

HAL06194

History in the making: constructions of ‘nation’ and ‘citizen’

Kelsey Halbert
PhD Candidate
James Cook University, Townsville

Citizenship education has undergone a revival in Australia over the past two decades in response to national historical milestones, such as the bicentenary of ‘settlement’, and issues such as globalisation and multiculturalism. History teaching is recognised by citizenship educators as promoting nationalism. A deconstruction of the ways in which the 2004 Queensland Senior Modern History syllabus presents ‘nation’ and ‘citizen’ raises questions about history teaching and citizenship more generally.

This paper uses poststructuralist discourse analysis to highlight the ways in which students are discursively positioned. In conjunction with the analysis, Foucault’s concepts of technologies of the self and subjectification are used as a framework for arguing the significance of positioning students of history ambivalently as subjects of a global society as well as citizens of a nation. Analytical examples illuminate the position of the citizen and diminished presence of the nation. The nation is not the dominant point of orientation in the document, which also explores issues at an individual, community and global level. This indicates a shift from knowledgeable national citizens to the fostering of social subjects with capacities such as reflection, critical analysis, tolerance and evaluation. The education of ‘social’ subjects within the history syllabus encompasses many spheres of belonging and a dynamic view of citizenship education.

The traditional devices for constructing a comprehensive view of history and for retracing the past as a patient and continuous development must be systematically dismantled... Knowledge is not made for understanding; it is made for cutting (Foucault, 1971, p. 88).

The ultimate purpose of studying history is to give meaning to our own life – a personal statement of identity (QSA, 2004, p. 2).

Since the inception of state-run, formal education, the construction of desirable citizens has been a fundamental aim of nations (Curtis, 1988). Traditionally, the teaching of history sought to foster pride in the nation and develop a sense of belonging. The recent prominence of citizenship education, and its links with History, on political agendas prompts an analysis of whether the aims outlined in History syllabi have changed with respect to citizenship. A brief overview of the complexities of nationalism and citizenship, citizenship education in Australian history and Foucault’s theories about subjectivity provides a context for analysis of nation and citizen in the 2004 Queensland Senior Modern History Syllabus.

Nations and citizens

There is extensive debate surrounding the dynamics of the nation and citizen. Historians’ definitions of nations and constitutions of the citizen contain a wide range of contradictory

perspectives (Alter, 1994; Lawrence, 2005). Thus, Lawrence, for example, notes that the nation is treated by some as 'primordial', but by others as 'banal'; by some as a 'myth', but others as a 'reality' (2005, p. 8). Guibernau (2001) defines the nation in a more concrete cultural and a political sense as "a human group conscious of forming a community, sharing a common culture, attached to a clearly demarcated territory, having a common past and a common project for the future and claiming the right to rule itself" (p. 243). Criteria for defining a nation include: common language, customs, religion and/or territory, the consciousness of being a nation, and recognised superiority of the nation (Alter, 1994). On the other hand the nation can be viewed subjectively as "an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign" (Anderson, 1991, p. 6). Nations have also been described as the "sole binding agency of meaning and justification" (Alter, 1994, p. 5),

Citizenship can be defined in broad terms as "the power to act in a certain capacity, in particular contexts, in ways which can enhance the individual and society" (Mellor, 1996, p. 72). Prior to the creation of nation-states, a citizen was by definition the inhabitant of a town or city with civic rights as a 'free man' and a contemporary citizen is also defined spatially (Mitchell, 2003). Turner claims that "modern notions of social rights have defined citizenship as primarily a political and juridical category relating to liberal individualism" (2002, p. 50). Citizenship, although affirmed daily through symbols and rhetoric, is considered taken-for granted (Anderson, 1991; Billig, 1995).

Gilbert (2001) highlights four different conceptions, these include citizenship as: a status, an identity, a public practice, and participation in decision-making. The latter conception is the more defensible in educational terms because of its emphasis on active citizens. Prior (1999) claims that recent renewal in the concept of citizenship in Australia has been driven by political agendas to the exclusion of major stakeholders: teachers, parents and students. He argues that the ideal 'good citizen' has yet to be articulated, and focus groups with teachers show that characteristics fall under three main areas: social concerns, action/participation and civic knowledge.

Educating citizens; building a nation

As Curtis argues in relation to the wider European and American experience, modes of social regulation were central to the formation of schools, as institutions capable of "strengthening their [students] capacities for independence and reflection" (Curtis, 1988 p. 17). These capacities are imbedded in all aspects of schooling, and have been formally recognised as citizenship education.

In Australia, citizenship education has been embedded in the history curriculum since federation and there continues to be many interpretations of its role. John Hirst, Chair of the Civic Education Group, believes that history has double purpose: firstly, to "illuminate our institutions" and secondly, to make civics a "human and interesting story (Meredyth & Thomas, 1999, p. 2). Stuart Macintyre, Chair of the Civics Expert Group responsible for the 1994 report *Whereas the People*, makes the link between changing notions of international and Australian citizenship and the role of historical study. He claims, "we can try to understand the new circumstances historically, tracing their trajectories, interrogating the claims of their enthusiasts, making use of what we have done and learnt in order to plot the path into the future" (Macintyre, 1996, p. 61). Recently, many commentators have argued for a balance of cultural, national and global identifications within citizenship education (Banks, 2001; Reid, 2001).

