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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to examine how selected educators responded to dramatic changes in the world and provided leadership in seeking to change education in order to be better able to prepare citizens to cope with the increasing internationalization of society as it impacts people in their everyday lives. The study has two major foci: the roots of events and their formal and/or informal connections with the people that shaped the global education movement; and the intellectual biographies of James Becker and his life-long colleagues Lee Anderson and Chadwick Alger as they pertain to the subject. This study provides an overview of the last thirty years of global education in that context.

International/global studies should be viewed as interdisciplinary, involving the arts, humanities, sciences, technology and mathematics as well as foreign languages and the social studies. Global peace and conflict resolution, global ecology and environmental protection, human welfare and human rights are among the issues that need to be
integrated into the curriculum for the youth to be prepared for a world-centered perspective in education as we approach the twenty-first century.

This study was conducted employing qualitative inquiry methods with an interpretive/constructivist approach. It has been constructed primarily on interview data gathered from the interviews with James Becker, and Chad Alger and the works of these and other leaders in global education in addition to the primary sources and supporting literature to enhance the historical context.

The role of leadership in achieving educational change and continuity through global education was significant especially in generating, developing and promoting the ideas, and in developing the connections between people, agencies, organizations, and institutions through teaching, writing, editing, chairing, lecturing, and taking on various other active duties at such establishments as were influential in educational circles.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“There is properly no history, only biography.”
History, Emerson

It has been nearly thirty years since the term “Global Education,” or “education with global perspectives” began to be used along with “international education,” one of the most widely debated movements in education (Becker, 1996; Smith, 1989; Kniep, 1985; Buergenthal & Torney, 1976; Anderson, 1979;). Although the history of international education goes as far back as the nineteenth century and includes many changes in focus and emphasis, the redefinition of international education encompassed in the term global education appeared in a study funded by the Office of Education in 1968 (Anderson, 1968; Becker, 1968, 1996; Buergenthal & Torney, 1976; Kniep, 1985; Anderson, 1989). An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in the United States’ Secondary and Elementary Schools (1969), authored by James Becker and Lee Anderson, was the crucial effort in rethinking the nature of international studies in U.S. schools in that
period. "Though few people today are aware of the study much of what is now called global education was first articulated in that report" (Interview with Jim Becker, March 25, 1995).

The purpose of this study is to examine the role of leadership in the context of achieving educational change and continuity through global education over the years 1969-1997 (from Moon-landing to Mars-landing) with James M. Becker, one of the leaders of the field, and Chadwick F. Alger, a social scientist and a leading contributor to global education.

The Rationale and the Need for the Study

The most recent study on the history of global education is a long paper covering the period between 1945 and 1985, by Andrew Smith (1989), the President of the American Forum for Global Education. In *A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities*, Kniew (1985), another prominent scholar in global education, points out that "[p]ublications that promote the field and that provide materials for teaching about global realities are now widely available in increasing numbers" (p.42). Smith (1989) joins him in the same argument, imparting that "[h]undreds of projects and programs have been launched, and thousands of articles, books and supplemental curriculum materials have been
written and hundreds of thousands of copies of these have been disseminated" (p.3). However, the works that deal with the history of global education are only a few, they are: Buergenthal and Torney's (1976) chapter on "International Education: An Historical Review," Kniep (1985), Smith (1989), and publicity material published by the American Forum for Global Education covering the years 1970-1995 entitled A History in Progress, basically the history of the organization.

Smith's paper "attempts to identify broad trends and changes in international and global education"(p.2) between years 1945-1985, whereas Kniep's work "is a study of the literature of global education and is intended to provide a critical review of that field. It is based on the premise that the state of global education will be revealed, to a large extent, by the state of its literature" (p.3). Buergenthal and Torney (1976), on the other hand, state the purpose of their "brief history of various initiatives toward education for international understanding, cooperation and peace" as "to examine a range of definitions of international education, to consider the way in which individuals have become involved in developing these programs, and to identify and describe the institutional supports which have resulted" (p.23).
There is no work on the history of global education since Smith's (1989) paper, and none of the previous works cited above deal with the history of the global education in the context of role of the leadership and educational change. Quoting E.H. Carr (1986) that "[history] is ... an unending dialogue between the present and the past" (p.24), I believe that we need a similar dialogue in global education between its past and present.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) state that "[t]o understand a phenomenon, you need to know its history" (p. 14), and what I did in this study was to explore the history of global education through a qualitative study to understand the role of leadership in the context of educational change and continuity with the increasing globalization of society.

**Research Questions**

As an international graduate student and an aspiring global educator, I have interest in the dynamics of the origin of an education movement; in comprehending what happened in the past in the field so that I could better understand the social and political patterns that may contribute to or impede upon the decision making in educational reform efforts elsewhere in the future.

The history of global/international education, like the history of an organization or institution or a biography of an individual, is in a large measure a history of the society and environment in which the selected events, activities and life takes place" (Notes from Jim Becker,1997).
Therefore, a history of global education includes political events, funding, conferences, major publications, research, curriculum development, projects, organizations, development programs and courses, people (actors in the movement), and publications that had an impact and made a mark in the movement during that thirty-year period.

To build a bridge between the past and the present, this study focused on answering the following questions:

1. What were the roles of leadership in creating an environment conducive to educational change through global education? (i.e. Jim Becker's works, his cooperation with Lee Anderson and Chad Alger; the formal/informal connections between the federal government, funding agencies, and global education leaders)

2. How did the political, social environment, policies and agencies contribute to or impede upon the change global education envisioned in the last thirty years?

3. What kind of controversy did global education create among various interest groups such as academic, pre-collegiate vs. collegiate, intra-departmental, political, and other?

The Methodology and the Design

This study was conducted with a qualitative inquiry method employing Peshkin's approaches for qualitative research. It was constructed primarily on interview data gathered from the transcriptions of tape recorded interviews
with James Becker (24 March, 1995), and Chad Alger (17 May, 1995,) and the works of these leaders who were among the founding fathers of the movement. In addition, primary sources provided by James Becker (i.e. personal notes, letters, newspaper clippings, unpublished conference papers, conference reports,) and literature that supported and enhanced the discussions and interpretation of those primary resources were used extensively for the study.

The roots of events and their formal and/or informal connections with the people that shaped the global education movement, and the intellectual biography of James Becker who has played an influential role as one of the leaders of global education for over thirty years was one of the focuses of this study. “Qualitative researchers seek to make sense of personal lives” say Glesne & Peshkin (1992,p.1), and I used qualitative inquiry tools for data interpretation since the objectives of the study do not seek for generalizability or prediction, but rather contextualization and interpretation.

In Alan's words (Glesne and Peshkin, 1992), the field of global education is not “a world of numbers, it is a world of words” (p. 2), and therefore, qualitative inquiry is well suited to the purposes of this study. In addition, oral history enabled me to gain vicarious experiences of the past through interviewing those people who have firsthand knowledge of the past.
Over the past thirty years, oral history has found increasing favor among social scientists and humanists. Works such as T. Harry Williams's biography of Huey Long, Studs Terkel's "memory books" of the Great Depression and of World War II, David Halberstam's search for the roots of American foreign policy in the culture of the political elite, Howell Reines's history of the civil rights movement, and Alex Haley's tour de force with *Roots* have popularized oral investigatory techniques and helped to illustrate some of its pathbreaking potential" (McMahan 1989, p.xiii).

As Riessman (1993) states in her *Narrative Analysis*,

[s]tory telling, to put the argument simply, is what we do with our research materials and what informants do with us. . . . Nature and the world do not tell stories, individuals do (pp 1-2).

In a parallel activity to those described by McMahan, above, interviews with James Becker and Chad Alger shed light into the unwritten accounts of global education movement as well as the transactions and connections that created and promoted the movement.

Since qualitative research does not produce any concrete findings with statistical numbers (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), trustworthiness of the study was enhanced with member-checks, and through extant literature that further legitimized the platform for the discussions. As Gadamer says in *Truth and Method*,

Communication involves messages, and messages are always socially meaningful only within some contextually and historically created system of intersubjectivity. (quoted in McMahan, 1989, p. 107)

In addition to audio-recording and transcription of the recordings, there were ongoing interactions through fax,
e-mail, correspondence and telephone with James Becker, and with Chad Alger who was involved later in the study.

The study was presented in the first person's view of "I," rather than "the researcher" to openly display the subjective nature of the research.

**Time Frame for the Study**

In James Becker's words, the notion of global education first began to have salience in 1968-69 when the study that Lee Anderson and James Becker authored came out from the U.S. Office of Education, *The Examination of Objectives, Needs and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools*. Although the term global education was not used, much of what was proposed in that study later became known as global education.

In that sense, the years between 1969-present, in other words, just to mark the dates, from moon-landing to mars-landing, are the formative years of the global education movement that which this study will attempt to cover,

**Rationale for selecting Jim Becker and Chad Alger**

For more than thirty-five years, Mr. James Becker has been involved in international and global education. He has been a secondary school social studies teacher and college professor. He has served as director of several nationally known projects including the North Central Association's Foreign Relations Project (1956-66), The Foreign Policy Association's School Services Program (1966-1971), and the
Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education at Indiana University. He has also served as Director of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University, President of the Social Science Education Consortium, Vice-president of the Longview Foundation, and Director of the United States/Japan Textbook study project. Mr. Becker served as co-Director of the Indiana Global Education Project as well as the Vice Chairperson of the Indiana Curriculum Advisory Council. He also assisted in the development of "Your State in the World" publications and programs in many states.

As stated in the recent publication of The American Forum for Global Education 1970-1995: A History in Progress, published for the organizations’s twenty-fifth anniversary,

The earliest framers of the global perspectives agenda believed that American children needed to understand the concepts of conflict, conflict resolution, perception and misperception before conflagration erupted. Among this group were Lee Anderson, James Becker, H. Thomas Collins, Maurice East, Robert Freeman, Howard Freeman, Howard Mehlinger.

As he is one of the most prolific and most cited scholars in the field, James Becker's works have influenced almost all other educators and scholars in global education. In fact, "[t]o a considerable extent the phraseology of the UNESCO Recommendation also echoes the Becker/Anderson Report, especially in its references to the 'global perspective' and the 'international dimensions' of
education, as well as to the awareness of increasing global interdependence" (Buergenthal & Torney, 1976, p.34).

Becker's collegial connections with other leaders in the field, and his close cooperation with Lee Anderson and Chad Alger at Northwestern University made him a good candidate for a study with an historical context.

Chad Alger, a Political Science Professor by training, is known by all global educators for his "Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus" project, one of the most influential and widely used studies ever designed in global education. He was one of the contributors to the 1969 Study, Becker/Anderson Report, and one of the pioneer advocates of the field as well. His involvement in peace studies, and his contribution to the conceptualization efforts for global education makes him one of the key players of the field.

Borrowing from A Biography of the Constitution (Mitchell and Mitchell, 1964) "What can explain such a cluster of men of first-rate abilities..." in that period? "...Were they called out by perilous times, or did they create noble projects? They were both products and makers of history" (p. 20).
Outline of the Study

The presentation of this study has been organized in the following manner:

Chapter I, the Introduction, presents the rationale and need for the study, method and design, and outline of it.

Chapter II provides a review of the literature on the history of global education, and the works of James Becker, Chadwick Alger, and Lee Anderson in regard to the role these leader educators played in the global education movement and the way they influenced each other. Also, those works and projects that were influenced by these global educators' works have been reviewed. In addition, reports that strongly recommended or encouraged educational reforms, the standards set for teacher education to include international/global perspectives, teacher education programs with global perspectives, and evaluations of such programs were examined as they related to the educational change in the context of the study. Finally, those studies on achieving change and educational leadership that inspired this one were reviewed.

Chapter III describes the design and methodological strategies of this study discussing the qualitative study strategies to be used as the inquiry methods. Qualitative methods that are used and oral history techniques are elaborated in this chapter. Additionally, the selection of
the participants are discussed, data collection and the analyses of the data are explained.

Chapter IV is a history of global education as it has evolved over the past thirty years starting with the `1969 Study', also known as the Becker/Anderson Report, portraying the connections between the social and political environment, and the emergence of an education movement. This chapter gives a comprehensive display of connections among James Becker's, Lee Anderson's and Chad Alger's works, and their collective efforts and contributions to the field as the global education movement made its way into the U.S. elementary and secondary education. It is a history/biography of a movement focusing on the role of the leadership in creating an educational change and continuity.

Chapter V discusses the findings and addresses issues that emerge at the end of the study of this nature.

Chapter VI is the summary, concluding remarks and the implications of the study with recommendations for further research that would enhance the cognizance of the global education movement and its forbears.
CHAPTER 2

THE ROLE OF LEADERSHIP IN THE CONTEXT OF CONTINUITY AND CHANGE IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

"There is nothing permanent except change."
Quoted in Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, Bk. IX, Sec.8

The materials reviewed in this chapter pertain to the history of global education, and the works of James Becker, Chadwick Alger, and Lee Anderson focusing specifically on the role these leaders played in the global education movement and the way they influenced each other and made use of each other's work. Also, those works and projects that were guided by and modeled after these global educators' works are reviewed. To explore the roots of the support global education received from professional organizations and policy-making agencies, consideration will be given to those reports that strongly recommended /encouraged educational reforms with global perspectives. In addition, the standards set for the inclusion of international/global perspectives in teacher education will be examined as they relate to educational change in the context of the study. Finally, those studies on educational reform, achieving
change, and the role of educational leadership that inspired the context and the design of this one will be reviewed.

The History of Global Education

Although the history of international education goes back to the nineteenth century, (Becker, personal notes) there are only a few brief studies that deal with the recent history of global education. Buergenthal and Torney (1976) have a chapter in *International Human Rights and International Education* titled "International Education: An Historical Review," (Chapter Two). *A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities* by Willard M. Kniep (1985) is an 'ocassional paper' published by Global Perspectives in Education; Andrew F. Smith, the President of the American Forum for Global Education, authored a paper entitled "Pre-Collegiate Global and International Studies Education: A Brief History" for The National Governors' Association Conference on April 11-12, 1989; and recent publicity material has been published by the American Forum for Global Education covering the

---

1 Donald N. Morris, in his dissertation (1978) *Global Education in the Elementary Curriculum: The New American Educational Dream* at Arizona State University takes it as far back as to Greek civilization, the idea of the unity of all knowledge *paideia*.

2 Appeared in May 1989 in Access, the cooperative newsletter of The American Forum for Global Education, The Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies (AEGIS), and International Exchange Association, Inc. (IEA).
years 1970-1995 entitled *A History in Progress* is basically the history of the organization.

Buergenthal and Torney (1976), state the purpose of their study as the "brief history of various initiatives toward education for international understanding, cooperation and peace ...to examine a range of definitions of international education, to consider the way in which individuals have become involved in developing these programs, and to identify and describe the institutional support which have resulted" (p.23). Buergenthal and Torney (1976) recognize the significance of and the impact the Becker/Anderson Report (1969) had on the emergence of global education as a movement: "One of the major values of the report is that it lays out a definition of international education which differs from many previously employed," (p.32), and the authors also very aptly state that

[t]he Becker/Anderson report is truly a landmark. It has been widely quoted, and has expanded the group of those who pursue such objectives from an elite group of teachers who happen to have traveled extensively or studied other cultures to a concerned group of teachers, curriculum specialists, and administrators of various persuasions who have a vision of the global system and how education can prepare an individual student to live more effectively in it. (p.34)

Kniep's work, on the other hand, "is a study of the literature of global education and is intended to provide a critical review of that field. It is based on the premise that the state of global education will be revealed, to a large extent, by the state of its literature" (p.3). That
study covers the period between 1965-1985. For that brief history, Kniep reviews almost all the major works of the field with comments on the implications each work had on the conceptualization of the field. Kniep starts his overview of the literature with the 1969 Becker/Anderson Report and calls it one of the earliest calls "to educate young people for citizenship in a world that is increasingly characterized by pluralism, interdependence, and change" (p.9). Just as strongly, Kniep refers to Schooling for a Global Age, Becker (1979), as "one of the definitive works in the field; he discusses the significance of Anderson's (1979) Schooling and Citizenship in Global Age, and Alger and Harf's (1986) article "Global Education: Why? For Whom? About What?" which makes the firm statement that global education is for everybody and talks extensively about the importance of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (10 December 1948) which had an impact on the constitution of many countries.

The most recent study on the history of global education is Smith's (1989) paper which covers the period between 1945 and 1989, and "attempts to identify broad trends and changes in international and global education" (p.2). Smith gives major credit to the Becker/Anderson report as well as to the contributions of the Mid-America Center for Global Perspectives that James Becker established in the mid-1970s. A widely used project
model of "Your Community in the World," which was adapted from Chad Alger's original work, "Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus" was a major activity the Center promoted nation-wide. Smith also attributes "the best thinking about global education up to that time," to the publication of Schooling in a Global Age (Becker, 1979) during the same period.

According to Kniep (1985), there are two key factors responsible for the global education movement becoming a permanent part of the structure of American education, the first one having been achieved and the second one yet to be achieved: 1) global education caught the attention of those policy makers (i.e. state legislators, and state boards of education), and commissions and panels studying the need for global and international studies; 2) "the ability of those within the movement to provide the necessary tools for effectively carrying out the mandates for globalizing education" (p.6). The implication here is that unless the teachers and principals at the school sites are effectively immersed in the concepts of the new approach so that they can create curriculum with global perspectives, the movement will be doomed to fade out.

Smith (1989) states that in the 1960s, effective regional programs, involvement of national education organizations in the field, and massive involvement of federal support for the development for curriculum materials
had major influence on the growth of the field. For the 1970s, War/Peace Studies, the creation of the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, and federal funding through the U.S. Office of Education directly to pre-collegiate global and international studies education contributed to the national leadership of the field. Oswald (1993) shares the same views with Smith on this point.

Although the roles James Becker and Lee Anderson played as “the earliest framers of the global perspectives agenda,” (A History in Progress) (no page numbers in that booklet), are recognized, the role of their leadership in the context of creating educational change and continuity is not addressed in any of the studies reviewed above.

James M. Becker's prolific career produced a long list of publications and activities covering almost all areas of the field (see Appendix A for a complete list of Becker's works), i.e. from conceptualization of global education (1973a, 1973c, 1974) to curriculum development (1980, 1988a, 1988b, 1990, 1991); from teacher education (1968, 1973b, 1974), to peace education (1985); from media review (1991) to providing a reading list for social studies teachers to teach with global perspectives.

In the same line, Becker (1973), in Education for a Global Society, emphasizes the idea of “one earth” a total
system and states that education should help people understand that fact:

Global education, rather than being viewed as a unique academic compartment with a certain body of information to be mastered, should instead be seen as a matter of developing skills and insights in information selection and information processing. (p. 36)

Another major contribution to the field was Becker’s publication of *Schooling for a Global Age*, which compiled the best thinking about global education up to that time (Smith, 1989). *Schooling for a Global Age* brought together Lee and Charlotte Anderson’s world-centered school scenario, Jim Becker’s world-centered education case, Judith V. Torney’s psychological and institutional obstacles to the global perspectives in education, Bruce R. Joyce’s and Alexander Nicholson’s imperatives for global education, Don Morris’s elementary school programs, David King’s secondary school, and other aspects of global education programs presenting a comprehensive picture of the field. John I. Goodlad, in the foreword, defines the work as follows:

Because concern for global matters is an emerging and not an established goal for educational systems, there are no readily available, comprehensive, self-contained definitions, descriptions, analyses of what global education is, how it differs from traditional studies of other countries, what its objectives should be, what is now worth endorsing as likely to contribute to these objectives, and so on. There is ... a substantial but rather scattered speculative body of literature describing what various individuals and groups would like to see done. This volume seeks
to integrate some of this extant material and, in particular, to describe actual schools and classrooms in which some of these programs have taken form. (p. xvii)

Becker's (1979) *Schooling for a Global Age* is where 'world-centered education' is introduced comprehensively. The idea of designing world-centered programs, presented in the same context as the Becker/Anderson report, reflects all the components of global education which are interdependence, change, conflict, communication, non-governmental organizations, diversity, variety of transnational relations, global/world-system, and interaction between human beings and the natural environment. In the table entitled "three views of Global Education," Becker clearly differentiates global education from world affairs/foreign policy studies, and cultures or area studies. His chapter in this edited volume work deserves to be a classic along with the Andersons' and other contributors' chapters.

