

International Education and Social Studies in Korea

Je-Hun Ryu

Korea National University of Education

International education in Korea is now in its infancy. It is only in the late 1980s that specialists in education perceived the emergent national need for international education at schools. How to educate young students who can adapt to a rapidly internationalizing society draws attention from the contemporary specialists in education, especially in Social Studies.

A variety of definitions of international education in other countries implies that we Koreans need to develop our own perspective and contents suited to our new role in the world. However, development of our own perspective and contents involves the difficult and painful job of value judgement.

What couples the problem of value judgement in international education at schools is the unsettled dispute about the nature of subjects and underlying principles of curriculum design in Social Studies. This is why I propose that Social Studies educators should work to penetrate an international perspective, where appropriate, into all of the Social Studies courses. Social Studies curricula need to be reevaluated for international content, goals, perspective and pedagogical strategies. Such evaluations should include not only courses on world history and world geography but also Korean geography, Korean history and moral education.

As a short-cut to initiate a curriculum movement toward international education in Social Studies in Korea, I suggest a geography's pivotal role in the curriculum movement by bringing geographic perspective into history and introducing value perspective into geography. I maintain that only with value perspective alive in geography, world geography per se can provide a synthetic viewpoint that will integrate other subjects into so-called Social Studies in terms of international education. In order to develop a synthetic perspective, geography needs to demonstrate its relationships with other disciplines, especially history and economics.

I. Introduction

International education in Korea is now in its infancy. It is only in the late 1980s that specialists in education perceived the emergent national need for international education at schools. As they achieve economic development by increasing export, Korean people found themselves living in a global age that countries are increasingly interdependent, and diversifying their roles in the global society. The explosive growth in the volume of international tourism and T.V. documentary programs on foreign areas in the late 1980s parallels the increase of popular demand for international education in Korea. How to educate young students who can adapt to a rapidly internationalizing society now draws attention from the specialists in education, especially in Social Studies (Kang 1988).

As so-called Social Studies are expected to play a major role in international education at schools, this is the time to think about some possible future directions of Social Studies in Korea. Before laying out our own goals and guidelines for international education in Korea, it will be necessary to examine various aspects and problems concerning international education in other countries, such as the United States, the United Kingdom or Japan. Because these countries are far ahead in the experience of internationalizing curriculum and textbooks in Social Studies, there must be much to be learned from them.

Unfortunately, there has not been any consensus about the nature of subjects and underlying principles of curriculum in Social Studies. Due to its dualism in the research phenomena and approaches, geography, in particular, fell in the most awkward position in relation to other fields such as history and civics. As revealed already in other countries, international education itself is a difficult subject to be reflected in the curriculum and textbooks of Social Studies. Therefore, the infusion of international education into curriculum and textbooks in Social Studies may be doubly a difficult task, but a burden we cannot avoid. I describe it as a "double burden", because it involves the critical evaluation of Social Studies in general.

Discussing Social Studies in general on the one hand and proposing international education in Social Studies on the other may drive us in danger of blurring our focus on the topic, international education and Social Studies in Korea. However, I hope that this kind of

dual task should generate the critical mind of examining the nature of Social Studies and geography's role in it. In the discussion on the ideal type of international education in Social Studies, I will attempt to find a rationale for geographic education to occupy the core of Social Studies.

II. National and Popular Demand for International Education in Korea

After World War II, Korea was nothing but a "new-born" country, liberated from Japanese colonialism. Accordingly, nation-building became a national motto for Korean people. Nationalism, anti-communism, and westernism provided a major perspective for Koreans to look at the world order. What "foreign" meant to Koreans until the 1960s was roughly Western or American. Western countries including the United States were esteemed as ideals of nation-building in Korea.

Until the 1960s Korea had to receive a variety of aids from the United States as well as the United Nations for her social and economic development (Han 1987, 8). As Korea made a remarkable success in economic development in the 1970s, Korea's role in the world began to change rapidly. Korea improved her status from an underdeveloped country towards one of the "NICs" or Newly Industrializing Countries.

Developed countries no longer regard Korea as a underdeveloped country, and ask Korea to liberalize her domestic market. Underdeveloped countries consider Korea to be a model for their economic development, and expect Korea to give capital assistance and technological transfer to themselves (Han, 8). How does Korea adapt to her rapidly changing role in the world order? How do we train young persons who will be able to manage a new role in the world order? There arises a national demand for international education in Korea (Kim C. 1985, 20 and Kim C. 1988, 49).