There is debate between History academics and professionals about conceptions of History as 'traditional' and lacking contemporary relevance, and History as a source of life skills and social knowledge which builds the conceptual understandings necessary to confront future change. The "emphasise on history as essential knowledge in itself is likely to remain

contentious” (Meredyth & Thomas, 1999, p. 11). Analysis of the citizenship skills (as distinct from knowledge) imbedded within the history syllabus may illuminate its future role in the curriculum.

History: a discipline under a Foucauldian Lens

Informed by Foucault’s theories of subjectivity, governmentality, and technologies of self, I deconstruct taken-for-granted meanings within the document, not to provide directions on how to teach history but to illuminate how particular citizenship characteristics position subjects. Subjectification refers to “the particular, historically located, disciplinary processes and concepts which enable us to consider ourselves as individual subjects and which constrains us from thinking otherwise” (McHoul & Grace, 1993, p. 3). My main concern here is to demonstrate the way the syllabus establishes conditions for self recognition, or “the way in which the subject constitutes itself in an active fashion, by the practices of the self”(Howarth, 2000, p. 80).

The process of identification itself can be understood using Foucault’s concept of technologies of self. There are three elements of technologies of the self, the first being ‘disclosure of self’, which refers to the capacity to know who you are and what you identify with to yourself and others. Second, ‘examination of self and conscience’, which is the capacity to judge ones own actions and reflect on them. This is the ethical and moral dimension of technologies of self. Third, the element which Foucault termed ‘remembering’, which is the capacity to verify whether familiar discourses will allow the subject to confront new events (Foucault, 1984). In brief, technologies of self are “procedures which prescribe how the subject is to going to define, maintain and develop their identity” with an aim of self-control and self-awareness (Andersen, 2003, p. 25). Analysis of the history syllabus will show how practices of governmentality, such as technologies of self and technologies of domination, “foster and attribute various capacities, qualities and statuses to particular agents” (Dean, 1999, p. 32).

My analysis of the history syllabus using these concepts, is made as an Australian citizen, who has adopted the roles and responsibilities promoted within the institutions in which I have been positioned. The following analysis is also necessarily limited by, and to, the ‘bodies of knowledge’ I possess - bodies of knowledge I have acquired as part of my education within, among other contexts, the discipline of History. Thus, inescapably, I stand within the very discursive regime I seek to critically explore and, in some sense stand outside. Also, I wish to make explicit the boundaries I have worked within as a researcher. I do not comment on the document’s production, the possible outcomes and effects or the many outside factors that would influence implementation in schools such as teacher’s engagement with the curriculum, and the background experiences of families and students. Social changes will also shape the interpretation of the document because the study of history is a practice undertaken in a particular present (Green & Reid, 2002).

A sense of identity and belonging is fundamental to how individuals function in society and construct our world. The teaching of History can be seen as centrally concerned with putting into circulation an array of discourses constituting the social world, including the nation and the citizen as objects of knowledge. More importantly, students and teachers interact with concepts from which knowledge of self might be formed and influence citizenship in the future.

Students as social subjects - analysis of ‘the citizen’

Given the demands on history evident in the literature, it is not surprising that there are tensions in the syllabus. Within the syllabus, multiple discourses construct the student not only as a national citizen but as a social subject more broadly. The concept of ‘social subjects’ plays a

key role in my analysis and may be broadly understood as the constitution of students as part of, and examiners of, society.

The citizenship aims espoused at key points in the document include the cultivation of social responsibility and the take up of universal moral values. Not surprisingly, there are important continuities with previous syllabi in the desirable skills and qualities for students to develop as future participants in society. However, the goals are broader than simply the creation of national citizens. Several of the issues addressed in the syllabus and some of the critical and reflective practices students are encouraged to adopt go against traditional citizenship aims of loyalty to a nation and obedience to the rules of that nation based simply on their existence.

The construction of the range of subject positions presented to students, and the practices through which they are encouraged to take them up (or reject them) are distributed unevenly through the syllabus. The syllabus itself is structured thematically with a rationale and possible inquiry topics provided for each theme. Each thematic outline is divided into five aspects of inquiry and inquiry questions are provided under those sections. These include: definitions; sources; backgrounds, changes and continuities; effects, interests and arguments; and reflection and responses. Generalised positions, with strong normative inflections, are found in the rationale with a more complex array of specific positions outlined in the content of each theme. Finally the assessment section, other than privileging certain knowledges, contains little reference to social subjects.