Anderson's voluminous work *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education* (1979) comprises of historical facts and the background of the emergence, components, skills, areas and evolution of global education. In this work, he deals with an array of issues such as the new definition of citizenship in a global age and the role of the individual in the world-system. He paints the picture of an ideal high-school providing an education compatible with these
ideas and emphasizes interdisciplinary learning and a global approach to curriculum design. His Century 21 High-school full-text scenario is overwhelmingly realistic and visionary. In detailing a student's life at Century 21 High-school, Anderson provides a practical description of a curriculum unit for teacher:

...she took the two basic courses offered by the Program for Studies of Humankind's Planetary and Cosmic Environments and the Program for Studies of Global Society. ...the course dealing with individual growth and development was an interdisciplinary mixture of material from biology, the health sciences, and social sciences. One part of the course focused upon the biological, cognitive, and emotional processes involved in human growth from conception to death. (p.467)

The profound historical background on which he bases the emergence of global education, and his insightful statements about the future make reading this gigantic work as delightful as reading a futuristic novel. This abundant source of information (some of which may need to be updated) offers the best rationale for change by means of drawing a parallel between the ecosystem and the life of the human species:

Species that do not succumb to change adapt to change in the form of alteration in one or more of their anatomical structures or physiological characteristics. Thus the species survive the trauma of change but in altered form. (p.251)

Starting with the Becker/Anderson Report (1969), the kind of change that is envisioned and described by Anderson, was what was meaningful for any learner: an
interdisciplinary learning in an interdependent, interconnected world.

The world is a dynamic interdependent system in which change in one thing leads to change in something else and that change in turn to other change and so on; so we have a planet that is a kind of perpetual motion machine. Among the things that change are the environments on which given species depend for survival. (p.251)

Anderson's (1982) article with the humorous title "Why Should American Education be Globalized? It's a Nonsensical Question," further explains that what triggers a need for change comes from outside the educational system; it comes from the societal setting, and therefore, "social change generates educational change, albeit not by any simple formula of linear translation or through an automatic, conflict-free, and resistance-proof process" (p.155).

Anderson (1990) continues with his argument, in a more condensed format this time, in his chapter "A Rationale for Global Perspectives," in Global Education: From Thought to Action. In that article, he underscores the "continuing cosmopolitization of the American people" (p.28). Quoting Walt Whitman, he says that "America is a race of races," and therefore, "education mirrors society in the sense that social change generates educational change," (p.32).

Anderson views education as an extension of society at large and therefore believes education cannot remain immune from or silent to the changes taking place outside the school system.
Alger's (1968) "Some Problems in Improving International Education," is the paper he wrote for the 1969 Study. In that paper he criticizes the practice of international education because "what is taught about international relations is done in the context of United States foreign policy on certain issues of great concern to the United States. ... A way must be found to put these issues in the context of the whole, ...[and that] will require a curriculum that views the total system ...from a vantage point outside the nation system itself" (p. 657).

His strong argument about the way international education needs to change requires a continuous effort to see beyond the present and go further into the new century.

Accordingly, each course and each textbook ought to include sections on the future, including specific predictions. Subsequent courses and textbooks should then analyze these predictions, in order to learn the cause of error. ...These changes should be examined in terms of the agenda of problems they will produce and the problem-solving institutions that will be required to handle these problems. (Ibid.)

Alger's strong belief in the significance of international non-governmental organizations in striving for and building peace in the international system without the need for a strong central government constitutes the core of his arguments in numerous other papers, articles, and keynote speeches that he delivered over the last three decades. Although he was not involved in global education directly, his works entered the field and have been welcomed

Alger adopted the theme "Think Globally and Act Locally" and that became one of the major themes of global education in underscoring interdependence, transnational relations, global connections, and peace education (Alger, (1993a). Charlotte Anderson first used the idea of "Your Community in the World," in a fifth grade textbook. Alger’s "Columbus in the World the World in Columbus," project is still being used as a curriculum model to show students the significance of local links to the world out there. We read
in *Global Education: A Study of School Change* (Tye & Tye, 1992), that the “'Orange County in the World' project, modeled after 'Columbus in the World' project was ...a success” (p.73).

Jan Tucker (1996) examines the participation by the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) in international activities “beginning with the emergence of the concept of the world as a global village in the 1960s and using specific years, events, and individuals as an organizing framework,” (p.45). With an interesting, and a similar approach to that of this study, Tucker mentions that Lefter S. Stavrianos wrote in 1989 in his book *Lifelines from the Past* that global perspectives are autobiographical. Tucker agrees with that statement. Tucker also takes the 1969 Study as the landmark for the birth of global education.

**James M. Becker, Lee F. Anderson and Chadwick F. Alger’s Roles as Leaders in Global Education**

Among the leadership skills of a good teacher and communicator, according to Hughes et al. (1993), are trust, the ability to motivate, stamina, care for people, vision, visibility and accessibility. Leaders should have a sense of humor. Leaders must be decisive, but patiently decisive. Leaders should be reliable, open minded, and should exude integrity. When we look at the works and activities of
Becker, Anderson, and Alger over the past thirty years, they embody all those traits. Their prolific careers reflect dedication, commitment, cooperation, and an array of creative and reflective ideas that open avenues in the field for others either to follow the leaders, or travel on their own.

In 1973, a National Seminar on the Diffusion of New Instructional Materials and Practices was held in Racine, Wisconsin; James Becker and Lee Anderson were among the conference co-directors. Following this conference, the *Workbook for Educational Change*, co-authored by James Becker (1977) was published. The book, including the ideas and feedback of the conference participants, cover the issues of change in schools in detail. It represents an array of prescriptive guidelines, and a great variety of practical suggestions and recommendations generated by the participants. As advice to any innovator or change agent, the authors conclude that "...the success of an innovation requires that one keep in mind that the teacher’s use of the new materials or practices ...constitutes innovation" (p.62). (See Appendix-F for a complete list of conference participants.) Becker directed most of his efforts towards a grassroots dissemination of the ideas, concepts, perspectives of global education through summer seminars, bibliographies, and lists of resources prepared particularly for elementary and secondary teachers/principals/educators.
(Examples of these activities have been provided by James Becker).

In the Report of A Wingspread Conference on November 26-28, 1994, "Shaping the Future of International Studies," we read that more than forty-five elementary, secondary and college teachers and administrators; state department of education personnel; social scientists; and representatives of professional education associations and special projects came together to discuss "current efforts and plans to improve and expand international studies in the nation's schools" (Foreword by James Becker). One of the issues addressed in that conference was "Leadership: The Key to Success."

The most important element in any field is its leadership. Leadership is complex, multifaceted, and difficult to assess. The global education leaders are a few in number, overwhelmingly white, and until a few years ago, almost all were male. (Report of a Wingspread Conference, November 26-28, p. 25)

This candid assessment of the leadership status in global education further continues with the following definition of the unique characteristics of the leaders in the field of global education: "The leaders were basically those dedicated individuals who could survive through the difficult times when funding was almost impossible and interest was low" (p.25).

In the same conference, a noteworthy recommendation is that minorities and women should be recruited to participate
in all aspects of the global education field, and another one contributes to the objectives of this study:

develop research studies which will help determine how institutionalization of global education takes place and how programs are implemented. (Ibid.)

Herbert Kliebard, a curriculum reformer, makes a similar argument in Lockwood (1997), in the chapter "The Supreme Context of Reform," that "a reform needs a school structure that can support it. Many reforms fail because they are inserted into a system that cannot quite digest the idea," (p.177).

The Onset of Educational Reforms

Starting with the launching of Sputnik, the most significant educational consequence of the event has been the impetus it gave to federal financing of public education -- at least that was the perception of some scholars who were interested in a long overdue reform in U.S. schools. The Soviet success in space exploration activities lead to the passage of the 1958 National Defense Education Act (NDEA). An outcome of the NDEA, Title VI, and related federal educational activities, is, at least indirectly, a school curriculum reform movement that begins in the late 1950s and continues into the 1960s. However, most of those efforts were short-lived. "One of the greatest failures of the academic reformers was their ignorance of the realities of day-to-day schooling activities" (Urban & Wagoner, 1996, 283).
Goodlad's approach in *The Dynamics of School Change* (1975) is not much different from his previous account of the failure of the educational reforms in which he deals with the ecology of education. As Goodlad (1985;1989) presents an agenda for better schools, he talks about a complete rethinking of the domains of human experience, and he touches the core of the matter when he talks about Boulding's "world-system" approach that Anderson (1979) strongly promotes.

The essential domains of human experience and thought embrace much more than the array of subjects conventionally allotted to the curriculum. Indeed, we would be well served by transcending these rubrics to get a holistic picture of the universe into which students should inquire and about which they should become conversant." (Goodlad, 1989, p.18)

The President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies launched by President Carter in 1977 produced *Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability*, and the U.S. Commissioners of Education Task Force on Global Education *Report with Recommendations* (1979) both include a rationale, a context and detailed recommendations for improving and expanding the international dimension of U.S. education.

One reform report coming from the educational establishment was from the Council of Chief State School Officers (1985). Leading global educators submitted papers and recommendations to the Council of Chief State School

---

Officers Study Commission. Widespread recognition of the need to improve the international dimensions of education sparked a tide of statements by numerous professional educational organizations supporting global education, and those statements were included in the CCSSOSC Report (See Appendix-G for a list of those statements). "These statements generated at state, local and national levels cite a variety of trends and developments that are shaping today's world and have serious implications for what and how we teach about current and future prospects for our social, economic and political well-being," (James Becker, personal notes, May 15, 1990).

In Global Education and States: Some Observations, Some Programs and Some Suggestions⁴, a report prepared for the same commission by H. Thomas Collins, who was the Senior Program Consultant to AFS International Scholarships at the time, the author states that "[i]n spite of substantial curriculum development and teacher retraining efforts during the 1960s and early 1970s, conditions in many classrooms have not improved as much as we would like." Collins, referring to the 1969 study states that

Lee Anderson and James Becker - two leading authorities in the field of pre-collegiate global education - have commented on the situation ... in the most important study undertaken up until that time. (iii)

Collins further suggests ways that states might deal with

⁴ No date on the publication; it should precede the CCSSOSC Report which is 1985.
diminishing resources in order to cope with the funding to undertake activities to globalize the curriculum.

In his speech “The State, the World and International Education,” at the annual meeting of CCSSO in Orlando, Florida in 1985, Becker underscores the role states play in expanding international and foreign language studies.

By law and tradition education is the responsibility of the states [and this] makes them key actors ...to improve and expand international and other language studies in the schools. ...[CCSSO's] emphasis on ...the study of international issues ...and the study of other nations, cultures and peoples, the comparing of educational systems and exchange of practices, offer ...goals and guidelines for a comprehensive effort.5

In another conference hosted by the New York State Education Department and by the United Nations on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the United Nations (September, 29-October 3, 1985), Becker presents his rationale for international education including the curriculum areas (history, geography, economics, citizenship, multicultural education, and English), and gives concrete examples for the implementation of language studies, and also talks about the significance of the “Your Community in the World,” approach which was modeled after Alger's “Columbus in the World,” project and was by then in more than thirty communities. James Becker, in his paper

5 See Appendix-H for the full text of the speech (original provided by James Becker.)
“Education for a Changing World,” prepared for the CCSSO Study Commission Report (1985), emphasizes the issue of state participation:

The Council urges state education agencies with the aid of the federal government, to establish, maintain and coordinate programs of global education. These programs should pursue the goal of understanding global interdependence and its importance to our future. It should promote curiosity and insight into the cultures, languages and lifestyles of many peoples.

The report of the Southern Governors' Association Advisory Council on International Education (1986) entitled “International Education: Cornerstone of Competition,” recommended international education; however, their view of international education was clearly not geared toward a participatory type of involvement in world affairs, but one arising from "falling behind the global economy/market" concerns. This report recommended geographic literacy, foreign languages, and area studies as a means to get ahead in education and regain economic world power status: “It is no longer possible to assume that we will be able to sell our products, conduct our negotiations, and understand our world in English” claimed the report, because “American education fails to prepare our citizens to compete and participate in the world marketplace” (p.22).

The National Governors' Association identified in their report of 1989 that teacher preparation was inadequate in global education and that was a major obstacle in the ability of the United States to meet the economic,
political, and cultural challenges of today's world. The National Governors Association's first goal was to "discover new and emerging international markets for American products to become again the Yankee traders we once were (p.iv)."

Even though the governors associations recommended international education, the rationale they offered was based on economic competition. From the educators' point of view, economic well-being would not magically produce citizens who would have the knowledge and skills to solve the problems of humankind in the postindustrial world.

What those two reports claimed was that the responsibility of schools was to supply a trained workforce for business and industry so that U.S. companies could regain preeminence in the world marketplace. These reports assumed that the basic structure of the U.S. high school was sound and that what was needed was more diligent and globally competitive people produced by of the same system. There was little said about the interdisciplinary nature of knowledge or about how these subjects could be taught more effectively from a global perspective.

The most scholarly of the reform reports were the institutional excellence reports which were written by individuals closely connected to teacher training and the education establishment. Amongst them were Sizer, Boyer, and Goodlad (Mullins, 1990).
Ernest L. Boyer (1984), U.S. Commissioner of Education between 1977-79, and then President of the Carnegie Foundation, makes the strongest argument for a global perspective of any of the reform reports:

Our perspective must be global. If education cannot help students see beyond themselves and better understand the interdependent nature of our world, each new generation will remain ignorant, and its capacity to live confidently and responsibly will be dangerously diminished. (p.19)

Although not every reform being put into place in the restructured schools is built around a global curriculum, many interdisciplinary curriculum models incorporated the idea of global interdependence.

The trend toward incorporation of a global vision was reinforced by the release of the National Commission on the Social Studies (1989) curriculum guidelines Charting a Course. The Commission states:

We have no doubt that the social studies in the schools can continue to adapt and expand so as to take on the pressing task of acquainting young people with the truly global dimensions of social change today and the truly global interconnectedness of states and people ...in such a world the multidisciplinary study of humankind in its variety, rootedness, and interrelatedness becomes even more essential. (p.x)

The Commission recommended that U.S. history at the high school level be replaced with a three-year sequence of world history courses with U.S. history being taught within the context of world history.
The Board of Directors of Global Perspectives in Education, Inc\(^6\) asked Clark Kerr to assemble a national commission on the future of global education. Dr. Kerr, a former president of the University of California and the founding chairman of Global Perspectives in Education, chaired the commission in 1986. Bill Clinton, then the Governor of Arkansas, was among the members of the study commission on global education.

Among the recommendations published in the report the commission prepared *The United States Prepares for its Future: Global Perspectives in Education* (1987) were state and local policies; careful program development; teacher involvement; programs of studies (at the elementary and secondary level); teacher education; school-college collaboration; private sector organization for global perspectives in education. These areas of concern were directed to "states (legislatures, governors, state education authorities), to supporting foundations, to local school districts, and to the teachers and other personnel in individual schools where change ultimately takes place" (p.31).

---

\(^6\) Global Perspectives in Education, Inc. (GPE) was founded by Robert Wallace Gilmore in 1976 as a non-profit corporation based in New York. Gilmore coalesced an elite group of educators and business leaders to serve as a formative board of directors, among them were Clark Kerr, Harlan Cleveland, John Goodlad, Virgil Martin, Bill Good, Ruth Chance, Frank Wallin, John Richardson.
Standards for Global Education

Curriculum Standards for Social Studies: Expectations of Excellence (1994) is the book of curriculum standards for social studies prepared by the National Council for the Social Studies. It includes "Global Connections" as the ninth of the ten thematic strands that form the framework of the social studies standards stating that "Social studies programs should include experiences that provide for the study of global connections and interdependence" (p. 29).

Prior to the formation of social studies standard formation, National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) had already published a position statement on Global Education in January 1982 issue of Social Education. The position statement was prepared at the request of the International Activities Committee of NCSS by John Chapman (Chairperson), James M. Becker, M. Eugene Gilliom and Jan Tucker. The recommendations of the position statement include a need for emphasis in the social studies on the increasingly globalized phenomenon of the human experience, the variety of actors on the world stage, citizen participation in world affairs. It has been noted in the statement that the analysis in the first part of the document was taken largely from Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age by Lee Anderson (1979).

In the Standards Procedures and Policies for Accreditation of Professional Education Units of the
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (1995), the late twentieth century is called the decades of change.

Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, NCATE has operated in a context of proactive response to a national demand for education reform. The nation has reached consensus that American education must be transformed to meet the needs of the emerging information society. ...Education reform must include the reform of teacher preparation. Reaching the nation's education goals will require greater expertise on the part of the teaching force. (p.3)

In the section "Design of Professional Education," the conceptual frameworks are required to be knowledge-based, and to "reflect multicultural and global perspectives which permeate all programs," (p.15).

A Global Perspective for Teacher Education (1983) was jointly prepared by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education and the International Council on Education for Teaching Task Force on International Education. AACTE's decades-long commitment to international education is mentioned in the 1969 Study:

The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has, during the past two decades, maintained an active interest in pushing back the parochial frontiers of American teacher education. ...has attempted to cooperate with ...various agencies and efforts to add an international dimension to American higher education. (p. 234-235)

In the AACTE brochure, the guidelines for "a global perspective for teacher education," are prepared in the light of Hanvey's (1982) "An Attainable global Perspective." Their definition of international education is "the process
by which people acquire a global perspective to explain events in recognition of the increasing interdependence of nations and cultures."

The National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) Curriculum Guidelines (1979) adopted the global perspectives approach in the social studies programs nationwide. Numerous other education organizations such as the Educational Policies Service of the National School Boards Association, the Joint National Committee for Languages and the Council for Language and Other International Studies, the National Association of Elementary School Principals, the American Association of School Administrators, the American Federation of Teachers, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, the National Association of Secondary School Principals, and the National Education Association released position statements endorsing and supporting educational programs reflecting international/global perspectives. (See Appendix-G for the statements of these organizations.)

Other Studies Dealing with the Role of Leadership in the History of Reforms and Continuity and Change in Education

Anne Turnbaugh Lockwood's Conversations with Educational Leaders (1997) includes sections with Theodore R. Sizer (the Coalition of Essential Schools,) in "The Constancy of Change"; with Herbert M. Kliebard (a curriculum reformer), in "The Supreme Context of Reform"; with Roland
S. Barth (creator and promoter of the self-renewal of schools idea) in "Professionalism and School Leaders"; and with Patricia K. Anderson (the coalition of Essential Schools,), in "Reflections on Professionalism and Leadership" where the author interviews with those educational leaders and obtains first hand information in regard to their experiences as they promoted and implemented their innovative ideas and school reform models.