The explosive growth of international tourism and capital investment abroad in the 1980s led to the increase of opportunities for Korean people to experience a variety of foreign cultures. This means to Koreans the discovery of new foreign cultures, non-Western cultures such as Southeast Asia. Moreover, in the late 1980s, liberalization in the socialist countries of the Soviet Union and East European Countries enabled Koreans to pursue so-called "North Policies" toward socialist countries (UNESCO 1988, 22). The in-

creasing frequency of economic relations with these socialist countries will bring Korean people down to the bottom of cultural realm buried under political ideology.

What is the meaning of culture behind political ideology and economic system to Koreans who have been strongly oriented toward anti-communism? How do we educate young persons who will be capable of handling their experiences in non-western and non-capitalistic cultures? There appears a popular demand for international education in Korea as well.

III. Variety and Problems in the Definition of International Education

The term "international education" was used increasingly during the 1960s and 1970s in the United States. International education is not a clearly defined professional or disciplinary term. It is a useful term to label a wide range of activities and research interests. International education is broadly defined to include a variety of activities and programs designed to encourage the flow of ideas and peoples across cultural and geographical boundaries (Mitzel 1982, 945). Implicit or explicit in most of definitions of international education are notions that such activities and programs are essential if we are to prepare a citizenry capable of dealing with the challenges of the modern world. Here, the challenges are its shrinking resources, and its increasingly interdependent social, political, and economic elements (Mitzel, 946).

Whatever the goal of international education in general may be countries differ in their approaches towards international education depending on their own development levels, national interests and ideological orientations. International education appears in various forms according to the kinds of countries and periods within a country. In this paper, I will examine international education that has developed in relation to Social Studies in Korea as well as in other countries. These are what have been called education for international understanding, multicultural or cross-cultural education, global education, and development education.

A. *Education for International Understanding*

A UNESCO recommendation, adopted in 1974, outlined the guiding principles of education for international understanding (UNESCO, 5). This type of education promotes understanding, toler-

ance, friendship among all nations, and furthers the activities of the United Nations toward the maintenance of peace. Instilling positive attitudes toward peace, justice, and human right in young people is organized around the existing curricula rather than through new courses in international education.

Perhaps the best example of this type of education is the UNESCO Associated Schools Project for Education in International Cooperation and Peace. The goal of this project, which was launched in 1953, is to promote international cooperation and peace through formal schooling. Some of primary and secondary schools in Korea have participated in this project since 1961 (UNESCO, 5). Because the range of this project is restricted to extracurricular activities and representative schools, the experiences in this project cannot be used as the basis for the future development of international education in Social Studies of Korea.

Peace, justice, and human right are the values which transcends national and cultural boundaries. It requires a highly sophisticated level of instructional methods and materials to instill these transnational values in the minds of young students. It is in this context that education for international understanding led by UNESCO is criticized for its idealistic, impractical or impossible goal (Teachout 1966, 346).

B. Multicultural or Cross-Cultural Education

The multicultural education is an education which emphasizes cultural pluralism. Multicultural education affirms that schools should be oriented toward the cultural enrichment of all children and youth. Multicultural education reaches beyond awareness and understanding of cultural differences. More important than acceptance and support of these differences is the development of reciprocity through the recognition of the right of these different cultures to exist (Mitzel, 952).

This type of education can be initiated not only by explaining how other societies are structured but by emphasizing the underlying reasons for the differences rather than similarities. Its goal is to produce citizens who may be able to understand better other nations' interpretations of our country and to recognize how this other group arrived at its conclusions and interpretation (Teachout, 346). The reciprocity, however, can be developed in the mind of young students only when their experience expand from the visible and the present to the invisible and the hidden dimensions of culture.

Multicultural education, by nature, may inevitably be involved with the mental problem of contradiction between self and others or between national loyalty and international understanding. Nonetheless, multicultural education is applauded as a perspective that can provide the concrete, realistic and manageable instructional materials and method at schools (Kwon 1986, 64-5). This type of education found its practical value in the application to the improvement of communication between various ethnic groups in the United States, and to the readaptation of children returning home from abroad in Japan. In Korea, none of efforts have been made to utilize this type of education in the area of international education at schools.

