Form IV History*, c 1965, p7.
- 35 C.W. McLaren, 'Introductory Remarks', in New South Wales Department of Education, Inservice Education Branch, *Workshop in Form IV History*, c 1965, p11.
- 36 Secondary Schools Board, *History in NSW Secondary Schools Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1981, p3.
- 37 Board of Secondary School Studies (Queensland), *Junior Syllabus in History*, Brisbane, 1988, p1.

- 38 *ibid*, p1.
- 39 Board of Studies, *History Syllabus Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1992, pp2-3; Board of Studies, *Modern History Syllabus*, Sydney, 1994, pp4-5; Board of Studies, *History Stages 4-5 Syllabus*, Sydney, 1998, p17.
- 40 Although by the 1999 Syllabus, 'invasion' had been replaced by 'contact' and 'colonisation'.
- 41 'Govt paper seeks schools reform', *SMH*, 12 December 1988.
- 42 Board of Studies, *History Syllabus Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1992, p1.
- 43 Board of Studies, *Modern History Syllabus*, Sydney, 1994, p2.
- 44 Secondary Schools Board, *History in NSW Secondary Schools Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1981; Board of Studies, *History Syllabus Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1992; Board of Studies, *Modern History Syllabus*, Sydney, 1994.
- 45 History Teachers Association of NSW Executive, 'Response to the Discussion Paper on Curricula in NSW Schools', *Teaching History*, April 1989, p23.
- 46 Carmel Young, 'History—Tomorrow', *Teaching History*, February 1991, p35; and G. Duncan, 'History, Historians in an age of anxiety', *Teaching History*, March 1992, pp1-2.
- 47 John Aquilina, 'Keynote Address to HTA Annual Conference', *Teaching History*, March 1992, p12.
- 48 Ian Steel, *Developments in History Teaching*, London, 1976.
- 49 David Kent, *op cit*, p41.
- 50 'Kids and the Constitution', *SMH*, 17 May 1994, p15.
- 51 'Canberra sets politics for years 4-10', *SMH*, 9 May 1997, p5.
- 52 Carmel Young, 'Recasting School History: For Better or For Worse', *Public History Review*, vol 7, 1998, pp12-13; Halse, *op cit*, p13; and Eileen Sedunary, 'Constructing Schooling, Constructing Nation', *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 1991.
- 53 See for instance, History Syllabus Committee (NSW), 'History and Core Curriculum', *Teaching History*, October 1981, pp57-63.
- 54 Goss repels 'invaders', *SMH*, 2 February 1994, p4.
- 55 'Teachers threaten syllabus ban', *SMH*, 26 June 1994, p9.
- 56 'The Carr way of history studies', *SMH*, 27 July 1994, p12.
- 57 'History teachers give study time a fail mark', *SMH*, 23 June 1994, p6.
- 58 'Course in history loses HSC status', *SMH*, 25 May 1996, p7.
- 59 *ibid*.
- 60 Halse, *op cit*, pp24, 67; and Kate Cameron, 'School History in NSW: a response to Alan Ryan', *AHA Bulletin*, no 88, June 1999, p21.
- 61 Clive Logan, 'History Stages 4-5 Draft Syllabus: perfect document or *diktat*?', *Teaching History*, December 1998, pp56-58.
- 62 'Kids and the Constitution', *SMH*, 17 May 1994, p15.

- 63 'Civics course for schools', *SMH*, 3 March 1995, p2.
- 64 Civics Expert Group, *Whereas the people...*, 1994, p45.
- 65 See for instance, Cameron, op cit, p21.
- 66 'History course sparks a revolution', *SMH*, 26 July 1995, p6.
- 67 Halse et al, op cit, p89.
- 68 Board of Studies, *History Syllabus Years 7-10*, Sydney, 1992, pp2-3; Board of Studies, *Modern History Syllabus*, Sydney, 1994, pp4-5; Board of Studies, *History Stages 4-5 Syllabus*, Sydney, 1998, p17; Board of Studies, *Modern History Stage 6 Syllabus*, Sydney, 1999, pp7-9.