Another study similar in design and conceptualization to this one is "The 'Grammar' of Schooling: Why Has it Been so Hard to Change?" (Tyack and Tobin, 1994), which examines why the established institutional forms of schooling have been so stable and why most changes became marginalized. In their approach, the authors explore the origins of two enduring institutional forms (Carnegie unit and age-graded school), and they then analyze the history of three transient alternatives: the Dalton Plan, the Eight-Year Study, and the new model flexible high school of the 1960s. In their findings, they reflect on the nature of institutional continuity and change. They conclude that,

Humans build organizations and can change them. Cultural constructions of schooling have changed over time and can change again. ...To do so would require reaching beyond a cadre of committed reformers to involve the public in a broad commitment to change. This would require not only questioning what is taken for granted but also preserving what is valuable in existing practice. (p.478)

Another study, Creative Leadership for a Global Future, by Berenice D. Bahr Bleedorn (1988), is a published
dissertation following a design of quantitative inquiry. In the Foreword, Bleedorn states that the critical question she asks in her study was “What talents would be required for effective leadership in a global future, and which of the perceived required talents are being currently addressed in educational practices?” (p. xv). According to her survey results many talents perceived to have priority for effective leadership were shown to be relatively neglected in current educational practices.

[a] growing awareness of the speed and scope of change in human affairs is forcing leadership into new patterns of thought and behavior. Global realities and interconnections are relatively new factors in decision-making; ...preparation for leadership roles has to be a necessary part of educational programming. (xv)

A final reference goes to the Leadership Lessons: From a Life of Character and Purpose in Public Affairs by Stephen S. Kaagan (1997). This book is a good example of the design of this study, wherein the author gathers his data through a series of interviews with a leader in education sector, and builds his work around the intellectual life of that educator, affirming his findings with extant literature and first-hand documents.

In the next chapter I will talk about the design and methods used in this study to explore the role of leadership in achieving change and continuity through global education.
CHAPTER 3

METHODS AND DESIGN

“In determining the universal or essential quality of a theme our concern is to discover aspects or qualities that make a phenomenon what it is and without which the phenomenon could not be what it is.”

_Researching Lived Experience_ By Max Van Manen

**Introduction**

The purpose of this study is to examine in an historical context how selected educators responded to dramatic changes in the world and provided leadership in seeking to change education in order to be better able to prepare citizens to cope with the increasing internationalization of society as it impacts people in their everyday lives.

As the purpose of the study implies, the data are conveyed through words rather than numbers in this study, and therefore, it has been conducted employing qualitative inquiry methods, using interpretive/constructive theory. It has been constructed primarily on the interview data gathered from the transcriptions of tape recorded interviews with James Becker and Chad Alger along with the works of
these two and of Lee F. Anderson and other leaders in global education. In addition, primary sources provided by James Becker (i.e. personal notes, letters, newspaper clippings, unpublished conference papers, conference reports, etc.) and literature that supported and enhanced the discussions and interpretation of those primary resources were used extensively in the study. There were several contacts with Andy Smith, the president of American Forum for Global Education, and with the Stanley Foundation for cross-checking the facts on certain issues.

In the first part of this chapter, I will explain the theories on which this qualitative study is based, and in the second part I will elaborate on the processes I employed in incorporating the theory into the methods I utilized as I designed and progressed from the beginning to the end of the study.

**Qualitative Inquiry**

Qualitative inquiry is a task seeking to capture what people have to say in their own words (Patton, 1980; Glesne and Peshkin, 1990). Denzin and Lincoln (1994) give a broader definition for the qualitative research:

>[It] is multimethod in focus, involving an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter. ...[It] involves ...a variety of empirical materials - case study, personal experience, introspective, life story, interview, observational, historical, interactional, and visual texts - that
describe routine and problematic moments and meanings in individuals’ lives. (p.2)

There is an in-depth description of experiences of people, and the collected data can be interpreted in a variety of ways “in order to find out what people’s lives, experiences, and interactions mean to them in their own terms and in their natural settings” (Patton, 1980, p.22). Qualitative inquiry is a general term encompassing various philosophical approaches to interpretive research. Such studies may be referred to, by their researchers as ethnography, case study, phenomenology, educational criticism, etc. In their environment they “deal with multiple, socially constructed realities or ‘qualities’ that are complex and indivisible into discreet variables,” (Glesne& Peshkin, 1992, p. 6); the entire quest is to understand and interpret how the world is constructed around the participant(s) in a particular social setting. In that sense, qualitative studies are descriptive, heuristic, and particularistic. In quantitative inquiry the intent is prespecified whereas qualitative inquiry is evolutionary, which means that the interview questions, the design and the problem statement develop and change as the researcher progresses. As Merriam(1988) argues, “[t]he selection of a particular design is determined by how the problem is shaped, by the questions it raises, and by the type of end product desired” (p.6). As a general practice, in
educational research with qualitative inquiry, methods, theories, and designs are adopted from fields outside education such as psychology, anthropology, or ethnography (Chandler, 1992). Selecting those theories that further drive the research is a manifestation of the axiology (values) of the study. Inquiring into the complex world of lived experience does not come value-free. Nevertheless, the selection of one orientation over the other (i.e. critical theory over constructivism or vice versa,) either by intent or by the nature of the inquiry, defines the orientation of the researcher as well as the role of values in the inquiry. “Qualitative research explores the poorly understood territories of human interaction” (Glesne & Peshkin, 173). Therefore, this study focuses on unearthing those aspects of global education, specifically the social dynamics and connections as well as the origins of partnership among people with a common cause.

Merriam (1988) argues that data conveyed through words have been labeled “qualitative,” and referring to Patton (1980), she states that qualitative data consist of “detailed descriptions of situations, events, people, interactions, and observed behaviors; direct quotations from people about their experiences, attitudes, beliefs, and thoughts; and excerpts or entire passages from documents, correspondence, records, and case histories,” (p.68). In
addition, the sampling is small and nonrepresentative in qualitative inquiry. And as Lincoln and Guba (1985, p. 254) suggest, those participating in a qualitative study must be "fully informed" to assure that what is known to the researcher should be disclosed to the participants.

Glesne and Peshkin (1992) give a thorough account of the predispositions of quantitative and qualitative modes of inquiry (p.7). Among those differing steps and assumptions between the two types of inquiries are: in qualitative inquiry reality is socially constructed as opposed to social facts have an objective reality in quantitative method; the subject matter, not the method has the primacy; variables are complex, interwoven, and difficult to measure, not identifiable; and the study requires personal involvement and partiality with descriptive write-up in qualitative mode. In addition, "[t]o do justice to that complexity, qualitative researchers immerse themselves in the setting or lives of others, and they use multiple means to gather data" (ibid., p.7). By the same token, qualitative study designs "focus on in-depth, long-term interaction with relevant people in one or several sites" (ibid, p.6).

As succinctly expressed by Guba and Lincoln (1994),

"[h]uman behavior, unlike that of physical objects, cannot be understood without reference to the meanings and purposes attached by human actors to their
activities. Qualitative data, it is asserted, can provide rich insight into human behavior" (p.106).

Qualitative inquiry accepts the fact that all answers given to the questions raised by the researcher in any study are human constructions (Guba and Lincoln, 1994), therefore, the paradigms presented in a qualitative study can only have meaning within the ontological relativism presented in a specific context.

Context of the Study

This study has two major foci: the roots of events and their formal and/or informal connections with the people that shaped the global education movement; and the intellectual biographies of James Becker and his lifelong colleagues Lee Anderson and Chadwick Alger as they relate to the movement. In this study, the stories told by two prominent figures in the field, and their connections with the issues in the global education movement are placed in the foreground telling us about the world as it was (Chandler, 1992), and the research issues are placed in the background as the design of the study emerged following the literature review and during the process of the data analyses. In that sense, interpretive/constructivist theory in qualitative research is the one basically adhered to, interview methods were employed as deemed appropriate in this kind of work.
"Every discipline has a set of methods that its practitioners use to explore the universe they investigate," (Zaharlick, 1992). In my case, as a researcher in education, exploring the emergence of global education in an historical context required first hand knowledge and background work in order to identify the elements to be researched. Although this task is not the same as writing an extensive history of global education, it is nonetheless laden with the same responsibilities, ethical questions, and issues related to credibility and authenticity of a broader study of a similar nature. In the process of formulating the research questions used in this study, and in the course of my examination of thirty years of global education, I adhere to the precepts of the historian E.H. Carr (1986 (first edition, 1961)):

Learning from history is never simply a one-way process. To learn about the present in the light of the past means also to learn about the past in the light of present. The function of history is to promote a profounder understanding of both past and present through the interrelation between them. (p.62).

As regards to the above mentioned foci of this study, qualitative inquiry as opposed to quantitative measurement was best suited to achieving the objectives and to answering the research questions defined for this study. "Qualitative researchers seek to make sense of personal lives" says Glesne & Peshkin (1992, p.1), and I employed interpretive
research as I made connections between educational change, and the life of a leader and a major participant in the global education movement.

This study involves interviews, examination of primary documents, first-hand literature as well as second-hand literature, and controversial views to the global education movement itself. In the piles of data collected in the process, a need to quantify the findings and or seek for objective reality has not arisen to answer the research questions. The research questions in this study deal with interaction with people rather than measurable variables, therefore, I was not in a position to manipulate or control any of the variables, I was expecting them to emerge in the process. To use the words of Glesne and Peshkin (1992), the interpretivist paradigm "portrays a world in which reality is socially constructed, complex and ever changing" (p.6).

**Use of Theory: Interpretive/Constructivist Inquiry**

There has been a major conceptual shift by some interpretivists (i.e. Barone, 1992; Schwandt, 1992, 1994; Smith, 1992) in reassessing the role of methodology in the educational research process, which means that social and educational research is not 'scientific' (i.e. value-free, objective, deductive and generalizable) in the standard sense of the term.
"To the contrary, interpretivists see research as an
eminently practical and moral activity that shares
much in common with, or is continuous with, other
forms of inquiry, such as those practiced by
journalists, novelists, painters, poets, and ordinary
people in their day-to-day lives" (Smith, 1992, 100).

Interpretivists disagree with many of the issues that
dominate the way both quantitative and qualitative inquiry
are perceived. "For them the focus of inquiry must be on the
interpretation of the interpretations people give to their
own actions and interactions with others" (Smith, 1992,
105). Accordingly, interpretivism opens the avenue for a
researcher to inquire his or her own reality which can only
be brought to the forefront through the researcher's
interpretations and the descriptions of the situation
examined. Many people are attempting to categorize
particular studies as, for example, ethnographic, critical,
phenomenological, symbolic interactionist, qualitative.
Smith argues that those types of categorizations do not mean
a great deal to the interpretivist in a research project
although he acknowledges differences at the philosophical
level, "because all manner of inquiries, as long as they
focus on meaning and intentions, can be considered
interpretive- even if the author claims it was done in
accord with a particular stance" (Smith, 1992, 104). In
that paradigm, "interpretivists prefer researchers who are
themselves the instruments of their own research in the
sense that they acknowledge their own instincts, intuitions, and curiosities and allow them to guide their interpretations" (ibid. p. 105).

In order to answer the research questions raised at the beginning of the study, the interpretive, constructivist approach seemed to be the most appropriate and therefore, has been employed in this inquiry. To an interpretivist, the goal of theorizing is to provide an understanding of direct "lived experience," not abstract generalizations. Originating in phenomenology, the idea of "lived experience" emphasizes that experience is not just cognitive, but also includes emotions. Interpretive scholars consider that every human situation is novel, emergent, and filled with multiple, often conflicting meanings and interpretations. The interpretivist, according to Denzin(1988) quoted in Glesne and Peshkin (1992), "attempts to capture the core of these meanings and contradictions" (p. 19).

Guba and Lincoln's "constructivist paradigm" is a wide ranging eclectic framework. They originally discuss their approach under the heading of "naturalistic inquiry" (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). However, they also use the term constructivism to characterize their methodology, "although they acknowledge that constructivist, interpretive, naturalistic, and hermeneutical are all similar notions"
(Schwandt, 1994). They propose their constructivist paradigm as a replacement for what they label as the conventional, scientific, or positivist paradigm of inquiry, and they have spelled out in detail the epistemological and ontological assumptions, aims, procedures, and criteria of their approach" (Schwandt, 1994, p.128).

The purpose of the constructivist approach to inquiry is the “understanding and reconstruction of the constructions that people (including the inquirer) initially hold, aiming toward consensus but still open to new interpretations as information and sophistication improve” (Guba & Lincoln, 1994, p.113). Discussing the nature of knowledge in 1994, Lincoln and Guba argue in the above article that:

Knowledge consists of those constructions about which there is relative consensus (or at least some movement toward consensus) among those competent (and, in the case of more arcane material, trusted) to interpret the substance of the construction. ...These constructions are subject to continuous revision, with changes most likely to occur when relatively different constructions are brought into juxtaposition in a dialectical context. (p.113)

The role of ethics and values in constructivist inquiry is that ethics is intrinsic to this paradigm because of the inclusion of a participant’s values in the inquiry; hiding the inquirer’s intent is destructive of the aim of
uncovering and improving constructions and working toward increased information and sophistication.

This study underscores the values, connections, differences of opinions, social and academic contexts, and various activities undertaken by the study participants as they tried to achieve change and maintain continuity in education. An attempt has been made to understand the reasons for the impediments which slowed down the movement from time to time, and to define the role of leadership in overcoming the resistance.

Zaharlick (1992), an anthropologist herself, argues that ethnographic research can be placed in an educational research context, and an adequate understanding of the anthropological view of ethnography can have value for education. For ethnography, there are two main sources of information about a particular sociocultural system: “the living members of the society and the existing written accounts, documents, and reports about that group of people,” (Peoples and Bailey, 1988, quoted in Zaharlick, 1992). In that sense, this study makes use of ethnographic research techniques in data collection and analyses.

The way the interviews are conducted in this study dovetails with the definition of ‘oral history’ as well. McMahan (1989) defines ‘oral history’ as “a conversation
with a person whose life experience is regarded as memorable" (p.5). He adds that, "[t]he oral history interview is a form of inquiry in which the evidence originates in the act of oral, face-to-face communication" (ibid.). In my case, the interviews with James Becker and Chad Alger reflect the "memorable" life experiences they both had in the global education movement. The study, however, uses "oral history" as one of the means of data gathering rather than operating with the rules of oral history as a form of inquiry.

Over the past thirty years, oral history has found increasing favor among social scientists and humanists. Works such as T. Harry Williams’s biography of Huey Long, Studs Terkel’s "memory books" of the Great Depression and of World War II, David Halberstam’s search for the roots of American foreign policy in the culture of the political elite, Howell Reines’s history of the civil rights movement, and Alex Haley’s tour de force with Roots have popularized oral investigatory techniques and helped to illustrate some of its pathbreaking potential. (McMahan 1989, p. xiii)

The main goal in oral history is to obtain testimony about a memorable, lived-through experience. Oral history movement created such works as Merle Miller’s Lyndon: An Oral Biography (1980), where oral recollections of the former president were interspersed with material from friends, family, political cronies and opponents; and Plain Speaking: An Oral Biography of Harry S. Truman by the same
author (1973), where Miller interviewed the former
president, his friends, family and others (Havlicek, 1989).

Life stories or oral histories are personal
retrospective accounts of experience usually collected
through a series of unstructured and loosely connected
conversations between a researcher/story writer and
participant/story-teller. In life-story interviews, the
conversations are usually dominated by the participant who
is asked to recall and reflect freely on life experiences.
The researcher maintains a more passive role. Life stories
provide important information and insights into lived
in Cole (1991, p.189), “life history developed through the
work of the 19th century anthropologists who, in
supplementing collections of personal accounts or life
stories with information gathered from other sources,
perceived the need for a new, more comprehensive term. Life
history, then, begins with but builds on life-story
information.” The interviews in this study are less for
purposes of gathering data or evidence, and more for
purposes of gaining insight. To achieve these purposes, a
context conducive to reflective dialogue is characterized by
a climate of comfort, informality, rapport, and trust (Cole,
1991). With a parallel practice, the life stories in this
study are a display of personal experiences and an attempt to understand the personal and social dynamics of the movement the study focuses on through the eyes of the participants. In that sense, ‘life story’ is neither the personal history, nor the fictionalized version of a life; it is, however, a narration of memorable experiences.

**Background to the Study**

In October 1992, having newly started my doctoral studies in the College of Education at The Ohio State University, my advisor Dr. Merryfield invited me to a seminar she taught to a group of doctoral students who were at the ‘dissertation proposal’ stage of their studies. In that seminar, Dr. Merryfield invited Lee and Charlotte Anderson, two prominent global educators from Northwestern University in Evanston, Illinois to meet with those prospective global educators, and share their expertise and their personal/ professional experiences in global education. Among the questions asked at that seminar were “what are (should be) the priorities in research in global education? What is it that we need to know to pull the field a little forward?” (Notes from the seminar, October 2, 1992). One of the suggestions was that the history of international/global education was not well known to the new generation of global educators, and therefore it would be
advisable to do some research on the topic. That was my first real encounter with the world of global education and with other global educators, old and new, talking vigorously about the issues, problems, and future of the field.

The second of the same series of seminars was on October 23, 1992, with James M. Becker from Indiana as the invitee. After he was introduced as the ‘father of global education,’ the same group of doctoral students asked Becker the following questions (from my personal seminar notes):

- How do national loyalties come together with international loyalties? (Asked by Tish)
- Can you have a value-free global education? (Asked by Merry Merryfield)
- Do we need one definition for what global education is?
- How do you assess global perspectives?

James Becker’s responses to these and other questions raised a deep interest in me and a desire to hear more of what he had to say about these points in global education. Although I had worked with Jim Becker at the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University in Bloomington, Indiana (where he was the senior consultant to the National Clearinghouse for U.S. Japan-Studies Project that I was a part of for nearly three years), I never had the chance to get first-hand information on his background in global
education. Those seminars were stimulating and motivated me to learn more about global education through lived-experience of the pioneers of the field.

As an international student and an aspiring global educationist, I started wondering as to what types of lives those leaders lived? What circumstances brought them to the leadership of an educational movement, and what would they, could they have to say for themselves? The motivation for the study was mainly curiosity, excitement and pride. The experience was humbling.

My initial intent was to involve four prominent global educators, namely Chadwick Alger, Lee Anderson, James Becker, and Robert Hanvey in the study. My initial criterion was that they were the most frequently cited, and secondly, they were the pioneers in conceptualizing global education. However, the enormous quantity of the material to be studied and examined proved to be beyond the scope and time limitations of a doctoral study, and several of the potential participants were unavailable during the period I intended to intensify on the research. Therefore, I focused my attention on two who agreed to cooperate and be interviewed.

A study with qualitative inquiry thus began. I would proceed, not in a methodical fashion, but through what in
retrospect can be identified as a series of identifiable phases in which I tried cover the requirements of qualitative study.

**Time Frame for the Study**

I was mainly interested in James Becker's involvement in global education. I wanted to look into the role he played as a leader in that field of education. When I first talked with him about my projected goal of a study with him in the context of creating change in education, he welcomed the idea very warmly and encouraged me to pursue it more seriously.

When I tried to frame the study in a manageable period of time, what I had in mind was the last quarter century of global education. As Jim Becker and I talked about his involvement in the field, I realized that the last thirty years would make more sense since, in James Becker's words, the notion of global education first began to have salience in 1968-69 when the study that he and Lee Anderson authored came out from the U.S. Office of Education as, *The Examination of Objectives, Needs and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools*. Although the study did not use the term global education, much of what was proposed in that study later became known as global education.

In that sense, the years between 1969 and the present, became the time frame of this study. The 1969 moon-landing
(20 July, 1969), and the Mars-landing (July 4, 1997) were chosen as convenient time markers, the latter event occurring as I was writing my dissertation.