C. Development Education

In 1966, a co-ordinating body, the voluntary committee on overseas Aid and Development was formed in the United Kingdom (Walker 1982, 505). A new emphasis on development education began to be apparent at British schools. There was no universally agreed, precise definition of what came to be known as development education. But there was a fairly wide measure of agreement on a number of basic propositions (Walker, 505).

First, a majority of those involved saw development education not as a new and separate subject, but as a dimension of many subjects. Secondly, it was generally recognized that development education is concerned with the affective as much as the cognitive aspect of education. Lastly, in teaching at secondary level, some understanding of international economic order has come to be seen as an essential part of development education.

The main contents of development education include the problems and causes in the underdevelopment of developing or underdeveloped countries, such as poverty, malnutrition, disease, illiteracy and overpopulation (Kwon, 53). Development education seeks to train young students who are aware that these problems arise out of international economic order. By placing young students on the standpoint of developing countries mostly in the South, development education aims to develop attitudes among young students, willing to assist developing countries in their striving for development.

D. Global Education

A trend exists in the 1970s and early 1980s for a new, synthetic

area to emerge, usually, under the title of global education in the United States. The using of global education as a terminology is attempting to cut across traditional disciplinary and professional interests embedded in earlier terminology. Viewing the world as a single system, global education suggests approaches that prepare citizens to cope with an increasingly complex domestic and international community of interests (Kniep 1986, 536).

Anderson defines global education as efforts to bring about changes in the context of education in order to better prepare students for citizenship in a global age (Anderson 1979, 15). Global education is anchored to a belief that there is a critical need in the United States for schools to better prepare young people for life in the world increasingly characterized by pluralism, interdependence and change. The most common approach to bringing global education into schools has been through infusion into the existing curricula rather than by reconstructing, replacing or creating courses.

As compared with development education that highlights two-worldism of developed and underdeveloped countries, global education closes up one-worldism of interdependent countries. A focus on the interdependent nature of our world lies at the very core of programs in global education. Global education is concerned primarily with the universal human values that transcend group identity and the diverse values that define group membership (Kniep, 437).

Global education clearly promotes certain values, and there can be confusion and conflict about some of them. For example, does global education foster attitudes that are at odds with patriotism and national loyalty? Yes, global education, in some case, may be perceived as promoting attitudes that are at odds with patriotism and national loyalty (NCFSS 1987, 245-246). Unclear and confused statements about the aims of global education can fuel perception that it aspires to indicate a "one-worldism" that fails to give due to national loyalties (Vocke 1988, 20).

IV. An Examination of Social Studies from the Perspective of International Education

As reviewed above, we can notice that major contents and perspectives in international education vary not only from time to time but also from country to country. This suggests that we Koreans should develop our own perspectives and contents in international education

which are to fit into the present and the future of our role in the international order. Korea, one of the NICs or Newly Industrializing Countries, lies at a position where to look up to the advanced countries as potential targets for economic competition, and look down upon the underdeveloped countries as possible receivers for technical and capital assistance.

Which perspective would be emphasized in the organization of international education at schools in Korea? Will it be education for international understanding or multicultural education? Otherwise, will it be development education or global education? Because all the types of international education are embedded in their own kinds of national value to pursue, such a decision-making process involves a difficult and painful job of value judgement. However, I do not believe that such a grand task can be accomplished within a single step forward such as this paper. It is only to be reached by incorporating various efforts of value judgement.

In this paper, I will not attempt to present a clear-cut type of international education for Social Studies in Korea. I will make all the facets of Social Studies open to criticism from the perspective of all kinds of international education. By doing so, I hope that I will be able to construct a philosophical foundation upon which Social Studies can be reorganized to accommodate an ideal type of international education in Korea.

A. Social Studies in General

As noted earlier, any agreement has not been made on the nature of subjects and underlying principles of curriculum in Social Studies of Korea (Seo 1989, 160). Conflicting claims and divergent arguments toward and against the intergrated curriculum called "Social Studies" have plagued specialists in Social Studies. What complicates disputes concerning the problems in curriculum is the separation of moral education and Korean history from the Social Studies. It was argued that any type of Social Studies as an integrated curriculum cannot appear with these subjects staying out of Social Studies (Choi 1989, 166).

Since 1945 anti-communism has dominated the social education, because nation-building in the defence against communism was the prime concern for Koreans. Moral education became an independent subject from Social Studies to instill anti-communism among children in the curriculum of 1963. Korean history was separated from Social Studies to imbue nationalism in the mind of young persons in

the curriculum of 1973 (Choi, 165-166). Now, our main concern is about international education that will train young students to cope with a rapidly changing global society where economic interests transcend ideological concerns.