Citizenship aims

Specific aims listed in the rationale and exemplified below are imbedded with key terms that are used without definition, and thus, effectively draw on assumed commonsense meanings. Thus, for instance, the opening phrase [of?] includes the term “society’s citizens” (QSA, 2004, p. 1).. It offers no definition of either ‘society’ or ‘citizen’. Such terms are richly complex, and the range of meanings; and the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary’s* suggestion that society is ‘an ordered community’ barely begins to scratch the surface. More subtly, however, the formulation, ‘society’s citizens’ itself, by allowing ‘society’ to exercise possession tacitly constitutes ‘society’ as a ‘collective subject’, endowed with some of the capacities otherwise associated with persons or corporate entities.

“Students can become: more knowledgeable, effective, constructive and committed participants in personal, professional and civic life” (p. 1). Various attributes such as “constructive and ethical” (p. 1) – particularly drawn from economic and moral discourses – are made explicit in the syllabus as desirable goals of Modern History. “Constructive” is a term interpreted as *servicing a useful purpose*, which implies that some actions are more purposeful than others. This meaning leads to highlight further attributes deemed ‘useful’ and explore why they are constructive and for whom. “Effective” participation is another attribute deemed desirable for subjects of the syllabus. Although the term remains undefined throughout the syllabus, ‘effective’ is defined by the Oxford dictionary, as *successful in producing a desired or intended result*. This acknowledges that participation as a goal in itself is not enough, but rather subjects are encouraged to participate in certain ways which are articulated by the document and the institutions of governmentality it represents. The words “effective” and “participation” are repeatedly used together within the rationale – a significant section of the document in articulating citizenship beliefs. “Effective” or “effectively” is used four times within the rationale. “Effective” is not used within the seven global aims, however, words such as “proficient” and “proficiency” appear and “understand/ing” is used seven times.

“Committed” is another desirable attribute, which links, both in accepted meaning and through collocation, to loyalty, responsibility and dedication. “Commitment” and “dedication” are used in similar ways within the document and associate the meaning of words often used in

conjunction in broader discourses, for example, ‘loyalty’ and ‘responsibility’ as in a marital agreement. These same qualities are invoked by “committed students”. However, the term is used generally with reference to all areas of life and not in relation to a particular individual, occupation or ‘Australian citizen’.

“Students can become: more reflective, responsible and sensitive citizens, parents, workers, managers, entrepreneurs, consumers and investors” (p. 1). This use of “reflective” as being able to think about yourself and others actions, motivations and feelings is similar to the same quality in technologies of self which examines one’s self and conscience and is a key element of the syllabus. Traditional citizenship aims of instilling social control and moral principles are evident throughout the rationale, although in theory these are developed independently by the student as a social subject and not made into clear directions such as right and wrong. The syllabus acknowledges that concepts and events are complex and require analytical qualities, such as reflection. Reflecting as an educated social subject in order to make the ‘right’ decision and critically analysing a situation ‘objectively’ are not the same functions. The above use of “reflective” and its context implies self control on the part of social subjects through a reflection on consequences of one’s actions.

“Responsible” is defined as *having an obligation to do something or having control or care for someone, as part of one’s job or role*. Governmentality seeks to align the will of those in control with the will of the subjects within that society (c.f. Lempke, 2000). The syllabus takes responsibility as an unquestionable positive attribute. The above phrase does not indicate whether social subjects are responsible for themselves, their immediate family, community or the society as a whole. The subject positions listed following the attributes “citizens, parents, workers, managers” can all be interpreted as productive – even that of a parent as a producer of future citizens and, thus, physical and intellectual capital. In the context of the aims, as a whole, the meaning associated with responsibility is confined to productivity and construction. The scope of responsibility is interpreted by the type of positions listed (they are not the subject positions of only a parent) and responsibility is clarified as economic by the specific nature of the roles. The subjects mentioned have control and care for the economic well-being of the society, not necessarily physical or emotional care. Production is, therefore, privileged as the main activity of social subjects.

“Sensitive” is another attribute promoted which constitutes harmonious subjects. The word refers to *having or displaying a quick and delicate appreciation of others feelings* (Oxford Dictionary). “Sensitive” subjects would perhaps be those who appreciated the poorer economic situation of others and displayed feelings of social welfare. More importantly, sensitivity can be interpreted as maximizing subjects’ capacities for social harmony and conflict management. “Sensitive” is generally an attribute that can be added to a bank of moral qualities, which like “reflective” and “responsible”, foster self-government and ordered society.

“Students will: develop the knowledge, abilities and ethical commitment to participate as active citizens in the shaping of the future” (p. 6). The degree to which ‘active citizenship’ is emphasised in the global aims is restricted to one of the seven. The explanation of this aim includes: “help students approach the challenge of making a better future with realistic, informed enthusiasm”. “Enthusiasm” is qualified as “realistic”. This use of “realistic” seems at odds with the terms “enthusiasm” and notions of the “future”. Firstly, enthusiasm is predominantly an emotion unlike realistic, which pertains to information and rational thought. Also, it is virtually impossible to determine ‘realistic’ views of the future when it is unknown.