Selection of Participants: Jim Becker and Chad Alger

As one of the most prolific and most cited scholars in the field, James Becker's works have influenced most educators and scholars in global education. In fact, “[t]o a considerable extent the phraseology of the UNESCO Recommendation also echoes the Becker/Anderson Report, especially in its references to the ‘global perspective’ and the ‘international dimensions’ of education, as well as to the awareness of increasing global interdependence” (Buergenthal & Torney, 1976, p.34).

Becker's collegial connections with other leaders in the field, and his close cooperation with two prominent men in the field, Lee Anderson and Chad Alger, at Northwestern University made him a good candidate for a study with an historical context.

Chad Alger, a Political Science Professor by training, is known by all global educators for his “Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus” project-- one of the most influential and widely used studies ever designed in the history of global education. He was one of the contributors to the 1969 Study, also known as the Becker/Anderson Report, and one of the pioneer advocates of the field as well. His involvement in peace studies for over three decades, and his
contribution to the conceptualization efforts in global education made him one of the key players of the field.

Selection of Inquiry and Methods

In the light of definitions and descriptions given for a qualitative study, the research questions that I had for this study seemed to find salient answers only through qualitative inquiry. Since one of the foci of the study has been to find out about the intellectual biographies of James Becker and Chad Alger to gain vicarious experience of the past through their had first-hand knowledge of what happened in global education in the past thirty years, the qualitative inquiry techniques well suited to that purpose. The interview method provided personal details for the larger picture of the field of global education. The anecdotes, and the stories of their involvement in the field have provided an insight to the literature supporting the topics that deal with similar issues.

As Riessman (1993) argues in her Narrative Analysis, “[s]tory telling, ...is what we do with our research materials and what informants do with us. ...Nature and the world do not tell stories, individuals do” (p. 2). In conjunction with the above, an oral history with James Becker of the global education movement shed light into the unwritten accounts of its contributors as well as the
transactions and connections that created and promoted the movement. Since qualitative inquiry does not produce any concrete findings with statistical numbers (Strauss & Corbin, 1990), the question of validity needs be verified for a qualitative study. According to Carr (1986), "[t]he validity of the knowledge depends on the validity of the purpose" (p.22). In that regard, the trustworthiness of the study was enhanced by the member-check, and extant literature that further created the categories and backed the platform for the discussions of those categories. As Gadamer pointed out in *Truth and Method*,

> Communication involves messages, and messages are always socially meaningful only within some contextually and historically created system of intersubjectivity. (quoted in McMahan, 1989, 107)

Tuchman (1994) argues that history is always the story of lived experience. As quoted in M.L. Smith (1994), "Howard Becker makes the argument for life histories as part of a "mosaic" of community and institutional investigations, as important "touchstones" for considering any abstract theory of person and community, and the testing of implicit assumptions about human beings in the larger sociological studies" (p. 298).

**Instrumentation**

Conceptual frameworks, research questions have a focusing role within a study; the researcher has an idea
what to find out from whom and why (Miles and Huberman, 1994). This study involves a single case with two participants. Therefore, 'little prior instrumentation' was appropriate for the purposes of the study, since the interview questions were open-ended and there were no quantitative elements involved. In addition, the study is descriptive and contextual, interpretive of "lived experience." In that sense, it would be more appropriate to call it 'data sources,' rather than instrumentation. "Prior instrumentation seeks for uniformity, comparability and universality. But qualitative research lives and breathes through seeing the context; it is the particularities that produce the generalities, not the reverse" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 35). In line with that approach, they suggest minimally predesigned instrumentation in order to "maximize construct and descriptive-contextual validity, assure ourselves that our interpretations connect with people's lived experience" (Huberman & Miles, 1994, p.441).

Data Sources, Data Collection

"Ethnography is eclectic in its use of data collection and data analysis procedures. Ethnographers use many different data collection techniques, so that data collected in one way can be used to cross-check the accuracy of data gathered in another way," (Zaharlick, 1992, p.120). In this study, data sources were the interview material
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(transcriptions), literature, and primary sources that support the data in the interview. “Methodological triangulation combines dissimilar methods such as interviews, observations, and physical evidence to study the same unit” (Merriam, 1988, p.69). Zaharlick (1992) points out that the eclectic approach helps ethnographers place events, people and ideas in the larger context in which they naturally occur. Following that approach, I sorted out the data so as to be able to see the dynamics of the field (see the chart on the following page) which further helped me to analyze the additional data obtained from different sources.

**Interviewing**

Method is more than a process of data collection or analysis; it also reflects philosophic and value commitments. Conceptions of reality are reflected in selections of methods. In qualitative studies, interviews may serve various purposes. In this study the main focus of the interviews I conducted was “to develop a conversational relation with a partner (interviewee) about the meaning of an experience,” (van Manen, 1990, p.66). I entered the field with questions and categories in my mind; I was ready to share them with the participant and the best way to establish the desired communication was to converse in an
open-ended style rather than with a pre-submitted written list of questions.

**Interview With James Becker:** My first formal and recorded interview with James Becker was on March 24, 1995 at his residence in Bloomington, Indiana where I was a houseguest for an overnight stay. The extensive interview I had with him further refined my research questions. Four hour-long recordings resulted in a forty-page transcribed manuscript that was member-checked by James Becker. During that visit, James Becker provided me with a substantial amount of materials, documents and information on global education including his published and unpublished works, manuscripts of previous histories, conference reports, news articles, newspaper clippings, correspondence with organizations dealing with global education, and the work of some of his students and colleagues. These generously shared materials and documents have been invaluable in my data collection for the study and opened an avenue for me to build a rapport with the participant, facilitating the search for more relevant information as I developed my focused rationale for the study.

I briefly met with Jim Becker in Bloomington, Indiana a year later, in April 1996, and gave him the complete manuscript of the interview and exchanged some feedback on
the first interview with him. After discussing the emerging issues, he provided me with more data and documents to support the topics that touched upon in the interviews as well as those that I came across in the literature review. To ascertain and compare the perceptions of the three leaders, I systematically provided literature findings and/or primary sources to support the arguments of the categories that emerged in the findings.

**Examples of the interview questions:** Prior to the first interview, Jim Becker and I, along with Anna Ochoa, had a long conversation about what I wanted to do in this study. I shared my intentions, areas of curiosity, and long-term aspirations with Jim Becker in a conversation we had before I turned on the audio-recorder that night. During the 'light talk' I told Jim Becker that my primary purpose was to find out about the inception of global education. At that point, he handed me the "1969 Study" and told me that therein lies the genesis of the field. Thus started our interview/conversation. I transcribed the entire recording and gave the original transcript to Jim Becker, in April 1996, exactly a year after the interview. He returned an edited copy to me a month later in May 1996. The following are some sample questions from the interview.
YAO-q1: Let’s start with the 1969 study, shall we?

YAO-q2: You said international education later turned into global education. What was the concern of that change in terminology?

YAO-q3: Chad Alger mentions in one of his papers that international education has a connotation of more of an elite group of people involved in international studies. But global education is a term itself for the people, for the educators, not only for an elite group of international relations people. Do you agree with that?

YAO-q6: Was there any assessment done for this [the 1969 Study]? What were the reactions later on?"

Our third meeting took place on March 28, 1997 when I visited Jim Becker and Anna Ochoa in Bloomington, Indiana. I briefed them on the progress in my study, and told them that I would spend serious time on it in the summer of ’97.

Starting June 15, 1997 I took time off from work and concentrated on my dissertation full-time. From June 1997 until the completion of the work (end of October 1997) the frequency of my interaction (via phone, fax and other correspondance) with Jim Becker, and with Anna Ochoa several times, has intensified considerably. Jim Becker was informed of each step taken in the anlaysis and interpretation of the data he provided; yet, with all due respect to him, the decision was mine to make.

Interview with Chad Alger: Following the interview with James Becker, I interviewed Chad Alger on May 12, 1995, in an attempt to cover the same ground I covered with James
Becker and to hear a first-hand account of his involvement in global education. However, I did not transcribe that interview until July 1997. This interview was transcribed and member-checked with Chad Alger in July 1997.

**Examples of interview questions with Chad Alger:**

YAO-q1: This interview will be your story of your involvement in global education with your personal touches such as the kind of environment and climate that pushed you into that field. A quick journey back to twenty-five years ago and what happened since then?

YAO-q2: From that point on, as you found yourself more and more involved in global education, what you did [with Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus Project] started contributing to the pre-collegiate level research and curriculum development. How did you feel about it? What was it like cooperating with pre-collegiate people? A rewarding experience?

**Primary Sources**

**Curriculum Vitae:** Data gathered from the interviews were interesting, stimulating, exciting and most importantly authentic. Yet I needed to go beyond that. After the interviews, I requested a copy of their curriculum vitae from both Chad Alger and Jim Becker. Later on, Jim Becker sent me a copy of Lee Anderson’s C.V. as well. I used those in the data analysis and in the history section of the text writing to document chronologically the careers and involvement of these three leaders in global education.

**Letters:** As supporting data or verification sources, Jim Becker shared some letters that he either sent to some
institutions or organizations or received from them. Again, I used some of those in the appendices to back up the data presented in the direct quotations.

**Personal notes:** Jim Becker had extensive personal notes on various issues in global education. Whenever I had a question regarding a recurrent issue either in the literature or in the interview data, he addressed it with a personal note that he sent me. Some of these notes have been included in the appendices.

**Original Documents:** A separate category of raw data was the original documents such as newspaper clippings, conference lists of participants, project reports, and evaluation reports. They were instrumental in data analysis to cross-check the facts and to document certain issues that appeared in the interviews.

### Data Analysis

Huberman and Miles (1994) argue that:

Choices of conceptual framework, of research questions, of samples, of the ‘case’ definition itself, and of instrumentation all involve anticipatory data reduction — which, as we have noted, is an essential aspect of data analysis. (p.430)

As is the case with qualitative studies, they try to describe and explain a pattern of relationships (Huberman and Miles, 1994); these patterns emerge following a set of selective decision making and analytic approach from raw
data to the conclusion. In a similar manner, data analysis in this study was processed taking the following steps:

**Making sense:** This first step included understanding the raw data, decision making as to what to include and what to exclude; listening to the recorded interviews, sorting out the documents, preparations of files and folders for further arrangement.

**Initial processing:** Developing logs and taking notes and transcribing the tapes was the main activity at this stage.

**Member-Check:** I tape-recorded and later transcribed all the recordings I did during the interviews. The transcriptions of the recordings were member-checked with the interviewees, and the corrections were later shared with the parties involved. In addition to the recordings, there was an ongoing interaction through fax, e-mail, correspondence and telephone communication with James Becker and Chad Alger.

**Cross-checking of Facts:** There were a few occasions where I had to find an authority in the field to answer a specific question that I encountered during the data analysis. One of them was a footnote in a report prepared by Andy Smith for the Danforth Foundation. The explanation given in the footnote did not match with any other information I had on the issue. I called Andy Smith and checked with him for further explanation. The additional information he provided
guided me to the dissertation abstracts and I was able to locate the original source of information that would fully answer my question.

Another occasion arose at the end of the interview with Chad Alger. He mentioned two consecutive conferences in Taos, New Mexico organized by the Stanley Foundation of Muscatine, Iowa. He was not sure about the dates but as one of the participants he emphasized the significance of those two conferences. As I was dealing with the foundations and funding issues during my data analysis, I ran into that information and called the Stanley Foundation. They sent me complete lists of participants and a brief memo explaining the objectives of the conferences; the note on those two conferences became a crucial piece of the statement of conclusions at the end of the study.

In another cross-check, I had to call Andy Smith again regarding the term ‘global education.’ From the seminar in October 1992 at OSU, my notes said that the term was first used by Tom Collins. Andy Smith added Robert Gillmore and David King to the pioneering users of ‘global education.’

Data display/organization: I call it ‘picturing the spoken word.’ No coding was used, instead, from the early stages I aimed to display data in categories and groups so that the relations and connections would be more clearly visible.
Reading and re-reading defined certain categories, and frequency of occurrence necessitated others. The first Chart I created is a good example to this stage. That first Chart illustrated the connections, and the dynamics of the field. “Dynamics of Global Education” gave me the big picture to understand the role of leadership in the field. The direct connections between the people and organizations clarified the significance of networking in disseminating the movement. (See the chart at the end of the chapter).

Subsequently, the Table 1, “James Becker’s Workplaces and Programs at Selected Institutions and Agencies” emerged from the interview data with Jim Becker and with his additional input. Table 1 guided the writing of Jim Becker’s story chronologically.

Table 2 was prepared as an aide to comprehend the chronology of the connections between political events and educational policies.

**Interpretation:** Denzin (1994), citing Clandinin and Connelly (1994), aptly suggests the term “experiencing experience.” He argues that “a good interpretation takes us into the center of the experiences being described” (Denzin, 1994, p.501). In effect, moving from the transcribed interviews, to the literature and to the primary sources was “experiencing experience.” The interpretation was most
difficult when the piles of data gathered in separate files had to be put together in a meaningful way so that the reader would vicariously experience the same "experience."

"Interpretation is an art; it is not formulaic or mechanical" says Denzin (1994, p. 502). Writing is interpretation, or storytelling. Thomas (1993) has an interesting approach for interpretation:

Interpretation of data is the defamiliarization process in which we revise what we have seen and translate it into something new. ...Defamiliarization is a way of distancing ourselves from the taken-for-granted aspect of what we see and allowing us to view what we have seen more critically. (p.43)

As a 'defamiliarization' technique, I reorganized data in new ways to have different perspectives of what I initially heard from the participants during the interview or read from the primary sources. As an example to this practice I developed the following chart to search for patterns, to find out if the recurring topics would fit into new categories, different from the ones they originally appear. Here, the frequency of occurrence (frequency of distribution in quantitative terms) has been the selective criterion.
Four C's Model for Global Education:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes</th>
<th>Curriculum</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>Connections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trade</td>
<td>Social Sci.</td>
<td>Peace</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>Ecology</td>
<td>Schools/Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Lang/Culture</td>
<td>Human Welfare</td>
<td>NGOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactions</td>
<td>Behavioral Sc</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>INGOs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again, the above categorization was solely for further interpretation purposes, not for a conclusive interpretation. (This chart is a summary of some of James Becker’s articles and interview remarks.) What was interesting in the above practice was that this chart was very similar to the table developed for conceptualizations. The categories were not as elaborate in the above as they were presented by those who came up with various forms of conceptualization of global education, yet, the idea that global education has emerged out of rapidly changing world circumstances was apparent.

Another display was developed after Lee Anderson’s arguments that the nation-state system lies within the the world-system, and thus, we experience the change through the reflections of that bigger system on our own. In other words, whatever happens out of our state-nation systems would reflect as a potential change in the dynamics of our
social structure in our society. In an educational environment, those dynamics are the ones displayed in the following diagram:

```
World - System

Nation-State System

Social Events
Media
Actors
(Leaders and Followers)
Institutions
Foundations
Professional Organizations
Academic Research Centers
Publications
```

The purpose of this diagram was to find out about different dynamics of that are instrumental either in communicating or transforming that change into educational circles. There is no particular sequence or hierarchy in the way the influencing agencies are listed in the above diagram.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam War</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>President’s</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protests</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Comm Iran</td>
<td>Iran Contra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human-Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Reform</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Cultural Studies</th>
<th>Multicultural/Bilingual</th>
<th>Global/International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace Studies</th>
<th>Nuclear Disarmament</th>
<th>Foreign Policy</th>
<th>Nat’l Security Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>1970s</th>
<th>1980s</th>
<th>1990s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam War</td>
<td>Watergate</td>
<td>President’s</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protests</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>Comm Iran</td>
<td>Iran Contra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Rights</td>
<td></td>
<td>Human-Rights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mov.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Reform</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
<th>Standards</th>
<th>Testing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area/Cultural Studies</th>
<th>Multicultural/Bilingual</th>
<th>Global/International</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peace Studies</th>
<th>Nuclear Disarmament</th>
<th>Foreign Policy</th>
<th>Nat’l Security Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Connections Between Political and Educational Issues

Table 3 is a comparative chart displaying various approaches to the conceptualization of global education. Starting with Hanvey’s most widely-used domains, it includes other prominent models used in the field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perspective consciousness</td>
<td>Inter generational responsibility</td>
<td>Exercise of influence</td>
<td>Multiple loyalties</td>
<td>procedures and mechanisms</td>
<td>global history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Planet awareness</td>
<td>International cooperation</td>
<td>Involvement in World System</td>
<td>Spaceship Earth</td>
<td>Global issues</td>
<td>Global issues and problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cultural awareness</td>
<td>Unity in diversity</td>
<td>Judgement making</td>
<td>Human species and diversity of cultures</td>
<td>actors</td>
<td>Human values and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Global dynamics</td>
<td>Global Interdependence</td>
<td>Interdependence of human relationships</td>
<td>transactions</td>
<td>transactions</td>
<td>global systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of human choices</td>
<td>International Human Rights</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
<td>Futurism</td>
<td>values</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table-3: Comparative display of various GE conceptualizations

75
None of these charts or tables claim to be all inclusive or final. They are used to facilitate data analysis prior to the writing stage.

Construction /Presentation: Chapters 4 and 5 emerged out of those data displays. Once the data were sorted, selected, reduced and processed, the need for a text was imminent. In Denzin’s (1994) words:

If the paradigm is constructivist, the writer will present a text that stresses emergent designs and emergent understandings. An interpretive, or phenomenologically based, text would emphasize socially constructed realities, local generalizations, interpretive resources, stocks of knowledge, intersubjectivity, practical reasoning, and ordinary talk. (p. 502)

Initially I did not aim to separate chapters 4 and 5, however, data analysis (displays) told me to separate the history section from the discussion and findings section. Chapter 4 stood on its own as a history of global education chronologically presented reflecting the life experiences of the participants. Chapter 5, on the other hand designed to include the findings and discussion of issues appeared in the text.

**Phases of Story-telling**

In story telling, as Barrone (1992) admits, "the qualitative inquirer may feel anxious and adrift as phenomena flicker without discernible pattern, like
phosphorescent jellyfish in the endless sea around him," (p.144). That was exactly how I felt after completing the transcription of the interview tapes and reviewing the literature that was shared with me during my first visit to Bloomington with Jim Becker. Denzin (1994) explains this phenomenon as follows:

Interpretation is a productive process that sets forth the multiple meanings of an event, object, experience, or text. Interpretation is transformative. ...Meaning, interpretation, and representation are deeply intertwined in one another. (p.504)

In a parallel thinking, I decided to keep the long direct quotes of the participants in Chapter 4, so that the meaning making will transform from their personal interpretations of their experiences, rather than from my interpretation of their meaning-making. In addition, some of the long interview conversation sections included interesting anecdotes which reflected the insight and the participant’s approach to issues that would not be found in any literature.

**Use of Anecdotes**

van Manen (1990) defines 'anecdote' as “a usually short narrative of an interesting, amusing, or biographical incident” (van Manen, 1990, p. 115). During the interviews, both Becker and Alger used several anecdotes. As these anecdotes were instrumental in telling their stories, I
decided to keep them as they were told without my interpretation and/or paraphrasing. Fadiman (quoted in van Manen (1990)) defines anecdote as “secret, private, or hitherto unpublished narratives or details of history.” In Greek, it means, “things unpublished,” “often, it is originally a fragment of the biography.” van Manen states that biographers and historians value anecdotes for their power to reveal the true character of persons or times which are hard to capture in any other manner.