We have seen above that values in any type of international education may collide with patriotism and national loyalty. Then, how do we revise our Social Studies that can accommodate programs in international education while maintaining our educational tradition of nationalism and anti-communism? Do we maintain the current curriculum in Social Studies at the junior high school with geography and world history in the first grade, civics and world history in the second grade and geography and civics in the third grade (MOE 1988, 110-111)? These questions are also difficult to be answered without a serious consideration about the nature of the subjects and underlying principles of curriculum in Social Studies.

In this paper, therefore, I will suggest a more phenomenal problem in contemporary textbooks to ignite a discussion concerning the nature of subject and underlying principles in Social Studies. With this preliminary discussion, I expect that solutions to the problems in reorganizing Social Studies will show up.

It is no secret that textbooks play a major role in most Social Studies program in Korea. Indeed, they are the curriculum in many schools. In the examination of textbooks in Social Studies, I will focus on world history and world geography that are believed to occupy the core of programs in international education.

B. Textbooks in World History

Recent historical scholarship has failed to produce a coherent overview of the past in world history as well as Korean history. Contemporary historians are overspecializing in consecutive history that takes account of massive body of specialized scholarship. They have failed to construct the broad vistas and panoramas that are labelled "eras", "epoches", or "periods". For example, the emphasis remains on great men with relatively little attention to the daily lives of the broad spectrum of poor and middle class citizens. It is known that the broad picture of eras can be drawn only through the so-called "total history", depicting the lives of "ordinary people"(Pellicano 1982, 125).

Historical discussions of foreign nations or regions tend to focus on a few dramatic events or phenomena, with huge time gap (often centuries) occurring. As a result, textbooks in world history gener-

ally give students little sense of historical continuities and changes during those ignored periods.

So-called "world histories" are often primarily histories of Western civilization or of the spread of Western influence to the rest of the world. Often they are histories of separate regions with little attention to relations among them. Usually, these histories focus on the development of states that are the most powerful in the contemporary world. As in textbooks of world history and civics, another common type of imbalance occurs often in the area of international relationships of the Third World nations. While textbooks sometimes address Third World connection with Europe or the Soviet Union, they seldom treat relations among Third World nations, including nations within the same region.

C. Textbooks in World Geography

Within Social Studies at the junior high school in Korea, Korean geography and world geography divide the geography section almost even. World geography, in particular, fell into merely a collection of chronological facts without connection to any abstract concepts, not to mention human values. Recall of factual knowledge is the least demanding mental operation in Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives (NCFSS, 248). World geography has failed to offer other objectives demanding a higher order of critical thinking skills that include the ability to apply knowledge, to analyze, to synthesize and to evaluate — that is, to make value judgement.

In the selection of foreign area content, the exoticism and sensationalism typified textbooks in world geography. Factual inaccuracies and unevenness still plague world geography. The omission of critical themes or clarifying perspectives concerning contemporary foreign areas still remain in world geography. Such an imbalance in the contents and perspective is clearly the creation of geographers, who should be blamed for their lack of historical concerns or failure of updating their knowledge. History does receive some attention in world geography textbooks in varying degrees, but usually with only sketchy treatment.

Moreover, when dealing with the lives of "ordinary" people, world geography textbooks still lean to the exotic, the unfamiliar, the titillating, the colorful and the bizarre by Western standards. While these people and phenomena do exist, the space devoted to such exotics sometimes overwhelms more respective contemporary images of these regions, such as their growing, dynamic, bustling cities.

D. Problems in Perspective and Value

As I examined the problems in textbooks on world history and world geography, I came to an idea that there is perspective problem underneath in combination with value problem. I assume that perspective problem derives from the natural tendency to look at write about foreign areas through Western and even Japanese eyes. They could not but copy Western or Japanese perspective when translating Western or Japanese literature on world history and world geography. Without direct involvement with foreign area studies, it must be almost impossible to develop one's own perspective. Advocates of areas studies contend that it is essential for students to develop an awareness of the intricacies that characterize regions and culture throughout the globe. A reflection of this perspective occurs in the application of certain Western values such as modernization and development to Third World nations.