Use of metaphor

Textual features present within the ‘non-content’ areas of the syllabus include metaphor and imagery which impact on how societies and students are viewed. The phrase “processes shape societies” uses the imagery of sculpture, which positions a society as a physical entity, not just

a conceptual one (p. 1). The use of “shape” links to the repeated use of “constructive” throughout the rationale. The discourse of construction, for example, ‘building on knowledge’, ‘constructing understanding’, and ‘moulding ideas’ is common in the sphere of education and the articulation of thought processes. The metaphor of travel is also used within the syllabus as a positive outcome of Modern History in that “students can widen their horizons (p. 1)”. Travel is associated with freedom whereas school is a structured experience – as reflected in the layout of the document itself. The phrase attributes the subject a sense of self direction and agency in the process of learning. The student of Modern History is perceived to be on a ‘journey’ as discussed further in the following section.

Positioning of the teacher as a responsible social subject

Apart from students, teachers are also being positioned to identify with the desirable qualities of a ‘good teacher’. The syllabus document contains a first person narrative of a student as s/he progresses through the two year Modern History course (pp. 21-24). The student describes their enthusiasm for Modern History and the cumulative skills of the course. This directly targets teachers and perhaps a wider community who would be judging the merits of Modern History. The narrative positions the teacher of modern history, as described by the student, very favourably. The narrative is indirectly rendering the teacher a responsible social subject. For example, throughout the narrative the teacher exhibits behaviours, which include: showing a variety of sources, linking past events and current issues, emphasising critical literacy and being critical of the set text. The student displays an enthusiasm in the phrases “really enjoyed the major assignments”, “I love arguing” and “I see that history helped me develop life skills” (p. 23). These phrases seem to inspire constructivist, ‘meaningful’ teaching. It is the only time pedagogy is suggested to the teacher, and in an indirect and powerful way. The inclusion of such a powerful device links to Foucault’s theory of governmentality. Attributes such as creativity, passion, and motivation which the teacher finds desirable are aligned with the role teachers are encouraged to adopt (Vick & Donovan, 2005).

Moral values as technologies of self

Technologies of the self, as mentioned in the earlier discussion of theory, are promoted in the syllabus. One example of this, is the techniques of moral judgment. The word “ethical/ly” – either *referring to a set of moral principles or the knowledge dealing with moral situations* – appears in the rationale twice, as does the term “equity”. The term “values” is used six times in the first two pages of the rationale. This highlights the place of values in the syllabus, as a continuation of the role values play in the SOSE syllabus. Furthermore, selected values can be seen as desirable qualities for social subjects to acquire. Based solely on the document – and not its varied application – there appears to be a relatively open and critical evaluation process. The emphasis is on the students’ own evaluation of values as they arise., for example: “**gaining a critical understanding of the values underpinning both the study of social behaviour and the actions of those within society**”(p. 1). Students’ capacities are developed by comparing their beliefs and actions to those of other subjects. They are to become: “**more aware of the importance of values and beliefs, and how differences can be identified, understood and perhaps resolved**” (p. 1). The Syllabus also states that: “**we must be able to make wise decisions**” (p. 3). This use of “wise” is open-ended depending on the values attached to its interpretation. Also, the terms “be able to” imply that there is still individual agency. The term “we” is also varied in its scope, as it could pertain to teachers alone or those who teach and study Modern History, yet its context suggests it refers to all of humanity.

Within the rationale, the syllabus acknowledges that: “**Values of individual students should be explored and evaluated in a constructive and critical way**”(p. 2). Critical analysis is a dominant process encouraged throughout the syllabus. Critical analysis contains implicit social value judgments about which issues are worth studying. Promoting an evaluation of values emphasises the skill of reflection. In the subjectification of social subjects it is important

to note which values are criticised and which are encouraged. Only global values such as social justice, peace and sustainability are encouraged within the themes, others are not judged. As evidenced by the aims of the syllabus, social subjects must reflect, evaluate and then decide on a set of values. This process is referred to as “refining their own values commitments” or “enhancing their personal values framework”.

The rationale suggests Modern History is also the study of consequences: “**Making effective [successful] decisions requires an understanding of any far-reaching ramifications of actions occurring in a particular social and historical context**” (p. 2). These form a platform for the development of technologies of self. The historical process prescribes to social subjects how to define their values with the aim of self control. The use of the term “ramifications” in the place of consequences has added meaning. A “ramification” is a *consequence of an action or event, especially when complex or unwelcome*. Understanding “ramifications”, therefore, requires more ‘in depth’ thought and analysis than comprehending the cause and effect. Many events studied in history, particularly those which focus on war, are deemed unwelcome.

Reflection on the themes

Given the degree of analysis incorporated into historical process, a critical and constructive analysis of the themes (areas/topics proposed for study) is necessary. Foucault’s theory of normalisation offers a lens through which to explore the choice of themes and any implicit value judgements. The document does privilege some themes and issues, but maintains a relatively broad scope. Analysis focuses on the subjectification of social subjects, promotion of technologies of self and issues of governmentality and citizenship within each theme.