The significance of anecdotes as a methodological devise was apparent in my data analysis and writing. “Methodologically speaking, story is important because it allows the human science text to acquire a narrative quality that is ordinarily characteristic of story” (van Manen, 1990, p.121). The people and the events that were both dependent and independent of those individuals shaped the interview content. In that sense, interviews were mostly consisted of those anecdotes reflecting the people’s experiences both personally and vicariously.
First Phase: Jim Becker’s Story:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Projects</strong></td>
<td>NCA Foreign Relations Chicago</td>
<td>FPA School Services New York</td>
<td>Indiana University Global Education Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>Retired U.S. Japan Studies Bloomington, IN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Activities</strong></td>
<td>Foreign Relations Series</td>
<td>New Dimensions Series U.S.OE Study Dangerous Parallel INTERCOM</td>
<td>Blue-book-School&amp;Cit Mid-America Program Conferences, Seminars Schooling for Global Age AEGIS Your State in the World Indiana in the World IN/Kent Project U.S. Office of Ed. Study</td>
<td>Summer Seminars Articles ASCD Comm. Center on Global Change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: James Becker’s workplaces and programs at selected institutions and agencies with different settings, similar messages, programs; relatively, freedom of operations in each setting.

This chart has been the road map to Becker’s story in making connections between his work places and the people he worked; it reflected both the change and continuity in gender, and in the areas of interest in global education.
**Second Phase: Chad Alger’s Story**

The concepts that emerged during the interview with Chad Alger have been compared with the discourse in global education literature:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chad Alger’s concepts:</th>
<th>GE Literature terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement across the borders</td>
<td>Transnational Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment (of the people)</td>
<td>Grassroots action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global connections</td>
<td>interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local links to the world</td>
<td>internationalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of local identities</td>
<td>multiculturalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World-centered perspectives</td>
<td>global society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following ideas of Chad Alger were compared with the ideas of Jim Becker:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chad Alger’s terminology</th>
<th>Jim Becker’s terminology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Preferred world’</td>
<td>to envision a better world</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peace education</td>
<td>a redefinition of ‘peace’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local activism</td>
<td>“think globally, act locally”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>movement across borders</td>
<td>interdependence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>larger connections/identities</td>
<td>world-citizen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>redefinition of scholarly work</td>
<td>dialogue with community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work with pre-collegiate</td>
<td>conflicts with scholarly work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rewarding experience</td>
<td>receptiveness of teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All the points above presented the similarities of ideas, and approaches between the two participants.

**Third Phase: The 1969 Study and Lee Anderson’s Story**

In an ideal scenario, Lee F. Anderson should have been a part of this study, but the real world does not always run in accord with our wishes; Lee Anderson’s health did not allow him to become a fully committed participant in this study. In my first phone conversation with him, in March, 1995, Lee Anderson expressed his interest in the study but later, as I was delayed in my data collection and analysis I was told by Jim Becker that although he could not commit himself to be available on a regular basis, he would be happy to read some parts should I need his feedback.

Anderson’s lack of direct participation does not exclude his vicarious involvement. He is an important part of this study. His involvement has been made possible by his life-long colleague/friend James Becker in the best possible way; also his works have been extensively used to reflect the subtleties between the three global educators giving him due credit and respect for his contributions to global education. His works, especially the 1969 Study, have been the core literature supporting the interview data that the two participants provided for the historical and intellectual context of the study. His humor and
intelligent perspective on some controversial issues in
global education are reflected in his writings and there is
no doubt of the crucial importance of his presence in the
field.

**Researcher’s Role**

As a researcher I constructed and interpreted the data
in accordance with my values and belief system in this field
of study. Although I maintained a low-profile
conversationalist-interviewer role with unstructured
questions during the interviews, I maintained the authority
for decision-making regarding data selection, reduction, and
sequencing as well as the selection of participants,
defining the time frame for the study and the subsequent
categorization and interpretation of the data. As Glesne &
Peskin (1992) suggest, “the researcher works to understand
the others’ world and then translates the text of lived
actions into a meaningful account” (p. 153). As a
researcher, I placed myself in the role of a meaning-maker
who makes sense out of the interaction with the
participants. Conclusions drawn from the data that were
gathered from the participants and other sources reflect
that subjectivity and the value-laden approach to the study.
Yet, as the researcher, it was my responsibility to question
uncertainties and/or to choose among competing explanations;
my role was instrumental in cross-checking the facts and in member-checking prior to making any conclusive judgements on the findings. The rapport established between myself and the two distinguished world-citizens as participants influenced the way the study reflected the social dynamism in the field of global education and in this study.

The researcher’s role however did not effect the validity of the study; in other words, the natural validity of the study, “the idea that the events and settings studied are uncontrived, unmodified by the researcher’s presence and actions,” (Warner, 1991, cited in Miles and Huberman, 1994, p. 278) has been maintained.

**Validity/trustworthiness**

According to Glesne & Peshkin(1992), "time is a major factor in the acquisition of trustworthy data" (p. 147). There is evidence of prolonged engagement with extensive interviews, phone calls, visits, and written contacts. I have spent almost five years in this study starting from its early conceptualization in the Fall of '92 till its completion in the Fall of '97. The data collection, transcription of the audio-tapes and data analysis took nearly two years. The writing was done in the last six months of 1997.
Records which were kept offer confirmability of the various aspects of the study. These include the participants' handwritten comments, personal notes, consent letter and audio tapes. The documentation of the study was regularly shared with the participants; the audio tapes, transcripts, and cross-checking were available to them, and they are still preserved. Triangulation in data collection and continual alertness to my own biases, and subjectivity also helped me to pay more attention to producing more trustworthy data. Several unpublished materials that were referred to in the study were provided for the reader in the appendices.

The dates of meetings, important phone calls, fax messages, correspondence and e-mail with the participants were filed and documented for the validity of the study. In the Appendix-M are included the memos written by Chad Alger and James Becker verifying their involvement in and consent to this study. The following is an example of the log of events as recorded at the time of the activity:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 27 '95</td>
<td>M. Merryfield</td>
<td>Meeting</td>
<td>Discussed diss topic; she gave me phone numbers for the Andersons, Bennet, Turney-Purta and Hanvey; suggests a constructed history through the eyes of these people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 13 '95</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>Jim wasn't home; talked to Anna, she is not willing to bring both fields (ME+GE) together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 14 '95</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
<td>Phone</td>
<td>He called back; made arrangements for a trip to B-ton on 3/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 24 '95</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
<td>Visit (house guest)</td>
<td>Drove to B-ton for an overnight stay. 442 hr talk. Time frame will be the last 25 yrs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 24 '95</td>
<td>Anna Ochoa</td>
<td>Discussion during the stay</td>
<td>She suggests that I pass description in history, and pick up somebody to compare notes to validate my data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 12 '95</td>
<td>Chad Alger</td>
<td>Meeting at 3:50 at Mershon Center</td>
<td>Interview 1 hr. 30 min. He agrees to be a participant in the study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 18 '95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Left Columbus, OH for a full time position at ASU, AZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun 18 '95</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
<td>Phone from Arizona</td>
<td>Gave him a brief report about the proposal that Merry and I went over the night before we left Columbus. He says the term 'global' has more economical implications; those four people (Hanvey, Becker, Alger, Anderson) are the most cited, and the oldest in the field; Hanvey joined later. History is recording to see the future we have to know what happened in the past.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 5 '96</td>
<td>Jim Becker</td>
<td>Visit</td>
<td>Handed him transcription; required more documents on foundations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Credibility, a major trustworthiness criterion, can be located throughout the text of the study (text refers to the chapter 4 where a history of global education is presented). Moving back and forth between direct quotes from the participants and their anecdotes, one will find questions and issues which arose in one section were addressed or backed by extant literature in the same or another section.

While there is no reason to attempt generalizability from this study, there is certainly some transferability possible. Given the experience and insights shared by the
two participants, it is quite plausible that these views will further help the reader understand social dynamics and connections that emerge in an educational movement.

**Limitations of the study**

Qualitative analysis allows a depth of understanding and knowledge within context for predictability and generalizability. Findings from interviews may not be generalizable to all circumstances; however, this approach is the only one to reflect the human dimension on a small scale for more profound considerations.

Any attempt to understand the history of a major movement comes with limitations by the very nature of the enterprise and the research activity thereof. Hence, this inquiry cannot cover all aspects of the global education movement even if it is framed within the last three decades, for this new movement created projects, programs, activities and literature outside the scope of this study.

In addition, the absence of policy makers/funding agency voices, and the concentration on one person's views and perspectives on the issues can be seen as limiting factors which can easily narrow the aforementioned learning process. Yet this kind of generalizability was not the purpose of the study; my literature review provided the lenses to examine through the perspectives I chose here.
The researcher's subjectivity can be seen as another limitation for a study done with a qualitative inquiry method; conducting research in the history of a movement, or examining the role of a leader in a movement requires subjective decision-making in the selection of the informant/participant to begin with. "Interpretation is inevitable because narratives are representations" (Reissman, 1993, p.2). My close cooperation and work with James Becker for nearly three years played a significant role in the selection of the topic and the participants in this study. The study, however, does not aim to be exclusive to one approach or view, or a particular group of people. Nevertheless the selection of James Becker is not arbitrary because of his indisputable role in the movement.

The study was presented in the first person, using "I," rather than "the researcher," or the "author," to point the subjective nature of the research.

The following chapter will unearth the stories of James M. Becker and Chadwick F. Alger as they told them during the interviews and subsequent conversations regarding their involvement in global education since the early days of the movement.
Summary

The multiple hats leaders wear in any enterprise and the kinds of influence they create vary from leader to leader. In other words, one leader’s life and leadership style may only shed light on the role that particular individual plays in a particular environment, in a particular period. In that sense, one needs direct interaction to find out about the dynamics of leadership within existing circumstances. Yet, the life-stories of such unique people are significant in holding the torch up to light the path to better worlds.

Joining Barrone (1992), I would like to say that “it is my hope that ever more of today’s qualitative educational inquirers will use their privileges to tell their own critical stories to themselves and to us all” (p. 145).
CHAPTER 4
A HISTORY OF GLOBAL EDUCATION WITH JAMES M. BECKER

"Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has."
Margaret Mead

Introduction

Three men and three decades of cooperation and leadership unfold in this chapter. The story starts around the time of the moon-landing (20 July 1969), and is about an innovative approach to the way we teach about the world. The moon-landing is used as a point of reference to mark the date in history using a universally known event. It is a story about the role of leadership, partnership, believing in a cause and creating a conducive environment for a desired change in education. It is a story about global education, and the three men are Lee F. Anderson, James M. Becker, and Chadwick F. Alger. They first worked together at Northwestern University, in Evanston, Illinois and each made a mark in the history of global education through their dynamic leadership in and contributions to the field. Among the three, Chad Alger and Jim Becker participated in this study; Lee Anderson was not available
due to serious health problems. In the following pages, we will have an account of James Becker's and Chad Alger's journeys, each involving interesting persons, issues and turns of events during their four-decade long service to education in an effort to create educational change for a better world.

Who are James M. Becker, Chadwick F. Alger and Lee F. Anderson?

In 1969, Both Anderson and Alger were tenured professors first at Northwestern, Alger later transferring to The Ohio State University as the Mershon Professor. Becker was never a tenured professor but worked for two major not-for-profit educational agencies, North Central Association and Foreign Policy Association, as well as Indiana University in the Social Studies Development Center.

All three worked as consultants, served on numerous committees and advisory boards, held administrative positions, did research, received grants, wrote reports, gave speeches, organized seminars, conferences and meetings and worked with many colleagues, students, teachers, and community groups on a variety of special programs and projects. Each had a career of his own but they worked together on numerous occasions. Examples include, Alger writing one of the Foreign Relations books, The United States in the United Nations (1963), and serving as
Director of a workshop for teachers sponsored by NCA and by Northwestern University. Becker made extensive use of Alger's "Columbus in the World" model for his "Your State in the World" projects. Anderson and Becker worked together on several major projects including the '1969 Study', *Schooling for a Global Age* (1979), *Citizenship and Schooling for a Global Age* (1979), and *Global Education from Thought to Action* (1990).

Their roles, leadership styles, institutional affiliations and careers might have been different, but they each had an abiding interest in and cooperated on efforts to improve teaching about the world and the role of individuals in creating a better world.

*James Becker*

He has been called the 'father of the field' in *Scholastic Teacher*. As Clare Howard (1974) stated in her article "Launching Global Studies,"

Most experts in the field give deference to James Becker, 'the father of global studies.' Becker became concerned with global education during World War II; he realized that there must be a better way of resolving world problems and saw education as one means of discovering that better way. (p.14)

When he was asked in an interview what he felt about that title, he said,
I don't mind [being referred to as the father of global education], but I don't think I am any more deserving of the title than some other people. To me global education is not one person's view of the world, it's a combination of a lot of things that happen. My own view of when that notion first began to have some salience was in 1969 when the major study that Lee Anderson played a major role in came out from the U.S. Office [of Education] which had commissioned the study" (Global Connection, 1996, p. 2)

Jim Becker (b. 2 September 1919), served in the army in the WW II and he was stationed at different places in Europe for two years. Upon his safe return home he returned school and completed doctoral coursework at the Columbia Teachers' College. He taught Political and Social Science at Winona State College, and at Illinois State University.

Starting from 1956, Becker directed and co-directed numerous projects in social studies; he was the president of two centers, and was a consultant to dozens of other projects in education with global perspectives over a period more than thirty years.

James M. Becker was the director (1982-86) of the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University and director of the Research Study of International Understanding Projects funded by the U.S. Department of Education. He served on the Program Planning Committee of the Foreign Policy Association, was a member of the board of directors of the Longview Foundation, and was on the board of directors of Prime Time School Television in Chicago.
Becker directed the Japan/U.S. Textbook Study Project, a two-year study in which teams of Japanese and U.S. social scientists examined textbooks from each other's country to determine inaccuracies and biases in how each country was presented in the other's textbooks. He also directed a similar study of textbooks from the Netherlands and the United States. Becker also was the co-director of the Indiana Global Education Program and national director for school services for the Foreign Policy Association. He served on the boards of directors for the Center for War/Peace Studies, the National Council for the Social Studies, and the International School of America, and was a member of the Global Education Task Force of the U.S. Department of Education. He retired from Indiana University in 1988, and was senior consultant at the Social Studies Development Center until 1994. He is one of the first recipients of Golden Apple Award, a very prestigious award in global education.

**The North Central Association- Foreign Relations Project (1956-1966)**

"In a sense the story begins long before 1969" said Jim Becker. He had been teaching at Illinois State University. He was supervising student teachers and teaching in University High School, Illinois State University, Normal, Illinois. It was from there, in 1956, he joined the North
Central Association of Colleges and Schools (NCA) Foreign Relations Project. Between the years 1956-1966 he directed the project which was designed to help schools to develop, improve and expand their teaching of foreign relations; in fact, what it really was teaching the U.S. Foreign Policy, not international relations. The project produced, tested and distributed instructional materials to schools and provided training for teachers; they supported themselves largely from selling the materials on the U.S. role in foreign relations.

"Maybe they did not change the world but they did make a difference in the lives of a significant number of educators and in the acceptance of world studies as legitimate topic for school curricula. The story needs to be told," said Jim Becker, and went on to say that

...in an era before paperback books were popular, at the time they were seldom used in the nations' schools, it was also a time when international affairs received little attention in educational circles and was viewed with suspicion in many communities. Senator McCarthy was a in his heyday and internationalists were often his target. Yet, between 1956-1966 the North Central Association Foreign Relations Projects sold to high schools across the country more than one million copies of paperback series of booklets dealing with the role of the United States in world affairs. Through publications, seminars, conferences, workshops, and school visits hundreds of schools and thousands of teachers were involved in discussions and study. The numbers are impressive but the story is really about people, their dedication, cooperation, and respect for each other (Personal notes of Jim Becker)

The idea and the vision was born when J. Edgar
Stonecipher, Director of Secondary Education Des Moines Iowa Public Schools, and Irving B. Harris, Chairman of the Board of Science Research Associates met to discuss possible cooperation between their respective organizations in publishing some materials developed by the NCA Committee on experimental units. This Committee had over the years sponsored the development of units of study on topics which its members felt were critical but neglected in the typical school curriculum. Stonecipher and Harris agreed that international affairs was an obvious candidate for attention. They also agreed that what was needed was enough start-up money to develop attractive materials and promotion by a major educational body to overcome the usual reluctance of school administrations to become involved in topics that might be controversial.

Irving Harris, through his interest in international affairs, had a contact in the Ford Foundation. He offered to help seek the needed financial support from the Foundation. Stonecipher was not only Chairman of the North Central Association Experimental Units Committee but about to become President of NCA. Through their combined efforts, the needed financial and educational support was arranged, and a director, Jim Becker, on leave from Illinois State, was hired. In February 1956, an experimental effort to improve and expand the teaching of international affairs in the nation’s secondary schools got underway.
The number of schools participating grew very rapidly from a total of 32 in the first year of the project to more than 3,500 three years later. Each school received one or more classroom sets of the booklets as well as teaching guide. If they wished they could buy additional sets of the booklets.

On the tenth anniversary of the Project, more than 5,500 schools had participated in this effort, more than 300 conferences had been held and there were eleven titles in the Foreign Relations series. The Project would continue for another two years. (See Appendix... for the list of titles in the series)

The success of this unusual effort played a role in sparking other programs in this area and helped create a climate more conducive to the study of international affairs in the nation's schools. The experience gained was instrumental in shaping the Foreign Policy Association School Services Program and the Center for War/Pace Studies' early efforts.

A “small group of thoughtful concerned citizens” did as Margaret Mead stated, “make a difference” (Jim Becker, in his notes). (For a full list of the members of the committee see Appendix-A).

Ten years directing this major project for a well known regional accrediting agency (NCA) that served thousands of schools in a nineteen-state area provided Jim Becker with a wide range of experience working with teachers, administrators, college and university professors, foreign policy experts, state department of education officials and editors and publishers. Each of the nineteen states served by NCA had a committee headed by a professor at a state university or an official in the state's department of education. As a result, many of the conferences and meetings held during that period, 1956-65, were sponsored by the institution which provided the
chairperson for the NCA State Committee. The Foreign Relations Series booklets were authored by experts on the topic dealt with in the text. (Chad Alger was the author of one of the booklets - The United States in the United Nations.)

Howard Mehlinger, a social studies teacher at Lawrence High School, Lawrence, Kansas when the project began became the assistant director of the project, and later, after he became an Indiana University professor served as a member of the project's advisory committee.

The project headquarters was in the Chicago area. The location made it easy to develop contact with Northwestern University with its well known, highly respected political science department headed by Dr. Richard Snyder, a widely known scholar with a deep interest in international affairs and a willingness to work with public education efforts. Lee Anderson was a young faculty member in the department.

The ten years directing the NCA Foreign Relations Projects enabled Jim Becker to build ties, connections and friendships that would last throughout his career. It also provided an unusual opportunity to learn about school programs, education politics, publishing, dissemination of innovation and materials and to build a reputation as a knowledgeable consultant on school programs in world studies.
Foreign Policy Association: School Services Program (1966-1970)

In 1966, Jim Becker went to New York to the Foreign Policy Association, to direct their School Services Program. The Foreign Policy Association (FPA) was mainly interested in adult education. Great Decisions, which involved organizing study groups all over the country, was their major effort. The FPA had regional offices in Berkeley, California, Atlanta, Georgia, New York, and Boulder, Colorado. The School Services program staff worked out of FPA’s regional offices. It was while Becker served as Director of the FPA’s School Services program that An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools, which was also referred to as the “1969 Study” or the “Becker/Anderson Report” was published.

The 1969 Study: An Examination of Objectives, Needs, and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Schools

Jim Becker’s views on global education were shaped largely by the people and projects he was involved with.