For example, European colonialism or political domination in the Third World is a recurring theme in textbooks. Although impact of European colonialism or political domination on the later modernization and development varies from country to country, the books tend to treat this theme as a general issue without recognizing the regional variations. With few exceptions, the books do not treat these variations from Third World perspectives. As Korea is qualified for the membership of Third World with her own experience of Japanese colonialism, I suggest that this theme should be covered in more detail and in further depth.

Another perspective problem, very sensitive to deal with, is the influence of nationalistic perspectives. There is one prejudice, one obsession, so pervasive and so powerful that it deserves special consideration: nationalism (Cortes & Fleming 1986, 342-343). Nationalism has a powerful hold on the writing and publishing of moral education and Korean history textbooks. I do not intend to deny the contribution that moral education and Korean history made in the 1960s and 1970s to the training of citizens who worked diligently for the nation-building in Korea.

In the 1980s, however, we seemed to reach the critical moment that nationalism cannot do everything in the citizenship education. We now need to return to the beginning of Social Studies, to evaluate the following development of Social Studies, and to plan the future of Social Studies including moral education and Korean history. I propose international education, whatever the definition may

be, as a new perspective by which we can revise the curriculum and textbooks in Social Studies.

V. Some Possible Future Directions of Social Studies from the Perspective of International Education

In the examination of Social Studies in general and textbooks in world history and world geography, we were faced with the problems with perspective and value. Now, I think that it is the turn for us to search for the possible future directions of Social Studies in Korea from the perspective of international education. What aspects of present and past international realities ought to be included in the curriculum of elementary and secondary schools if they are to offer an education that is truly international? What contents should teachers be teaching and what information should students be learning in an education for international perspective?

Recognizing our rapidly shrinking globe and increasing interdependence, I suggest, Social Studies educators should work to accommodate international perspective, where appropriate, into all of the Social Studies courses. Social Studies curricula need to be reevaluated for international content, goals, perspective and pedagogical strategies. Such evaluations should include not only courses on world history and world geography but also Korean geography, Korean history and moral education.

My standpoint presented here may draw misinterpretation that I may be absolutely toward the "integrated" curriculum called "Social Studies." My genuine point is that we need to reevaluate the whole structure of Social Studies from bottom up, and then decide whether we should maintain the traditional curriculum in Social Studies or not. As a short-cut to revise the current curriculum in Social Studies, I will discuss restoring the linkage between history and geography in Social Studies, and bringing value education into geography.

A. *The Need for Geographic Perspective in History*

As criticized above, Korean history became an instrument of nationalism. Nationalistic bias is as persistent in today's school books as in those used a decade ago. World history, with its strong reflection of Western perspective, simply consists of consecutive history that takes account of massive body of knowledge. World

historians as well as Korean historians have failed to write a "total history" of the lives of ordinary people. Geography is known for its traditional capability of treating the lives of ordinary people, usually without details in written records.

There is a need in history for scholars to write synthetic works that attempt to tie together the whole complicated story. To function effectively today, both as individuals and as democratic citizens, we should have some sense of total picture: our perspectives have to be personal, local, national, and global—all at the same time. In other words, the macro and micro perspectives have to be combined in a complementary fashion. International perspective can be achieved by a mode of thought that attempts to attain a perspective that unifies local and national histories into a totality or world history as a whole. Geography is also known for its flexibility in perspective from micro through medium to macro. Geographer's ability to synthesize is, certainly, originated from his flexibility of scale in perspective.

In general, traditional approaches to the study of world history as merely a collection of consecutive histories add little to the understanding of contemporary worldwide interdependence that can be one of central themes of international education. An effective approach to the presentation of global interdependence is to emphasize the historical roots of that interdependence. Yet if our students are to truly understand the contemporary interdependence of the world, they must be grounded in the knowledge that contact and exchange among civilizations has been more or less continuous for the last 2,000 years.

Contact, exchange and interdependence has continued throughout history. The global ecumene, which was created by the European explorers of the 15th and 16th centuries, has been accelerated through the continuing contacts of migration, trade and warfare of the past 400 years and has been transformed in today's world by global air travel and satellite communication. Contact, exchange and interdependence, not to mention global ecumene, are important themes of cultural geography in a broad sense. Cultural origin and spread, that is cultural diffusion, has been traditionally a main theme in cultural and historical geography in the United States as well as in Germany (Jordan 1986).