“Studies of conflict” is not limited to notions of war, also examining social and cultural conflict and debates. Particular mention is made of “moral issues”, and although this term is unspecified, it does show that studies of conflict provide a vehicle through which to evaluate the actions and motivations of social subjects. This social analysis may be focused on the desirable attributes, or lack of them, mentioned earlier in the document. “Studies of conflict” is juxtaposed with the next theme, “Studies of hope”, perhaps in an attempt to provide a ‘balanced’ view of social interactions. In the example work plans included, both themes are used in conjunction with each other. Most inquiry topics suggested within “Studies of hope” are based on ethical issues. For example, movements in the areas of human rights and child labour. This theme promotes “human and/or ecological well-being” (p. 29) and, therefore, ethical and moral social subjects, not purely national citizens. Social subjects here are referenced against some assumed universal humanity, rather than national identities or loyalties.

The reflection section of “The history of ideas and beliefs”, poses a question warranting analysis: “**Has the study of this idea helped you live more purposefully, ethically or effectively?**” (p. 30). The document is directly asking whether some citizenship aims have been achieved, and through the process of reflection, promote a critical aspect of technologies of self. “Studies of co-operation” poses the same question as it also focuses on values formation. Distinctively, all instances of co-operation are not viewed as positive. The section “Effects, interests and arguments” suggests: “**Whose interests were not served by the example in question?**” (p. 31).

The next theme, “The history of everyday life”, is a theme not included in the Queensland history syllabi prior to 2004. Seen through a Foucauldian lens, daily life is not normalised to the extent that it is not included as a relevant theme for study, however, different values and events present within the lives of students must not be subjected to normalisation. The teacher has the power to condone certain events or values as normal and others as outside the ‘norm’. Also an issue within this theme is the recurring idea of ‘progress’. Students are asked whether the study indicates progress in regards to the way people have lived their everyday lives. ‘Progress’ is

positioned here as positive and various interpretations of progress are not addressed. The following theme, “Studies of power”, also asks whether “you think that this use of power was a progressive one historically?” (p. 33). ‘Progressive’, in this instance, may be asking students to evaluate the historical event ethically. The possible inquiry topics position power as belonging to ‘others’ – individuals, groups and societies – rather than using the topic to develop active citizenship by giving the social subject individual empowerment. This positioning constitutes the world in particular ways, around particular notions of what power is and what its moral significance is, with implications for individual ethical action.

The theme, “Studies of Diversity”, promotes attributes such as tolerance by exploring ‘multiculturalism’ and social change. Within the definitions section the syllabus asks: **What is society? (p. 34)**. This is the first instance where the syllabus sets out to define social systems and how social subjects develop different identities. “Multiculturalism” and “culture” are not raised as terms requiring further definition even though they are equally as problematic as “society” and “diversity”. Like other themes, students are asked here to reflect: **Has this study helped you make decisions about your own life – especially how to live more purposefully, ethically and effectively? (p. 34)**. Again the decision-making aspect of technologies of self is being fostered.

The following theme, “People and environments in history”, is centred on the values of ecological sustainability and issues which threaten the environment such as: land use, modern consumer society and the impact of the automobile. It is desirable for social subjects to live in harmony with the natural environment. Like “Studies of diversity” students are asked to reflect on their decision making process. The themes “Local history” and “The individual in history” focus more directly – rather than simply instilling values – on active citizenship historically and presently. A sense of belonging to a social group and active participation on behalf of that group is positioned as a desirable quality by the syllabus. Within “The individual in History”, inquiry topics such as “your own history”, “a local identity” and “family history” focus on contributions made to that society. At the same time, the study is a process of subjectification as students develop identities based around their family, school, and local area. For example, the reflection question within ‘Local History’: **“What did you learn about yourself and about groups in society as a result of studying this inquiry topic?” (p. 37)**. This development allows students to express ‘who they are’. This sense of identity – of having a sense of ‘who they are’ that can be expressed – is, as Hunter shows in *Culture and Government* (1988), one of the outcomes of the array of deliberate activities in the cultivating the self to which the term ‘technologies of the self’ refers.

The theme, “Studies of change”, is an assertion of a key citizenry aim of the rationale which requires students to be able to respond, adapt and if necessary create change. An historical study of different changes provides the social subject with a bank of experience on which to reflect and draw on in an ever-changing social environment. A “reflection” question asks: **“Has this study helped you to understand your own life and the forces that affect it?” (p. 40)**. The following theme, “History and futures”, is linked closely with the concept of change. Inquiry topics explore how changes on all levels of society will affect the future. This theme is an attempt to use skills such as critical analysis, reflection and decision making and a future perspective of moral, economic and ecological issues in previous themes. The inclusion of this theme seems to be a response to the questioned relevance of modern history study. Social subjects are developing the technologies of self equipped to deal with change.

The new syllabus transforms traditional notions of the citizen as a national subject. Instead, qualities such as responsibility, reflection, empathy, sustainability, constructive, active, critical and sensitive are presented as the ideals of a social subject. The need to justify the place of history in contemporary society may reflect the emphasis on understanding social systems and social skills – skills that will equip subjects for change, interaction on many levels and importantly self-governance. Technologies fostered include decision making, analysis of

ramifications, reflection on actions and the establishment of values. With regard to the citizen the syllabus reflects the perceived needs for the future and changes in national identity, literacy and cultural and economic interaction evident in the literature.