I was in Chicago with the NCA-Foreign Relations when I met Lee Anderson. We were having a conference on Foreign Policy. At that conference, I thought now here’s a fellow I’d really like to work with - he’s brilliant. He had gone through the regular academic route in becoming a college professor - that’s what he planned to do. We got acquainted, we talked off and on. Then, I moved to New York, and we got a grant from the U.S. Office to do the study. The fellow I was working with asked me “Who do you think could do the study?” I
said, "I would hire Lee Anderson." So, I called Lee and asked if he would be interested. He wasn't sure because he was a young professor, and he had to take 18 months off to do it, and it might interfere with his getting tenure and moving up the ladder. So he talked to his mentor, Dick Snyder, the head of the Political Science Department at Northwestern. So we had a conference. Dick came and a whole bunch of other people came to hear what we were going to do. As a result of that, Lee decided, he would like to do this. He would not have done it if Dick Snyder hadn't supported him. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995)

Roger Mastrude, Vice President of Foreign Policy Association was largely responsible for designing the study, Professor Lee Anderson of Northwestern University drafted the major parts of the report, and large numbers of other persons from all parts of the country actively participated in the gathering of data and the discussions out of which conclusion finally emerged. (Becker, 1969, p.2)

The 1969 study was commissioned by the U.S. Office of Education and its purpose was to try to determine where the field was, and what kind of goals and objectives, guidelines might be used to improve and expand international education.

The study was done under the auspices of the Foreign Policy Association. I was there at the time as the Director of School Services; so the grant was in my name but Lee did most of the writing. We worked very closely together and had lots of conferences and meetings; literally hundreds of people were involved in the study. We had a lot of papers commissioned. The word 'global' had been used by then but not generally; certainly not in schools. In my way of thinking this is the first indication of what would later be known as 'global education' because the emphasis was largely on the interrelated nature of the world and it talks about global systems. It set the tone for many subsequent efforts in this field. This report established the need for a new kind of curricular emphasis in the social studies, grades K-12, and stimulated much discussion on needed changes in our international orientation. (Interview with Jim Becker, March, 1995)
In November 1968, the study was promoted in special issue of Social Education, the official journal of the National Council for the Social Studies, published with the American Historical Association with William A. Neisbitt, Editorial Director of School Services of the Foreign Policy Association as the guest editor. The entire issue was devoted to the theme of “International education for the Twenty-first Century.” Some of the original articles that were in the study were published in that issue and the Danforth Foundation supported the publication of the expanded issue of Social Education.

In the Introduction, James Becker mentioned that “[t]he essays in this special issue...are ...a by-product of the rapid social and cultural change that has engulfed modern man” (p.637). He further elaborated on the issue of change quoting Senator J.W. Fulbright that “if ever the line between domestic and foreign affairs could be drawn,...it is now wholly erased” (ibid).

This beautifully worded study pointed out the need for a change in the way we view the world. Lee Anderson, in his article promoting the study in that special issue made the following remarks:

There is nothing wrong with our traditional conceptions in the sense of being incorrect.

...But for a generation that will be the builders of a “post-modern” world (assuming that our generation does not destroy the basic building materials first), this is not enough. ...The world has ceased
to be a piece of cosmic real estate on whose land live
diverse and scattered bands of relatively autonomous

Anderson's sharp remarks on the emerging global
society underscored the need for breaking free from the
prison of ethnocentrism:

When we look at the world as a whole - blending in
our perception of some things we know about the birth
of human societies at the sub-planetary level and
adding a dash of historical imagination - we can see a
global society, albeit in a primitive or embryonic
stage of development. And we can catch a fleeting
glimpse of our planetary society on those rare
occasions when we manage to break free from our own
idiosyncratic perspectives and from the larger prison
of culturally shared ethnocentrism. (Ibid, p.643)

The questions raised in the study were as striking as
the facts that were stated one after another:

... A growing number of people use such phrases as
"international society," "global society," "planetary
society," and "world society" in talking and writing
about the contemporary world. Might not the time have
come to move beyond the easy job of paying rhetorical
tribute to our species' growing interdependence and
proceed to the much more difficult (and also much more
important) task of rebuilding our basic
conceptualizations of the world? Specifically, might
it not be time to consider seriously the possibility
of planning and developing world affairs education
grounded on an image of the world as global society?
(Anderson, 1968, p.643)

Anderson's response to the sceptics about the
pedagogical appropriateness of introducing the notion of
world society to children because "it is too abstract for
children and adolescents," was as follows:

Whether Bruner is right or wrong (and one suspects he
may be right about children's ability to understand
most everything that is presented in an intellectually honest way, and wrong about the ability of adults to do this very often), it remains an open possibility that the world is viewed as a society is not more and perhaps even less abstract and remote to many of today’s children than was, let us say, the Roman Empire to us when our exposure to that society consisted of a few words in a textbook, supplemented, perhaps, by a photo of the Coliseum taken in 1907 or a drawing evincing the assassination of Julius Caesar. (p.644)

Anderson continued his ardent message more colorfully as he painted a picture of the controversial nature of the new notion:

But if the idea of taking seriously the concept of global society is controversial, the concept is none the less an exciting notion. Admittedly the picture of the world as planetary society is not the best of all possible photographs of man’s contemporary condition, and hopefully, it will not be long before our conceptual lenses become much more refined. But ...this picture provides a comparatively better image of the “real world” than does our inherited image of the world as a mosaic of different lands and peoples or a pool table on whose surface are arrayed self-contained balls called nation-states.

Looking at the world as a whole rather than solely through nation-state-centric perspectives was one of the major themes of the study. When the Becker/Anderson report was presented nearly thirty years ago, there was a lot of interest in international education.¹

International Education Act (IEA) and Federal Funding

Maurice Harrari (1972), a political scientist, gave

¹ There had been an effort under the Johnson administration to pass an International Education Act (IEA). The act was passed, but it was never funded.
the following account of the status of federal funding of international education in the Global Dimension in U.S. Education: The University, 

...U.S. academia had adopted willingly a series of fundamental and revolutionary changes in curricula and services. What was desperately needed in the late 1960s and early 1970s was a period of consolidation, of diffusion, and of adjustment to a rapidly changing environment. Sustained financial support, spreading beyond the elitist institutions selected by the private foundations, was needed to capitalize on the momentum and build academic structure somewhat less vulnerable to the vagaries of external finance. An impressive procession of educators strongly urged congressional committees to provide a decade of critically needed support. Funds were presumably to be provided by the International Education Act of 1966. Not only was the Act never funded, but it was followed by a sizable decrease in the funding of Title VI of NDEA as well as of the State Department's Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961 (Fulbright-Hays). (The International Education Act included authorized funding at the level of $40,000,000 for fiscal 1968 and $90,000,000 for fiscal 1969.) (Harari, 1972, p.6) Not only was the hoped for federal funding not available, but large foundations such as the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations were cutting back on their financial support as well:

[2]

The four-book series of Global Dimensions in U.S. Education has been published with the help of a grant from the United States Office of Education as a cooperative venture by The Education Commission of International studies Association (chaired by William D. Coplin), The Committee on Pre-Collegiate Education of the American Political Science Association (chaired by Richard. C. Snyder) and The Center for War/Peace Studies of the New York Friends Group (with Robert W. Gilmore as the President). The other three books are: The Secondary School by James M. Becker & Maurice East; The Elementary School, by Judith V. Torney & Donald N. Morris; and The Community, by William C. Rogers.
To compound the crisis, such giants in the private sector as the Ford Foundation turned away from the support of international studies, partly in anticipation of the substantial funds which the International Education Act promised to pump into the undergraduate and graduate sectors of U.S. higher education. (Harari, 1972, p.6)

The Foreign Relations Project in Chicago that had involved thousands of schools had just gone out of existence. The Foreign Policy Association was out of existence by 1971. While at one level there was a great deal of interest in things international there was also a sense of disappointment; great things that looked promising in the 60s did not happen. The Vietnam War was still going on, and the Civil Rights Movement was in full swing; there were riots in the streets. The interest in things international were secondary in terms of public concern. People were worried about poverty, riots, reactions against Vietnam. The climate in one sense was favorable in that people recognized that the world was becoming more intertwined but in another sense domestic problems seemed more pressing.

**Moon-landing (19 July 1969)**

The moon landing may have had more to do with global education than most people realized. For the first time, after the moon landing, kids grew up with the image of the earth from the moon. We never had that image before. (Interview with Jim Becker)

Robert Leestma (1979), in his article “Looking Ahead - An Agenda for Action,” supporting Becker’s point above, cited Astronaut Frank Borman of Apollo 8, describing his
feelings as he headed back toward the earth after he rounded the moon in 1968: "The view of earth from the moon fascinated me - a small disk, 240,000 miles away. ... We are one nunk of ground, water, air, clouds, floating around in space. From out there it really is "one world" (p.237).

What happened with the moon landing was not that suddenly everybody changed their mind. But looking at the earth from the moon gave people a different perspective not only on the earth but on their relationship to the earth. There were no boundaries, no borders, a ball that everybody shares. The vast area of space was nothingness except for that blue marble as some people called it. Over the years that image had a great impact. (Interview with J. Becker, March, 1995)

Alger's reflections on the moon-landing were more earthbound than euphoric:

Moon-landing was very important because it enabled us to see vividly something which we should have seen before but didn't. It was not necessarily the moon-landing, but the pictures taken from there.

Did the pictures of the earth from the moon erase the borders between countries, at least in the minds of the people? Chad Alger did not believe so:

No, there are borders there! But the problem is that we're the prisoners of the wall map with those artificially drawn very firm hard lines that amplify the division between the states. Of course we also have relief maps but we don't look at them so much, so we understand the world only as states. I'm in no way belittling the significance of states, or the significance of little communities; that's not my intent. We must have local identities, local loyalties, local authorizations, but they always have to
be in dialogue with our larger connections, our larger responsibilities, and our larger identities. (Interview with C. Alger, May, 1995)

There were two major thrusts in international studies at the time: one was area studies, i.e. cultural or geographic areas. Sparked largely by WWII, it was clear that Americans needed to know a lot more about the parts of the world that they knew very little about. In WWII, often times it was very difficult to find an expert on the Middle East, or on wherever the Government was sending troops. The Ford Foundation and the Federal Government poured literally hundreds of millions of dollars into colleges and university area studies centers in the 1960s. The second way in which international relations were studied was mainly through study of U.S. foreign policy and international relations. The Foreign Policy Association, sponsor of the 1969 study, had been helping people understand the nature of America's foreign policy since the end of World War II. The Foreign Relations Project which existed for twelve years studied the role of the United States in the world affairs.

The Anderson and Becker study argued that in addition to studying foreign policy, and in addition to studying the areas of the world, you had to study the world as an interrelated unit or as a series of systems. The 1969 study presented a persuasive core in a conceptual way that, although long after it was published, influenced the way
curriculum makers; and teacher educators began to think about this whole field of international education.

Robert Leestma (1969), the Associate Commissioner for International Education and Director of the Office of Education's Institute of International Studies sounded very positive and seemed ready to lend support to international education in his article:

In a recent article in Social Education, Lee F. Anderson of Northwestern University pinpointed four ways in which the interdependence of the world clearly manifests itself. ...Few terms have been used more widely and disparately in recent years than "international education," and few concepts reflect as much significance for today's education and tomorrow's citizens. The ardent concern of educators across the Nation regarding the growing importance of international education was demonstrated in the enthusiasm that accompanied and followed the passage of the International Education Act of 1966. (p.5-6)

In 1969, when the study was commissioned everybody thought there was going to be money for international education. In fact when the U.S. Office of Education commissioned the study in 1968, they had decisions to make regarding funds in this area. However, things began to fall apart in terms of giving international studies a priority in funding due to Vietnam, poverty and racial issues. Jim Becker talked about that time in his usual relaxed and modest style:

In 1969 when we completed the study, the fellow who had headed that unit of U.S. Office of Education invited Lee Anderson and I to come to Washington and to present our report to U.S. Office [of Education]. When we finished making this presentation I said to
Robert Leestma, "Now we have done this study, we'd like to know what you are going to do." Well, they did very little.

In 1979, ten years later, the same Robert Leestma called me on the phone. He called me and he said, "I remember that presentation in 1969, and I remember your asking what are we going do." He said, "it's now ten years later, and we are ready to start doing something." USOE appointed a commission on international/ global education in 1979, ten years later. So, in effect, it didn't have the immediate kind of impact that people thought but it did get a lot of attention in educational circles - and it began to have some impact on programs that we were developing. But there wasn't much immediate impact other than some of the publicity. (Interview with James Becker, 1995)

Becker and Anderson were not discouraged by the lack of federal funding, they continuously used the ideas and diffused the imperatives that were presented in the report to make a change in the way education system dealt or could not deal with the rapidly changing world. In their article “Riders on the Earth Together,” (1969), they promoted the report with vigor and determination.

From lunar orbit man has seen his world, and the view is far different from the disjointed picture he gets sitting here on earth. ...Earth is a single system, and what if we would but learn to live accordingly? ...To say it bluntly, schools are failing to educate children and young people adequately for the world of today or of the future. ...If we came at international education from this avenue, thinking of man as man, we would compare him with other kinds of life instead of quibbling over differences within the species; we would see race, color, religion, and political affiliation in a broader perspective. We would recognize that we are all "riders on the earth together," as President Nixon put it in his Inaugural
Address, borrowing the phrase from Archibald MacLeish³. ...As directors of the study --together with Roger G. Mastrude, vice president of the Foreign Policy Association -- we felt the emphasis in educational programs should be future-oriented. What the students learn today should make sense in the kind of world they will inhabit in the year 2000. ...About the only thing you can be sure of is that change will be a basic fact of life, so schools should prepare students to adjust and adapt to change, to cope with differences, and to select most appropriately from all available choices. ...We asked people of different training -- elementary and secondary teachers, administrators, professors of international relations, anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists - to address themselves to some of the questions we were raising. ...We conferred, we interviewed, we surveyed the literature. And we found a wealth of material. We were, in fact, constantly surprised at what we could find relevant to our point of view, once we had set out to put international education in this new, different perspective.

Technology was the expedient factor.

Technology has an impact here, not so much in the sense of enabling us to do some particular thing but in that it creates new options. ...[S]ince it is now possible to get to the moon, you have to decide whether to spend money for this purpose or whether other objectives are more important.

The consequences of interdependence needed to be taught in schools.

Instruction in the schools ...typically implies an extreme, either-or loyalty defined primarily on the basis of nation-states. But for most of us, loyalties are apt to be considerably broader than the artificial

³ Archibald MacLeish (1892-1982) American poet, essayist who says "To see the earth as it truly is, small and blue and beautiful in that eternal silence where it floats, is to see ourselves as riders on the earth together, brothers on that bright loveliness in the eternal cold - brothers who know they are truly brothers." (Cited in "Elementary School Programs" by Donald N. Morris in Schooling for a Global Age, p.121.)
boundaries circumscribing the nation-state. ...Mass communications, man's increasing interdependence, the common agenda of world problems, and the growing similarity of worldwide values, all argue the greater importance of world-mindedness.

The `69 Study provided a rationale for world affairs education at pre-collegiate level but much work was needed for curriculum development:

The Foreign Policy Association's effort did not try to do a study of current practices in individual schools. Nor did we involve ourselves in curriculum development. We undertook a point of view, a rationale, for world affairs education in the elementary and secondary schools. Our report ... can be a launching pad for doing the things that need to be done in curriculum development, research, and teacher education. Much hard work is needed - and the sooner the better. For how and what the schools teach about the world can sway the future of that very world. (p. 3-4)

The Becker/Anderson report did make an impact on those who took the time to read it. Lewis P. Todd (1969), in his article "Inspiring Goals for the Social Studies," gave an outline of the report, noting that

[t]he Becker Report is realistic. ...The authors explain at length what they mean, and what they say does make sense. ...We end this discussion with certain knowledge of our failure to do justice to the boldest, most creative, and by far the most relevant proposal for curriculum reform we have seen in print. Our congratulations to all who shared in the preparation of this significant contribution to education. (p.7)

There were many scholars from different disciplines involved in the study, giving it an interdisciplinary approach. The papers were largely written by people in the social science discipline. Global education reflected the
fact that the "founding fathers" were in the social science field. The Report was different from what had traditionally gone on in international education. It was not a curriculum project. It examined goals and needs and objectives.

In 1979, the Center for War/Peace Studies reprinted Lee Anderson's article of "An Examination of the Structure and Objectives of International Education," that had appeared in the November 1968 issue of the Social Studies. Robert Leestma, Associate Commissioner for International Education, United States Office of Education, made the following comment in "Global Education: Long Range Goals and Objectives," (1979) regarding the `69 Study:

The study was a pioneering effort to lay before educators in clear and challenging fashion some fresh approaches to analyzing the nature of the modern world and some of the implications for education. ...Anderson's summary article has stood the test of time very well. The events of the intervening years since its original publication have brought about an increased readiness in the educational community to ponder and probe the study's various assumptions, propositions, and models and to experiment with their implication to the classroom. All concerned with international education in elementary and secondary schools will welcome the timely reissuance of Professor Anderson's article in this convenient form.

So, in 1979 things started moving at the U.S. Office of Education in the direction of global education. Ernest L. Boyer, then U.S. Commissioner, established the Task Force on Global Education to examine the need for global perspectives in U.S. Education.
The Task Force consisted of 31 members, 12 Federal and 19 non-Federal. The non-Federal members represented several State education agencies, professional education organizations, public affairs and international associations, and all levels of education. (See Appendix-E for a complete list of members.) The Task Force was initiated under the leadership of Dr. Robert Leestma, then Associate Commissioner for Institutional Development and International Education. (U.S. Commissioner Report, 1979, p. 1)

The Report included the context and the rationale of the global education and presented the following recommendation with a cautionary statement that “[the] report [did] not suggest that the Federal Government has "discovered" a problem and alone will shape or "solve" it. Nevertheless, the growth of education for global perspectives [was] in the national interest and [was] a national need" (p.7). The recommendations were: 1) to establish a special program of incentive grants and contracts to improve and expand education for global perspectives; 2) to encourage as appropriate the incorporation of global perspectives within existing or planned USOE programs; 3) to provide leadership in facilitating collaboration on education for global perspectives. The Report was appended with examples of national, state and municipal global education programs, and a selected list of education division programs that might be adapted for global education projects. Among those were:
Educational Television and Radio, and National Diffusion Programs. Jim Becker was one of the members of the Task Force.

**The Term "Global Education"**

The 1969 Study included concepts and ideas that later would be called 'global education,' but at the time that term was not widely used. The world was growing more and more interdependent.

A major change with the '69 Study that became very noticeable at the school level. Nations might be the most important unit, but it called attention to the fact that the world was much more interrelated. There were a lot more actors. There were a lot more individuals, groups, playing some roles that were international, rather than just everything was being done by the nations and their leaders. (Interview with James Becker, March 1995)

In addition, the 1969 Study was significant because it was the first to provide a comprehensive, coherent rationale for global education. The term 'global education' was not used in the title, but the study presented its goals, objectives and needs, and served to guide people in global education.

So it provided a rationale and made the case for global education. It was a long time before it had an impact; but, awareness did take place. The term global education was beginning to be used but if you went into schools you would seldomly find the use of the word global at that time, whereas ten years later, the word was very common. (Interview with JB , March 1995)

Charlotte Anderson remarked at a seminar that Tom Collins was the first one to pick the term 'global
education.' (Notes at a seminar with C. Anderson as a guest speaker, 1992). Andy Smith's recollection was that it was between Robert Gillmore, David King and Tom Collins that the term 'global education' must have been used for the first time in the early seventies.⁴ In an article in 1974 the term was used by Clare Howard, a former history and English teacher and assistant editor of Scholastic Teacher, in "Launching Global Studies." It was a very popular term at the time. Robert Hanvey and Robert Gillmore used the term 'global perspectives in education;' yet they did not like the term 'global education' as much.⁵ The term 'global education' created a controversy for years. Jim Becker recollected going to Illinois and talking to the State Superintendent.