B. The Need for Value Perspective in Geography

International education can hardly avoid value education. Interna-

tional education, then, must pay attention to the development of values from simple awareness to critical judgement, leading to mature understanding and commitment. If geography is to play a major role in international education of Social Studies, it has to include values in the contents of textbooks. The problems in values have been intentionally or unintentionally omitted from textbooks in geography, especially world geography (KEDI 1989, 81-166). I propose that only with value perspective alive in geography, geography can provide a synthetic perspective that would play a pivotal role in international education.

In France where synthetic perspective was emphasized in geography, geography was seen contributing to student's moral development—hard work and people's intelligent adaptation of nature (Graves 1975, 86). The study of geography teaches to be tolerant of other peoples through understanding of the struggle of others, of their way of life, of their beliefs and of their perceptions of their natural and cultural environment. In France, a knowledge of geography, with values as well as facts included within it, makes it easier to make balance judgements about national and world problems. I believe that the function of geography is to train future citizens to imagine world stage and so help them to think sanely about political and social problems in the world around.

Geography's essential contribution to knowledge as a whole was its synthetic viewpoint (Graves, 87). What geography can contribute to the common store of knowledge in exchange for what it receives from other disciplines, is the capacity for not disintegrating what nature brings together, but for understanding the connections and correlations between phenomena, either in the global framework which encompasses them or in the regional environments where they are localized. Without employing value perspective in its contents, I fear, geography will remain as merely a collection of chorological facts as it is now. Only with the choice of a certain value, we can select a certain perspective by which we can arrange facts and concepts in a certain hierarchy. Therefore, we should construct a synthetic perspective by engaging ourselves in the judgement of important values that is desirable for international education in Korea.

C. The Position of Geography in Social Studies

By giving a solid footing to speculation about the world, geography with synthetic viewpoints reminds the reader that he is dealing with real human beings who are just as circumscribed as he (Cogan

& Nakayama 1985, 48). Only with synthetic perspective including problems in values, the foundations of international education will necessarily take root within the framework of geography.

In order to develop a synthetic viewpoint by including problems in value, geography needs to demonstrate the relationships of the field to other disciplines, such as history, sociology, anthropology, and economics. History and economics, in particular, are the disciplines from which geography at schools should borrow useful concepts and values (Cogan & Nakayama, 51). Students need to see that geographic facts and concepts do not exist in a vacuum but are indeed interrelated with other fields of study. Students need to achieve a holistic perspective, and geography can lead to the way of developing such a view.

No discipline is more important to international education than geography. It is a key element in the development of international perspective, the central objective of international education (Cogan & Nakayama, 51). With this standpoint on the role of geography in international education of Social Studies, our final focus is on the recurrent dispute about *raison d'être* of the "integrated" curriculum and geography's position in it. As mentioned above, we have to resolve this dispute if we are to accommodate international education into the curriculum of Social Studies.

Should geography be taught as a separate subject? Could the objectives of geography education concerning international education be better achieved by not arranging a curriculum or part of a curriculum along traditional subject lines? If so, what should these curriculum arrangements be? Is it possible to put forward rational arguments for incorporating geographical objectives within in integrated curriculum?

I suggest that discussing these issues is meaningless without thinking of altering traditional contents of textbooks in geography and other subjects. With current division of subjects intact, including traditional contents in textbooks, reorganizing Social Studies may be nothing but a change of descriptive words without transformation of basic concepts and even fundamental perspectives. I maintain that the most urgent agenda for us, specialists in geography education, is the open-mindedness, willing to exchange our traditional concepts and perspectives with other subjects in Social Studies, and even to revise some of them, if necessary.

VI. Conclusion

In a variety of definition of international education, we could note that major concepts and perspectives in international education vary not only from country to country but also from time to time. This implies that we Koreans should develop our own perspective and contents that are to fit into our new role in the world order. However, because all the types of international education are embedded in their own kinds of national value to pursue, a decision-making in perspective and contents concerning international education involves a difficult and painful job of value judgement.

What couples the problem of value judgement in international education is the unsettled disputes about the nature of subjects and underlying principles of curriculum in Social Studies. That is why I propose that Social Studies educators should work to accommodate international perspective, where appropriate, into all of the Social Studies courses. Social Studies curricula need to be reevaluated for international content, goals, perspective and pedagogical strategies. Such evaluations should include not only courses on world history and world geography but also Korean geography, Korean history and moral education.