History as a global denominator- analysis of the nation

So far, I have argued that the syllabus constitutes the 'social subject' with self-governance and desirable moral qualities. The nation is limited to one of many social spheres to which the subject belongs, rather than emphasising national citizenship. Like the analysis of citizen this emphasis on a range of social settings, including nations, will be explored as they are represented in the rationale, aims and themes.

Within the rationale, "social systems" is the dominant term of reference. On the first page of text alone, the terms "society/societies" or "social" are used twenty-two times. In comparison, the word "nation/s", is used only once on the first page as one of a list which also includes other social groups and classes. Nations are acknowledged as a form of division and a source of resource distribution issues. This emphasises the shift from national to social outcomes in the current syllabus. According to the Modern History syllabus (2004), as one of the social sciences, the focus is on society in general rather than separate nations exclusively. However, 'society' has various interpretations, which alter the breadth of the term. According to *The Oxford Dictionary* (again used as a reference for discussion and not 'truth') society is a mass noun, which refers to *the aggregate of people living together in a more or less ordered community*. This interpretation can be linked to notions of governmentality and disciplined subjects by its reference to order. A different perception views a society as *the community of people living in a particular country or region*. The focus is geographical, similar to nation as defined by its territory. Finally, a society could also refer to *a specified section of a community* and, therefore, have less relevance as a term encompassing all the subjects implied in the syllabus. The use of the term in the syllabus is all encompassing and so excludes the third interpretation. Society is not defined geographically within the syllabus either. At no point is "society" positioned implicitly as Australia.

Within society, structures are identified and distinctions between individuals and larger structures are made, but with no specific reference to nations. Also, various social levels are identified; for example: "**personal, professional and civic life**" (p. 1). Thus, social systems are defined on a continuum from local to global in the selection of themes and inquiry topics. Rather than elaborating what this means in terms of one particular society (such as Australia), the document continues with general – indeed, generic – distinctions that might also apply to all modern societies, such as: "**public and private life**" (p. 1) and "**social processes... at the collective and individual levels**" (p. 1).

Global awareness

The syllabus rationale states that: students can become: more sensitive to the interdependencies between the social, cultural, political, environmental and ethical aspects of experience (p. 2). This statement acknowledges five spheres of experience, of which political participation as an Australian citizen is only one aspect. Use of the term "experience" at the end of the sentence highlights interaction with all these social structures rather than just awareness of their existence. Social competence, political involvement (or at least understanding), environmental appreciation and sustainability, and moral responsibility are all goals of citizenship which are evident in the literature. While the statement is undoubtedly promoting engagement with these dimensions within society it is not limited to national boundaries. The aim that follows in the rationale is that: students can become more able to grasp the sort of tensions that arise when a social system operates in a way that may seem at odds with its sustainability and the natural environment (p. 2). This links to national citizenship aims of sustainability yet has application on a local and global scale as well.

“Studying Modern History can help us live more effectively as global citizens” (p. 3). As mentioned in the literature (Banks 2001; Heater 2002), global citizenship is a component of citizenship education deemed necessary to equip students for future social interactions. The term “global” de-emphasises the nation as superior and recasts traditional national identities. This is further argument that despite the literature that supports the fostering of national citizenship, it is not as evident as in previous syllabus documents. The collective term “us” is used in the place of previous references to “students”. This terminology has the effect of fostering unity and cohesion. Its contextual link to the term “global” suggests the particular “us” invoked is humanity as a whole, although this is not explicitly stated. “We” and “our” are terms also used in most sentences on the third page of the document.

The literature on the traditional purpose of history mentions its role in forming the elusive ‘Australian identity’. This section is entitled “Learning through studying Modern History” and is a continuation of the rationale. The whole section positions the study of history as beneficial to all humanity. Skills identified as enhanced through the study of Modern History are viewed as necessary for everyday life. To some extent this section is justifying Modern History’s place in the curriculum and responding to the challenge posed in the literature such as a perceived lack of vocational focus and of relevance. Although ‘knowledge, skills and values’ are mentioned as the key offerings of Modern History, this justification focuses on skills, reflecting a shift from perceiving the study of history as simply gaining knowledge about the past. Skills, already identified as desirable for the social subject in the previous chapter, include: understanding change and continuity, critical inquiry, debate and reflection, empathetic engagement with others and capacity to make judgements. Developing a sense of nationhood is not presented in this justification.

The nation as a theme

The themes will be discussed focusing on their reference to nations and other spheres of belonging, the degree to which nations are used as entities for study, and how the themes address the issues of nationalism, globalisation and ‘multiculturalism’ as raised in the literature. Themes such as “Studies of Hope”, are universal, promoting tolerance with little national reference. “The history of everyday life” does not feature nations as an entity, although spheres of belonging are attached to some social institutions such as school and healthcare. Everyday aspects of life are universalised, such as playing and being entertained, and forming groups and working. “The individual in History” is a theme also free from national boundaries.