He would support some kind of resolution, urging the Illinois schools to do something in this field. But he said he could not use the term global, there would be too much negative reaction from the State Legislature; that, somehow or other, it is un-American, or it tends to make the study of America less important, putting too much attention on international was questionable, the term global implied was that nation was less important. And that would create political problems.

So what they came up with was 'Education for a Global Age.'

He did not have any trouble in using the term global as an indication that the world was becoming that way.

⁴ Information from Andrew Smith, President of American Forum for Global Education, over a telephone conversation on August 8, 1997.

⁵ Information from Andy Smith (August 8, 1997)
but he had trouble using the global that implied that citizens had less reverence for their own country and that they are more concerned about the world than about their own nation.
(Interview with J. Becker, March, 1995)

As a strategy, Jim Becker did not want to do things that made it more difficult for the State Departments of Education. Lee Anderson used "Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age." Michigan was one of the first states that developed a set of guidelines for Global Education. There were quite a few people who opposed using "global," saying that it would get negative reactions from the general public. And there have always been people who felt that world government was the next step, or that if we were citizens of the world we would be less patriotic, have less allegiance to our own country. And that has prevailed up to the present day to some extent. Jim Becker elaborated on the term 'global education' with a discussion on 'multiple loyalties':

The problem stems from the notion of what might be called 'multiple loyalty.' The misconception that if you are in an alliance or loyal to one group you cannot be to another; and that is a major issue in the world today with the ethnic national groups. The notion that you would either have to be with us or against us, you cannot be both. That is, people who tried to live in two cultures often times find that; or people who tried to live in two nations. But specifically in the United States, we live that way all the time. Because you are loyal to your family does not mean you are disloyal to your community or to your nation; or, if you belong to a particular religion that does not mean that you are disloyal to your country. People tend to confuse that and assume that you have to belong to one thing or the other, and you cannot be part of both, you cannot participate in
all these different groups without shunning your
responsibility to some of them; the issue is, how do
you negotiate among various groups that you are part
of? The largest group you are a part of, of course, is
the human species. So what kind of allegiance do you
owe to all human beings, to your family, to your
nation? (Interview with J. Becker, March, 1995)

Where did you draw the line when it came to defining with
whom you formed alliances? Was it race, religion? Was it
language? Ethnic group? Was it all of the above, or some
of the above? According to Becker, it depended upon where
a person found his or her identity:

You can see the issues that have broken out in Bosnia
and in some of the African countries, or Rwanda,
Somalia where people feel a part of a particular group
or a particular tribe and as a result do not have
anything to do with any other group. And it's ironic
because in a sense while the world is becoming much
more interrelated in someways there's a reaction
against that. The divisions seem to be stronger, and
we seem to be fractionalized in a much greater way
than we were before. So smaller groups fear that they
are loosing their identities in the larger group, they
become much more concerned about maintaining their own
loyalties, their own identities. On the other hand,
the multinational corporations people live in the kind
of world setting where they fly back and forth across
the world and communicate with people all over the
world. (Interview with J. Becker, 1995)

Just as the multinational corporations adjusted to the
needs of the global economy, educational change is a must
in a rapidly changing world, and the message had to be
conveyed. The need for change was obvious yet the
instruments for a change to take place were not yet in
place. In his article "International Studies," Jim Becker

118
(197?)\(^6\) pointed out that the drastic change that the world was going through required an equally drastic change in man's social order as he suggested books to the Social Studies teachers:

International studies today, like the world it seeks to understand, is in a state of ferment and change. ...Kenneth Boulding in *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century* (Harper Colophon, 1965), Richard A. Falk in *The Endangered Planet* (Random House, 1971), and C.A.W. Manning in *The Nature of International Society* (Wiley & Sons, 1962) all argue persuasively for the need for drastic changes in man's social order. ...Boulding emphasizes the need for changing the "noosphere" (our "mind-scape" of the world) as a necessary prelude to changing our collective behavior" (p.76).

Changing the existing mind set was a prerequisite to understanding and accepting the changes this new movement offered in the education system. Any definition of global education required elements that would reflect the need for a holistic, ecologic change in the educational system, and that was not an easy task.

**Defining Global Education**

The 1969 Study accepted the fact that it was difficult to cite a definition of international education.

[D]efinitions are always in some measure stipulations. There is obviously no such thing as "international education in the sense of something stored away in the universes awaiting discovery and hence description. (p.16)

---

\(^6\) There is no date on the article; by the references it seems to have been written in the 70s.
Defining global education created more challenges for the early users of the term than the movement that they became involved.

Finding a universally accepted definition of global education is probably impossible. In a sense, global education is like the U.S. Constitution - it is what the judges say it is. In this case the judges are educators, social scientists, accrediting agencies, school boards, state departments of education, parents, publishers, citizen groups, students - all those groups that play a part in setting the agenda for schools. Each brings to the problem of definition their own images of the world and notions of the mission of the schools in educating children and youth. (Becker 1988a, p. 4)

James Becker wrote the following in an unpublished article in an attempt to respond to the question of what global education was:

Global education like the term curriculum is an elusive concept that shifts in meaning depending on who is using it. Sometimes it is used in a narrow sense to mean an outline of content within one or more of the traditional courses or academic disciplines.

... Like general education global education offers a pattern of skills, values and understandings which are assumed to assist in the personal development of the learner and the common good of society. In the selection of content as well as in the pattern of learning there are assumptions about what a mature and educated person should be and what society is seeking to become.

...

I would argue that you cannot improve global education without a model of the learner or learning. But the model is not fixed but various. A choice reflects many practical, political and cultural issues. The best choice many not be the choice of one, but an appreciation of the variety that is possible. The appreciation of that variety and diversity is what makes the education in a democracy something more a
prescribed exercise in cultural rigidity.
(Jim Becker's unpublished article, no date)

Jim Becker's notions of global education curriculum, as he expressed them above included: awareness, activities, skills, and values. Global education placed on these notions and sought to contribute to the personal development of the individual, and contribute to the common good of the society. This was one of many definitions of global education curriculum and content areas.

There were numerous attempts to define global education and reflect its unique quality of inclusiveness, a major difference from the traditional definition of international education. With a similar aim, Alger & Harf (1986) made a clear distinction between international education and global education and provided the following definition indicating that global education was for everybody whereas international education was available to a small elite:

If global education is not to be confused with concrete proposals for world government, neither should it be confused with past approaches to international education. ...[The] difference between current efforts in global education and past approaches to international education is the orientation that global education is a necessity for everybody. Although not usually asserted as explicit practice, international education in the past was actually available only to a small elite. ...Global education stresses the involvement of individuals in a diversity of world systems and institutions, as consumers, workers, investors, members of religious organizations, ethnic communities, consumers of culture, etc. In essence this feature recognizes that human establishments are linked to the entire world. (p. 1-2)
Referring to the distinction made between international and global education by Alger and Harf (1986)
I asked Jim Becker about his reaction to the term `elite' for international education. Jim Becker, with his usual calmness and understanding, responded as follows:

I think that's true. There is an irony here because most of the founders of global education stem from disciplines that tend to be rather elitist. Also, a lot of us were initially involved in foreign policy studies. Many people involved in foreign policy had very serious doubts about whether everybody ought to be involved in it. Their notion was that foreign policy was something that's very complicated and it ought to be and can only be dealt with by those people who have some special expertise. Now `global,' as Chad Alger refers to it, and I certainly agree with, assumes that there are all kinds of contacts and connections between peoples of which have little to do with official government policies; there is tourism or trade, or people have friends abroad or belong to voluntary organizations. In that sense, `global' emphasizes international interactions of all kinds. (Interview, March, 1995)

Focusing on the transnational nature of the interactions of the people in the world today, Jim Becker attributed the growing volume and the scope of these transactions to three major trends: trade, technology, and tourism:

In my way of thinking what caused the whole global education movement is the tremendous increase in transnational interactions, much of the kind of education we had did not take account of the growth of transnational interactions.

There had always been some transnational interactions, it's not entirely new but the scope and the volume and the immediacy of them is what's changed. And that's the point that McNeill, the historian makes. Internationalization, as he calls it, is really a
matter of increased interactions, and that the number of people involved has increased tremendously. The impact of these interactions increased and this was largely due to technology and trade and tourism.
(Interview with Jim Becker, March 1995)

Later, during my interview with Chad Alger (12 May, 1995), I wanted to go back to the term global vs international. In connection with the term global education vs international education, I found out that Alger had a somewhat different approach to using the term 'global':

I tend to call it whatever people want to call it - whatever the group I'm talking to or with wants to call it, let them call it that. How about the word 'world'? Simply because the word global has a kind of an ideological sort of identity. So, I often use the word 'world', or 'world relations'. I have my very deep personal values, but I tend not to try to preach that things ought to be in a certain way. So, I use the word 'world.' I think it is good that we got beyond the word "international" with which we basically meant different states anyway; it's good that we got beyond that, and if it's the word global, fine. But, more often I use the word 'world.' (Interview with Chad Alger, May 1995)

Lee A. Anderson (1979) devoted a book to the importance of global education. His book *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education* (1979) spent nearly five hundred pages on that task, and he had been cited extensively. However, in that comprehensive study, Anderson stated that,

... asking for a definition of global education is much easier than providing one. ...[b]ecause 'global Education' is an abstraction whose referent is not a simple phenomenon. To the contrary, global education refers to a historically complicated and socially complex phenomenon. Given this, it is very doubtful
that there is any one single way of defining global education that will be universally satisfying. (p.2)

Anderson's definition of the field was that "[g]lobal education consists of efforts to bring about changes in the content, in the methods, and in the social context of education in order to better prepare students for citizenship in a global age" (p.15).

It should be noted that Anderson did not agree with the term "global education" for semantic reasons. However, he added that "education for global perspectives [was] a grammatically cumbersome term, although it [was] semantically preferable" (p.1).

In Anderson's definition, the individual had a role through his or her voluntary participation and natural involvement in the world system, the global system, and therefore, he or she needed to understand that system by learning about it and by cooperating with other individuals in the system. The changes in the human condition due to the population explosion, warfare, scientific and technological developments and in depletion of resources created an array of opportunities and responsibilities for each individual on planet earth to create better living conditions for him/herself and others.

Alger had a similar notion of global education in defining what to expect from a globally educated individual:
In my view of global education there are two important goals: one should be empowerment, give knowledge to students, to people such that they can acquire the competence to self-consciously and effectively take part in the inevitable international connections of their daily lives. The second goal will come from peace studies, and that would be that they would be empowered and competent to try and direct those connections in ways to help to fulfill their vision of a preferred future. [People] would see that every day, in little ways, they are building a future world and should take responsibility for that. I didn't start out this way at all. First, I actually saw the significance of the international relations in everyday life. Second, I saw that democracy won't survive if people don't acquire the competence to shape the international relations of everyday life -- because there are international aspects in all the issues of public policy. Third we must have a vision and that comes out of peace studies. (Interview with Chad Alger, May 12, 1995)

Alger approached the issue of what the objectives and goals of global education should be from a critical perspective:

I don't think that much of global education speaks of empowerment as a goal, and of the fact that the end towards which we ought to be striving, is to help people to fulfill some vision of peace or a "preferred world, a better world. (Interview with Chad Alger, May 1995)

(Chad Alger's involvement in global education and his emphasis on peace studies will be elaborated separately in the sections to come.)

The Climate of the 70s

Urban and Wagoner (1996) analyzed the political climate of the 1970s:

The 1970s constituted a period of rhetorical retreat from the excesses of the preceding decade, although
there was never a blanket repudiation of the policies of the 1960s. The tumult of Watergate, the economic battering from the energy crisis and the inflation that accompanied it, and the political maladroitness of the Carter Administration all led the nation further and further from the euphoria, the social agenda, and the political activism of the 1960s. (p.300)

The impact of these developments was felt in many non-government organizations including those which supported international education.

The Foreign Policy Association's School Services Program was declining. It would end in 1971 due to lack of funds. Most of FPA funds that supported School Services, didn't come from the government, they came from the Danforth Foundation, Ford Foundation, New World Foundation, etc. The 1969 study was an exception. The sixties was an era of innovative projects in education and quite a number of them were in social studies. Though some of these continued there was less funding and fewer new efforts. (Interview with J. Becker, March, 1997)

Jim Becker continued with his story, with the third and last major move of his career life from New York to Bloomington, Indiana:

The man behind the Center for War and Peace Studies, Robert Gillmore, said if the Foreign Policy School Service Program is going out of existence, he might be interested in putting more emphasis on international studies at the highschool and elementary level in the Center for War and Peace Studies. In fact, he offered me a job to stay in New York to do this. But I wanted to get out of New York. Particularly I was tired of the commuting and besides it was not a very good place to raise a family, not only was it expensive but there were a lot of other things going on. So, I came to Indiana University to head the Social Studies Diffusion Project. I'd known Howard Mehlinger, in fact we worked together in Chicago in the Foreign Relations Project, and he is the one who said why not come to Indiana? When I first met Howard he was a Social Studies teacher in Lawrence, Kansas, and in a sense, I recruited him. He came and worked with me in Chicago.
Well, he went to Indiana after he left Chicago, and he worked in an exchange program of Russian scholars. Howard has a degree in Russian History and, so he worked on that. In the meantime, he was setting up the Social Studies Development Center in 1970. He said why don't you come and work there. So we wrote a proposal for Ford Foundation and I came to Indiana University on that proposal in 1971.

The study that brought Jim Becker to Indiana University dealt with why some schools adopted innovations and others did not. Focusing on social studies, it was called the “Social Studies Diffusion Project.”

**Indiana University Social Studies Development Center Diffusion Project (1971-75)**

Jim Becker directed the Diffusion Project from 1971 to 1975. The project was " A Program in the Diffusion of Innovation Relating to the Social Education of Youth." In the final report, Becker specifically denoted the connections associated with the project activities and their importance for similar involvements in the future:

The activities, programs and joint efforts which provided opportunities to try out various diffusion strategies and techniques and to improve and expand the Center’s diffusion efforts included a long list of conferences, conventions, seminars and consultations involving agencies such as: The U.S. Office of Education, The National Science Foundation, The Illinois Office of Education, The Indiana Department of Public Instruction, The Kettering Foundation IDEA, The Center for War/Peace Studies, the Lilly Endowment, The UNESCO Associated Schools Project, The Social Science Education Consortium, The University of Illinois Committee on Public Service in International Affairs, and numerous other agencies. (p.7)
What was worthy of note here was that although the project was not directly related to global education, it was entirely relevant to the idea of the diffusion of innovations in education. In addition, creating a network with such organizations and agencies was an important investment in further facilitating cooperation and communication in future endeavors in global education.

Around the time Jim Becker was at the SSDC of Indiana University, Chad Alger started teaching as the Mershon Professor at the Mershon Center of The Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio. Becker and Alger knew each other when they were both in Chicago, at Northwestern. Jim Becker talked about the occasion of their encounter:

The first year, I was at the North Central Foreign Relations Project in Chicago, we wanted to have a summer workshop that would bring teachers in from high schools to learn more about international affairs. So, I went to Northwestern to see whether Political Science Department might be interested in co-sponsoring this. We had some money to pay the scholarships and staff. Richard Snyder, Chairman of Political Science Department, said sure that they would be interested to do anything about the international context of the human affairs, Alger, a member of the department directed one of the summer workshops. That's how I got to know him. (Interview with Jim Becker, March 1995)

Who is Chad Alger?

In global education history, Chad Alger (b. October 9, 1924) deserves to be known as the father of the 'your-community-in-the-world-the world-in-your-community' approach to looking at the local links to the world out there.
Although he did not call himself a global educator, in 1971 he designed the most widely followed project of global education. His model, nearly three decades after its original implementation, is still used in various cities and towns in the U.S. as a means to display of the international connections of a particular community.

Chad Alger, like Jime Becker served in the military during the WWII. He was with the U.S. Navy between 1943 and 1946 as enlisted man at Pacific service. Following the military service he worked at the Pentagon as a Naval Intelligence Analyst between years 1950 and 1954.

He earned his doctorate from Princeton University in 1957 in Political Science. His academic career included peace education, community activism and global involvement in international, and transnational relations. He is also a recipient of Golden Apple Award by The American Forum for Global Education.

**Project “Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus”: Chad Alger’s Story**

It all started when I was a professor of Political Science at Northwestern University, and I increasingly was discovering that a lot was going on in the world which our international relations teaching did not cover. It seemed to me that newspapers were full of international student activities, international artistic connections etc. etc. All we were teaching about basically was the international relations between states; this kept gnawing at me, so finally I taught a course called 'global society' and Lee
Anderson has since taught that course too, and what I was trying to do was break out from just teaching interstate relations. I decided that if there was such a thing as global society there ought to be evidence in the Chicago area; I asked students to do a paper on anything that had to do with the connection between Chicago and the world. I was astounded at what they found: things I never knew about myself. (Interview with Chad Alger, May, 1995)

Alger's enthusiasm about more and better knowledge is reflected in his recollections of his students' creativity in finding such interesting topics for studying the international connections in Chicago:

Just for an example, I thought two girls were putting me on when they said they wanted to study the zoo. They convinced me that the zoo's international connections involved more than animals. There's a world association of those who set regulations for treatment of animals and world organization of folks who procure these animals for the world association, etc. So behind zoos is a whole network of intersocietal relations. (Interview with Chad Alger, May, 1995)

Alger came to the Ohio State University in Columbus, Ohio in 1971. He decided that he wanted to go further. He developed a research project: "Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus" in which they studied how Columbus was linked to the world.