The examination of textbooks in Social Studies reveals that world history and world geography, in particular, are not proper in terms of contents and perspectives of international education. I came to a fundamental idea that there is perspective problem as well as value problem underneath. I assume that perspective problem derives from the natural tendency to look at and write about foreign areas through Western and even Japanese eyes. Another perspective problem, very sensitive to deal with, is the influence of national perspectives. Nationalism has a powerful hold on the writing and publishing of textbooks in moral education and Korean history. For this reason, I argue that international perspective cannot be incorporated into textbooks in Social Studies without revising textbooks in moral education and Korean history.

As a short-cut to initiate curriculum movement in Social Studies toward international education, I suggest restoring the linkage between history and geography and bringing value perspective into geography. I maintain that only with value perspective alive in geography, world geography per se can provide a synthetic viewpoint that will play a pivotal role in international education of So-

cial Studies. In order to develop a synthetic perspective, geography needs to demonstrate the relationships of the field with other disciplines. Therefore, I propose that the most urgent agenda for geographers is the open-mindedness, willing to exchange our traditional concepts and perspectives with other subjects in Social Studies, and, if necessary, to revise some of them.

Reference

- Anderson, L., 1979, *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education*, Bloomington: Indiana University, Social Studies Development Center.
- Choi, Yong-gyu, 1989, "A Discussion on Curriculum in Social Studies at Junior High School," *Social Studies Education*, No. 22, pp.162-175.
- Cogan, John, J. & Shuichi Nakayama, 1985, "The Role of Geography in Developing International Understanding," *Social Education*, Vol. 49, pp. 48-51.
- Cortes, Carlos, E. & Dan B. Fleming, 1986, "Introduction: Global Education and Textbooks," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, pp. 340-344.
- Graves, Norman J., 1975, *Geography in Education*, London: Heinemann Education Books Ltd.
- Han, Yong-hwan, et al., 1987, *Education in Reponse to Liberalization and Internationalizing Society*, A Special Seminar in Celebration of the 15th Birthday of Korean Education Development Institute.
- Jordan, Terry G., 1986, *The Human Mosaic: A Thematic Introduction to Cultural Geography*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.
- Kang, Suk-joo, 1988, "A Search for the Direction of Social Studies Education in the Age of Internationalization," *Newsletter of Korean Society for Social Studies Researchers*, Vol. 88, No. 24.
- Kim, Jong-chul, 1988, "Special Issue: Preparing Education for the Age of Internationalization," *New Education*, No. 405, pp. 48-55.
- Kim, Jong-Seo, et al., 1988, *A Study on the Plan of Developing Education for International Understanding*, Korean Committee on UNESCO.
- Kniep, Willard M., 1986, "Defining a Global Education by Its Content," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, pp. 437-446.
- _____, 1986, "Social Studies within a Global Education," *Social Education*, Vol. 50, pp. 536-542.
- Korean Committee on UNESCO (ed.), 1988, *A Guide to Education for International Understanding*, Seoul: Gumi Trading Co.
- Korean Education Development Institute (ed.), 1989, *Social Studies I*, Seoul: Daehan Textbook Publishing Co.
- Kwon, O-jung, 1986, *Human Development in the Age of Internationalization*, Seoul: Baeyongsa.
- Ministry of Education in Korea, 1988, *An Explanation of Curriculum in Social*

Studies at Junior High School.

- Mitzel, Harold E., 1982, "International Education," *Encyclopedia of Educational Research*, 5th ed., Vol. 2, New York: The Free Press, pp. 945-958.
- National Council for the Social Studies, 1987, "Global Education: In Bounds or Out?," *Social Education*, Vol. 51, pp. 242-249.
- Pellicano, Roy R., 1982, "Global Education: A Macro Perspective for Citizenship Education," *The Social Studies*, Vol. 73, pp. 125-129.
- Seo, Je-chon, 1989, "A Discussion on Curriculum in Social Studies at Elementary School," *Social Studies Education*, No. 22, pp. 48-55.
- Teachout, Noreen, 1966, "International Understanding: A Beginning," *Social Education*, Vol. 30, pp. 345-346.
- Vocke, David E., 1988, "Those Varying Perspectives on Global Education," *The Social Studies*, Vol. 79, pp. 18-20.
- Walker, Derek, 1982, "The Fall and Rise of Development Education in the United Kingdom," *International Review of Education*, UNESCO Institute for Education, Vol. 28, pp. 504-506.