Some themes are dominated by ‘nation’, going against the broader contexts present within the rationale. This focus is not unexpected due to the dominance of the nation-state in international politics, culture and conflict. A theme such as “National History” directly focuses on the emergence of the nation-state and, therefore, suggested inquiry topics require a choice between which nations to study. This theme is drawn from previous Modern History syllabi in which nationalism and the study of individual nations was prominent (BSSSS, 1995). Another theme focused on nations as the main form of identification is “Studies of Conflict”. Issues of conflict are either uniquely ‘Australian’ or concern conflicts between two or more nations.

Theme four, “Studies of cooperation”, is dominated by inter-*national* organisations such as the United Nations, the Olympic movement, the European Union and the Commonwealth of Nations. The other fifty percent of suggested topics such as trade unions, women’s movements are not agreements between nations but are in most instances national organizations. “Studies of power” mentions the “nation” in only two of the thirteen suggested inquiry topics. These are: **power relationships among nations or within region and economic power at the national and international level (p. 33)**. However, discussion of other topics such as communism, institutional power and resistance movements would inevitably refer to particular national

examples. Finally, “History and historians: theories and standpoints”, suggests the study of uniquely Australian sources and historians for a majority of the case studies.

Reference to other spheres of belonging

The sixteen themes within the syllabus cover a diverse spectrum of local, national and global topics. Students’ identity formation as social subjects and sense of belonging has several layers geographically and institutionally. In previous syllabi, nations and the relationships between nations (i.e. internationalism) was a main topic of study. The theme entitled “Local History” is evidence of the relevance of the environment, identities, changes and ideas in students’ local areas. This is the society that students engage with at a personal level. The “school-based” theme is also an opportunity to develop a sense of belonging at a micro level. “National history” is the only theme devoted to the study of nations exclusively. “History and the global perspective” completes the continuum from local to global spheres of belonging. The syllabus acknowledges the global scale of institutions, marketing and popular culture by including them as inquiry topics.

“Studies of Conflict” is a theme which can be interpreted between nations or within nations. The example of work plans provided in the syllabus (pp. 15-17) show differing topics based on conflict. One example is focused on “international conflict” and one on “land and freedom”, an issue within nations. “The history of ideas and beliefs” covers a range of economic, religious, political and environmental spheres of society. Within the theme “Studies of power” the syllabus states that: **“over time individuals, groups and societies have attempted to control and legitimise the use of power” (p. 33)**. Notably the term “societies” is used rather than nations. This term links to earlier references which emphasised social subjects rather than national citizens.

“People and environments in history” is a theme that, like “The history of everyday life”, is universal. Perhaps it is no coincidence that the outline precedes that of “History and the global perspective” as all suggested inquiry topics are global issues. Some agricultural or forest case studies are associated with particular nations, however, the focus is on the global environment. The theme “Studies of Change” is another example of various levels and spheres of society. Change is examined on a local, national and global level and within aspects of religion, technology, culture and gender status. “History and Futures” is another theme which explores all levels of society – mostly global – and how they may be influenced in the future. Like most themes, the title itself denotes universal significance rather than limiting study to ‘Future Australia’.

Issues of nationalism, globalisation and multiculturalism

“National History” and “The History of Ideas and Beliefs” are themes which allow the phenomenon of nationalism to be explored in depth. “National History” focuses on instances of nationalism by suggesting inquiry of past and contemporary nationalist struggles, whereas the concept and the history of the term is explored in the later theme. Inquiry into the concepts of “Globalism” and “Multiculturalism” is also suggested in “The History of Ideas and Beliefs”. Exploring the historians and theories associated with the ‘isms’ and critically analysing the benefits and resistance is relevant for students. The syllabus presents each as problematic and as an interpretation of events, not an inevitable force or state of existence. This inclusion of two fundamental ideas (globalisation and multiculturalism), which influence the nation as a concept dramatically, reinforces arguments in the literature and rationale of the document calling for global citizenship education.

“Studies of diversity” specifically inquires into issues of ‘multiculturalism’ and ethnic diversity. Most case studies suggested refer to Australian cultures, attitudes and Indigenous heritage. Many cultures are referred to and not just based on national origins. These include:

youth cultures and subcultures, mainstream culture and political, religious, sexual and racial diversity. As mentioned in the previous chapter, “multiculturalism” is not included under the “definitions” section, suggesting that the term does not need further clarification. “History and the global perspective: theories and standpoints” deals exclusively with global issues and concepts of trans-national importance. The word “perspective”, according to the syllabus glossary refers to: “**A point of view or standpoint from which historical events, problems and issues are analysed**” (p. 65). Possible inquiry topics include: “global impacts of regional trends”, “economic globalisation”, “globalisation and popular culture” and specifically “globalism and the nation-state”. Throughout historical debate, the term “globalisation” is used inconsistently to refer to a force, a concept and, in some cases, a justification. The syllabus has avoided multiple use of the term however, and this is an issue not made explicit in the document for teacher awareness.

The themes are either, in some instances directly concerned with local, national or global issues, or they allow scope within them to explore all three. Additional to the geographical focus, different spheres of social life are explored such as politics, religion, economics, military involvements. Furthermore, a distinction is made in the rationale and theme selection between personal/individual/private and universal/public concerns. There is a direct link between the literature surrounding the deconsolidation of the nation in today’s society and its decreased focus in the new syllabus. In this way, the syllabus reflects societal change and predicted future needs. Traditionally, history has been distinct from sociology because of its focus on particular events rather than social themes, however, the current syllabus contains collective terminology, reflection, and decreased focus on specific content in the place of universal concerns.

Conclusions: A history with a future

Producing citizens is an overarching aim of educational institutions in general. Social and cultural change on a global scale is changing the concept of the nation and, in response, the aims of citizenship education. The social sciences have always, and continue to be, a platform for instilling values, knowledge and skills ‘required’ for participation in society. The history of citizenship education in Australia shows the significance of the discipline of history in achieving these aims. The content, organisation and values which underpin the 2004 Queensland Modern History Senior Syllabus may be seen as a response to the problems Modern History faces within school settings and broader economic and social spheres identified in the literature (Banks, 2001; Macintyre, 1996; Mellor, 1996; Meredyth & Thomas, 1999).

Analysis of the current history syllabus disputes the argument that the nation is the sole agency of meaning and signals a conceptual change to broader themes. It reflects increased identification with a global community, and increased responsibility for individual and societal welfare rather than national objectives. Since the syllabus’ publication in 2004, continuing terrorism, industrial reform, superannuation changes, technological advances and supra-national organisations all reinforce individual and global responsibilities to ongoing social change. Characteristics and technologies of the ‘social subject’ include being: sensitive, understanding of diversity, responsible, ethical, active, critical, and aware of local, national and global spheres of belonging. Topics and methods of inquiry in the syllabus strengthen student’s capacities for independence and reflection, positioning the citizen as self-regulatory, and socially aware. The perceptions of students and teachers remains to be seen, however, these capacities within the syllabus document present a legitimate future for the teaching of history beyond historical knowledge or even nation-building. Ultimately, the 2004 Queensland Modern History Senior Syllabus creates social subjects equipped with technologies to critique and react to change.

The nation is still undoubtedly a strong phenomenon, but in this particular document, which informs citizenship educators, the prominence of national citizens and histories has diminished.

This state-based syllabus is more aligned with global and individual demands rather than regional and national identities.

References

- Alter, P. (1994). *Nationalism*. London: Arnold.
- Andersen, N. (2003). *Discursive Analytical strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luchmann*. Bristol: Polity Press.
- Anderson, B. (1991). *Inmaged Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Banks, J. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity. *Journal of teacher education*, 52(1), 5-16.
- Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Curtis, B. (1988). *Building the Educational State: Canada West 1836-1871*. London: The Althouse Press.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Governmentality: Power and Rule in Modern Society*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Foucault, M. (1971). Nietzsche, Genealogy, History. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (pp. 76-100). New York: Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1984). The Ethics of the concern of the self as a practice of freedom. In P. Rabinow (Ed.), *Michel Foucault: ethics, subjectivity, truth* (pp. 281-301). New York: The New Press.
- Gilbert, R. (2001). Education for active and informed citizenship. In R. Gilbert (Ed.), *Studying Society and Environment: A guide for teachers* (pp. 113-126). Tuggerah: Social Science Press.
- Green, B., & Reid, J. (2002). Constructing the teacher and schooling the nation. *History of Education Review*, 31(2), 32-40.
- Guibernau, M. (2001). Globalisation and the nation-state. In M. Guibernau & J. Hutchinson (Eds.), *Understanding Nationalism* (pp. 242-269). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Howarth, D. (2000). *Discourse*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Lawrence, P. (2005). *Nationalism: History and Theory*. Harlow: Pearson Press.
- Macintyre, S. (1996). Diversity, citizenship and the curriculum. In K. Kennedy (Ed.), *New Challenges for citizenship education* (pp. 23-28). Canberra: Australian Curriculum Studies Association.
- McHoul, A., & Grace, W. (1993). *A Foucault Primer: Discourse, Power and the Subject*. Melbourne: Melbourne University Press.
- Mellor, S. (1996). What can history contribute to the development of a citizenship curriculum. *Unicorn*, 22(1), 72-80.
- Meredyth, D., & Thomas, J. (1999). A civics excursion: ends and means for old and new citizenship education. *History of Education Review*, 28(2), 1-15.
- Mitchell, K. (2003). Educating the citizen in neoliberal times: from the multicultural self to the strategic cosmopolitan. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 28(4), 387-403.
- Prior, W. (1999). Concepts of citizens: teachers' perceptions of civics and citizenship education. *Social Educator*, 17(2), 5-15.
- QSA. (2004). *Modern History Senior Syllabus*. Brisbane: The State of Queensland.
- Reid, A. (2001). Public Education in a Globalising World. *Unicorn*, 27(2), 36.
- Turner, B. (2002). Cosmopolitan virtue, globalisation and patriotism. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(1-2), 45-63.