This was quite an extensive study with seven graduate students, supported by the Kettering Foundation. Again, I learned a lot more about local links to the world that I had not known about. I was astounded in 1971 to discover that the local air force base was rotating crews to Vietnam. At the time, I had never realized that we were that close to the Vietnam War. And I learned about the deep international connections of agriculture; the fact that there were farmers
around here that knew a great deal about the global soybean market. And we have local bankers that are going around the world all the time. This study dramatically extended my knowledge about the international connections of my own community.
(Interview with Chad Alger, May, 1995)

Alger (1982), in the keynote address at a symposium in Japan, shared his feelings about this project with his audience:

Previously my scholarly observations of international affairs had consisted of reading books and documents and talking to people in Washington, at the United Nations in New York and at the specialized agencies of the UN in Geneva, Paris and other cities. ...This research transformed my whole view of the world, and my understanding of my own location in the world. I became aware of the fact that my professional training had actually been a form of intellectual imprisonment. It had extended my understanding of some international activities - those in foreign offices, summit meetings, the United Nations, NATO, the Warsaw Pact. But this training had prevented me from being able to see the vast sea of international involvements of my daily life and those of other citizens in my city.
(p.191)

The study received unprecedented attention in the global education community and was cited and referred to extensively throughout the literature. The following is just one the reactions:

Pioneering work in looking at the extent of international resources and interaction in the community has been done during the past decade at the Mershon Center of Ohio State University. Under the leadership of Chadwick Alger (a past president of the International Studies Association), and with funding from the Kettering Foundation and others, the Mershon Center set out to analyze and develop community resources in the city of Columbus. It has been published in a Mershon Center series: “Columbus in the World, The World in Columbus.” This and other studies
can revolutionize one's thinking about the parochial nature of heartland America. Recently this project has produced a handbook for anyone who wishes to conduct a similar exercise in his or her own community. "You and Your Community and the World" by Chadwick F. Alger and David G. Hoopler (New York, Learning Resources in International Studies, 1979) is designed for the independent user; or it can form the basis of an innovative course in community sociology. (Dell, 1980, 74)

The repercussions of the project exceeded all expectations; the community became willing to learn about its own international connections:

This project began basically as a research project. I was just after better knowledge. But unexpectedly the project swept me into community involvement. Our interviews and mail surveys involved many community people in the study. They started inviting me to come out and make presentations on the results - and that resulted in the development of several community organizations. This process led, for example, to what is now called the Columbus Council of World Affairs, and to an organization of international voluntary organizations, etc. Folks in the voluntary organizations sector began saying: "If we are connected to the world as you say we are, there ought to be more going on around here than is now the case. Knowledge about international links stimulated a sense of empowerment. Many folks thought that Columbus, being away from the coast is isolated from the world - and this is just not true at all. That was the community side. (Interview with C. Alger, May 1995)

At this point, Chad Alger's project took a different turn and attracted the attention of people in the global education circle:

But then the educational side took off in ways that I didn't expect. Jim Becker became interested in this city project and applied it to the states. He developed a project that produced a number of "Your State in the World" manuals with exercises for high school classes. Then, Charlotte Anderson applied Columbus in the World material in a unit in a 5th
grade textbook. All of a sudden I found myself as part of the pre-collegiate global education community, which had never been my intent at all. So, I was involved in community activism and involved in global education basically because I had filled a vacuum in academic knowledge. (Interview with Chad Alger, May, 1995)

Chad Alger argued that knowledge about local links to the world was necessary in collegiate teaching, and others found that it was necessary in pre-collegiate teaching, and it was necessary for citizens out in the community to know these things. He did not plan to become a community activist, and he did not aspire to being involved in global education either. However, he found the experience to be very rewarding:

That was very rewarding, and brought great satisfaction that I was doing something useful. At the same time it brought puzzlement in the sense that in the university, in the milieu which I work, this kind of contribution tends not to be valued. A Professor of Political Science in a university receives virtually no credit, and certainly no reward for being involved in this kind of activity. Your job is to produce knowledge and communicate it to other scholars and engage in dialogue with scholars. Your job is not to contribute to formal education outside of the university. So, it set me down in a path of activities which weren't really appreciated by university legitimizers. But I've always tried to contribute research which at the same time extends the international research and teaching agenda in the university. But I don't think, that I have had great influence on university research and teaching of political science. Academic disciplines move very slowly to adapt to a changing world.

The connections that the project studied were the connections linking Columbus to the world out there. There
was no corresponding study at the other end of the connection:

We were studying our international connections, as reported by people here, and also people from abroad that were here in Columbus, but our studies were all based here. It was the world in Columbus and Columbus in the world but as perceived and understood by people here. In our research, we developed a list of people with a reputation of being considerably involved in international things. We called them on the telephone and asked them three basic questions. Then, if they met our criteria, we gave them extensive interviews. We had seventy extensive interviews of the people most internationally involved. Then, from there, we went to studies of the individual sectors: agriculture, banking, service industries, trade, churches, health and medicine, the arts, etc.

When all these connection were put together it gave the big picture of how Columbus was connected to the world.

Of course, what was so revealing was that there is no sector of human activity any place that is not extensively connected to the world. You go to any sector of community life, and it is someway involved. The more you think about it the more you see that there is no such thing as an "American academic discipline." There is no field of the arts in which there is not much coming and going from different countries. You go on and on and on.

Alger promoted the idea of local links for global understanding throughout his career (1977, 1979, 1982, 1987, 1993b). With all these findings in transnational connections, Alger pointed out a very important issue:

Now along the way, something very fundamental happened. Within political science there was the view, and that was my view, that we lived primarily in a world of states and this world of states was becoming ever more interdependent. This led to the assumption that interdependence is something new. But this assumption reveals a sedentary bias. From the time
when human history began there has been a dialogue between sedentary activities, within borders of what are now the states, and movement across borders. So the movement across borders has not evolved out of the breakdown of the states, it was there all the time. Now that sounds very simple but it is very fundamental- so my studies of Columbus helped me to gradually move to the point where I understood that. Lee Anderson was very helpful. Lee educated me on how deep interdependence goes into history because he acquainted me with the works of William McNeill and Eric Wolf. They demonstrate that interdependence is not something new, only the technology for interdependence has changed, and making it move much more rapidly and much more extensively but it's not new at all -it reaches deep into history. In global education a fundamental principle is the understanding of the perennial dialogue between movement across boundaries and creation of boundaries. I don't think in global education we have gotten that across yet, to the degree which we should.

Alger's involvement in the community and the welcome he received from the precollegiate circles via global educators gave him an opportunity to redefine his academic mission:

Well, let me say it's been very very rewarding that other folks thought that I've done something useful; that's very rewarding. I think that it also helped me to redefine my academic mission. That I now see that a scholar must simultaneously contribute to community outreach and to education more broadly. I now believe that good research requires a dialogue with the community through outreach, and dialogue through educational applications. Through these dialogues you obtain new research questions. So I think I've changed my definition of the basic function of a scholar. Early on I was quite pleased to serve the needs of dialogue with my scholarly colleagues and to assume that eventually a good research will trickle down. It now seems to me that that's not a good model.

Coming to grips with the immediacy of a dialogue between the community and academia impacted Alger's
research, and he used his experience with the 'Columbus in the World' project extensively for the next two decades of his career in connection with global and peace education.

My dialogue with global educators such as Jim Becker and Lee Anderson has helped me to understand the kind of research that I ought to be doing. They have signaled to me what is really useful and the way in which the 'Columbus in the World' projects involved the local community has done the same kind of thing so it's redefined my scholarly mission for me, it's broadened it tremendously. Where, as I said before and I'd say it again, I had that very false trickle down kind of notion; and the trickle down kind of notion generally means if there's anything useful it takes twenty years for it to get out there and by then it's probably antiquated.

(Interview with Chad Alger, May 12, 1995)

Jim Becker (1973c) was challenging a similar traditional approach and similar assumptions in the social studies content as Alger was in the international relations. In his "Perspectives on Global Education," Becker questioned the mainstream trends and assumptions in the social studies:

"[N]ow man's capacity for self-annihilation lends a new urgency to a seemingly academic concern. International studies have become the art and science of survival! ...Some of our most cherished assumptions about our global community are being questioned. These assumptions include: the notion that the only important actors in the international politics are nation states; that nations are sovereign in their domestic affairs and can be influenced in only very limited ways by foreign powers; that decision making units are not subject to internal tensions concerning goals, policies or definitions of national interests; and that international political processes differ fundamentally from political behavior within the national unit. Care will need to be taken to see that our new social curricula be placed in the perspective of an increasingly interdependent world - an emerging one-world society. (p.4)"
Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education
(1974-1978)

Jim Becker started a project in international studies with Kettering Foundation support; a small project at first, in a few years; with grants from the Lilly Foundation, it became a major effort: “Mid-America Program For Global Perspectives in Education.”

James Becker elaborated on the objectives of the project in a paper entitled “Mid-America Center: a Concern for the World in Our Backyard”:

How can youth develop the competence to gain greater control over the international processes in which they are involved? How can the contacts and connections between life in hometown, USA and life in villages and cities around the world be made more visible? What resources, talents and instructional materials and techniques are available for such efforts? What projects and agencies offer promising programs in the area of global studies? These are some of the questions and issues the Mid-America Center for Global Perspectives in Education is grappling with. This new agency maintains a part-time office at the International Center of Indianapolis. The Mid-America Center plans to work closely with the International Center and a variety of other civic and educational groups with a demonstrated concern for young people in the age range 5-26. The demonstration area for the Mid-America program efforts is the five states: Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, and Ohio. (Unpublished personal writing-1974)

The Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education produced a number of resources for the global studies field. One of the resources was the handbook modeled after Alger’s “Columbus in the World” Project. In
the following list of publications Jim Becker gave an account of the works that came out of the project:

(1) a 232-page handbook entitled Your State and the World, prepared for and distributed by the Council of Chief State School Offices; (2) a Curriculum Report "Global Education," prepared for the National Association of Secondary School Principals and distributed by them to more than 20,000 secondary school principals; (3) “Indy and the World,” a unit demonstrating how to use the local newspaper in learning about your community and the world, developed by the Indianapolis Star and Indianapolis News for use in elementary schools. MAP has also produced "Mid-America Trades with the World" and Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age by Lee Anderson and was involved in producing Improving International understanding: A School District Planning Guide. A recent publication is Strengthening International Studies in Schools: A Directory of Organizations listing agencies that offer service and materials to schools. (Personal notes “International Global Studies: a Review of Some Recent Developments,” 1985)

Your State and the World

The Mid-America Program became the major promoter of the idea of “Your State and the World,” the project modeled after Chad Alger’s “Columbus in the World” study. The following is a section of the Final Report (1979):

[During 1977] Kentucky held a series of 16 one-day workshops on global education in which their version of Your State and the World (Kentucky and the World) was distributed. ... The Illinois Office of Education printed and distributed 2,000 copies of two publications -- Interdependence: The World in Your Community and Your Community in the World; the latter an adaptation of David Victor’s Illinois in the World. ... The Indiana Department of Public Instruction began work on Indiana and the World, its version of Your State and the World, and continued distributing Interdependence: The World in Your Community and Your Community in the World.
...Developed at the request of the Council of Chief State School Officers, Your State and the World consists of 33 teaching activities, including teaching suggestions and student handouts, and a directory of materials and resources. After its introduction at an April conference sponsored by the Council of Chief State School Officers, Your State and the World quickly became one of MAP's most popular publications.

The popularity and aptness of Chad Alger's "You and Your Community in the World" in global education circles did not die down with the completion of MAP; in fact, it went even further and became a trade-mark application of the "think globally act locally," approach in peace studies. Elise Boulding (1988), one of the world renowned peace education advocates, took the idea and elaborated on it in a section called "Starting Point: Start Where You Are, With What You Know, Your Family in the World and the World in Your Family" in her book Building a Global Civic Culture: Education for an Interdependent World (p.121).

Think Globally And Act Locally

This was from the beginning one of the major themes of Alger's work for education with global perspectives (Alger, 1974, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1993a, 1993b; Boulding, 1988). Alger (1982), paralleling his points about vigorous citizen participation in everyday life world relations described the

imperatives for a change in the education system to include these perspectives:

I now believe that the foundation stone for world affairs education must be citizen knowledge about the place of their local community in the world. ...In the United States, the traditional curriculum and the past training of teachers makes this kind of education very difficult to implement. ...Education about the world ignores the fact that local communities throughout world are connected to the world systems. But progress in curriculum change and teacher practice will be difficult until researchers in colleges and universities throughout our country accept as part of their mission the illumination of the place in the world of people and institutions in their own local community. (p.193)

Alger (1993b) gave in profound detail some further prospects for the same topic in his work entitled *Perceiving, Understanding, and Coping with World Relations in Everyday Life.*

Chad Alger's involvement in peace studies started before he got involved in the global education field, and he later became an advocate of better and stronger peace education as part of a global education agenda. He was at the editorial boards of several international peace journals and publications such as Midwest Journal of Politics, 1969-1971, Journal of Conflict Resolution, 1968-1972, Current Research on Peace and Violence (Tampere, Finland), 1971-1990. He was with the Consortium on Peace Research, Education, and Development, Executive Committee, 1970-1973, and 1980-1983; Chairperson, 1974-1975. He was with the

Important for my involvement in peace studies was my attendance in 1967 of a conference of the International Peace Research Association in Sweden. There I found out what colleagues from other countries were doing. These scholars who did peace studies had a vision of a peaceful world and they were attempting to do research which would contribute to achieving the goal of a peaceful world -- whereas for the most part international relations research by political scientists in the United States tends only to explain why the world is the way it is. Gradually through the years I became a part of the International Peace Research Association and learned more and more about different perspectives in defining peace around the world - not just stopping violence but also including social justice, economic well-being, and ecological balance. (Interview with C. Alger, May 1995).

He eventually became Secretary General of the International Peace and Research Academy (IPRA) and he was on the faculty of the International Peace Academy, in Vienna (July 1970) and in Helsinki (1971), as co-director of a course on peace theory.

My feeling is that there ought to be a greater merger between Peace Studies and Global Education. It would be very difficult in the United States, although the end of the cold war could make it easier. In my view, the basic end of Global Education is to empower people to determine their own global future. And so, the end ought to be to facilitate more competent participation in determining what kind of global connections are appropriate for local communities, for local organizations, families, households, etc., etc. But that participation requires some kind of a vision of a 'preferred world' of preferred conditions for the local community etc., I don't think that's really being done, I think it ought to be done.
According to Alger, the reason why it is difficult to include Peace Studies in Global Education in the U.S. is because it creates a lot of controversy:

Folks like Lee Anderson and Jim Becker would be able to say it better than me but I have the impression that this becomes kind of controversial. If you start talking about educating young people on how to create a better world, it would be quite controversial. But I believe that peace education or peace studies has a lot to contribute to global education, but probably the synthesis hasn't been made yet. But I'm not in the public schools, so I am not really qualified to cope with this issue.

Chad Alger's views about the impediments that prevent peace education from becoming a part of the curriculum are rooted in an historical mistake:

I do know that, during the Cold War, 'peace' was a nasty word. Somehow we allowed the communist world to steal the word peace -- because they sometimes used it in false kinds of ways. Some tended to say that peace must be a communist plot, so we always had to be strong and ready to fight the communists so peace became a kind of a dirty word. Even now, in recent years, when you want to set up a peace studies program folks will says, "well, let's call it conflict resolution, let's call it conflict studies." It is very puzzling that peace does not have the positive ring to a lot of folks.

Alger states rightfully that replacing peace with 'conflict resolution' does not mean that we are fulfilling the requirements of peace studies. In addition, peace has manifold definitions which refer to different practices:

There is a big difference between peace and conflict resolution. There is another problem here: folks think peace studies is indoctrination. They don't realize that peace studies can be a scientific enterprise, but a scientific enterprise that is applied in trying to reach preferred worlds.
According to Alger, the need for vision, for insight about the future, about the kind of world people would like to live in or leave behind required the pursuit of knowledge, but some considered it indoctrination of the young:

I think some people are very fearful of having preferred worlds as the subject of study because they are fearful that you are going to indoctrinate young people on a particular view of a future world. Of course that's not the idea at all-- but rather, to encourage people to have their own preferred world, their own view of peace. Then they must be encouraged to pursue knowledge useful in pursuit of a preferred future. But political science has a tendency to indoctrinate people, when it comes to international relations, with the belief that the world can't be any different than it is. That's a terrible thing-- a terrible thing [not to have a better vision of it.] Instead we teach that there will always be wars!

It was Alger's expectation that global education would enable the empowerment of people, a process through which people would be more aware of their connectedness to the world, and that would consequently create peace and understanding among human beings.

In my view of global education there are two important goals: one should be empowerment, give knowledge to students, to people such that they can acquire the competence to self-consciously and effectively take part in the inevitable international connections of their daily lives. The second goal will come from peace studies, and that would be that they would be empowered and competent to try and direct those connections in ways to help to fulfill their vision of a preferred future. They would see that every day, in little ways, they are building a future world and should take responsibility for that.
According to Alger, people's empowerment is crucial to sustain democracy, and that can be achieved if people understand the role international relations play in our everyday lives; it is only those empowered people who could envision a peaceful world:

I didn't start out this way at all. First, I actually saw the significance of the international relations in everyday life. Second, I saw that democracy won't survive if people don't acquire the competence to shape the international relations of everyday life -- because there are international aspects in all the issues of public policy. Third we must have a vision and that comes out of peace studies. But I don't think that much of global education speaks of empowerment as a goal, and of the fact that the end towards which we ought to be striving, is to help people to fulfill some vision of peace or a `preferred world.' A better world. (Interview with Chad Alger, May 1995)

To Elise Boulding (1988), the co-founder of "Consortium on Peace Research, Education and Development," (COPRED) with Kenneth Bulding, peace requires a change in individual behavior, and an effort to learn the process:

Even more important is to acknowledge the core fact that peace has continually to be made, moment by moment, in the course of the daily affairs of women, men, and states. Peace never exists as a condition, only as a process. Before we look at some of the processes and settings in which peace making can go on at the international level, we will look at our personal management of conflict. Behavior begins with the behaving individual. (p.146)

Peace studies, or `peace education' as it is more often referred to in global education, did become part of the content areas of the field with the efforts of such organizations as The Center for War/Peace Studies.
The Center for War/Peace Studies of the New York Friends Group created in the late 60s, a national, non-profit, non-partisan educational, research, and consulting agency designed to work on international dimension of the problems of conflict and social change. In 1970, the center took over the FPA’s publication INTERCOM, and became instrumental in promoting global education. Andrew Smith (1989) sees the Center for War/Peace Studies as one of the three major factors that contributed to the national leadership of the field during the 1970s. The Center for War/Peace Studies coined the term “global perspectives” and, in 1976, changed its name to “Global Perspectives in Education.” The Center for War/Peace Studies, focused exclusively on the task of international education at the pre-collegiate level. Jim Becker’s article (1974) “Perspectives on Global Education” highlighted the role The Center for War/Peace Studies played in developing pre-collegiate peace studies in those years:

The specter of the atomic bomb and the subsequent development of the supersonic missile has haunted world leaders and ordinary citizens alike for some time. Yet only recently have educators begun to

---

The other two factors were the creation of the President’s commission on Foreign Language and International Studies, launched by President Carter in 1977, and direct federal funding through the U.S. Office of Education of pre-collegiate global and international studies education.
assume responsibility for helping students grapple with the complex threats to man's survival embodied in these gruesome weapons. The result has been the emergence of peace education - a form of international studies organized around the related topics of international conflict and conflict resolution, deterrence, war crime, control of violence, world law, and international disarmament. Also generally included are the allied issues of economic development, poverty, social justice, and environmental health. Groups such as the Center for War/Peace Studies and the Institute for World Order have helped prepare a great variety of classroom materials on these subjects. (p.680-681)

In a letter addressed to the nationwide global education project directors in 1971, Jim Becker tried to join the efforts in the field. In addition to providing them with a bibliography of classroom materials to encourage the sustainability of the programs in the field, he also encouraged the leaders to maintain their involvement in global issues and foreign affairs:

Dear Colleague:

In recent years many educators have been frustrated and disheartened about prospects for improving international studies in the schools. The failure of Congress to fund the International Education Act, reservation about or opposition to Vietnam, concern over constantly rising military expenditures, domestic crises and tightening budgets all seemed to work against efforts to expand and improve programs in international studies. The demise of the North Central Association Foreign Relations Projects and of the School Services Program of the Foreign Policy Association may well be attributed to these circumstances. However, things may not be as bad as they seem; or at least, they may be improving. In addition to the fine work of the World Law Fund in New York and the Center for Teaching International Relations at the University of Denver, several new developments are underway. The Center for War/Peace Studies recently made a major commitment to
help improve the teaching of international studies by planning a variety of publications and programs suitable for high school teachers. The International Studies Association has set up a Commission on Education to work at bringing together college and university specialists and high school educators seeking to bring about improvements in this field. And many World Affairs Councils are taking an increased interest in providing programs for teachers. Skeptics have long argued that the intricacies of foreign policy, international economics and politics should be left to the experts, and debates such as those surrounding Vietnam and the Pentagon papers have raised the issue again. Despite the complexity of international issues, such abdication is unacceptable to most people of democratic temperament. In fact, there is substantial evidence that policy makers and laymen alike are fallible in gathering and interpreting data. Becoming and keeping well informed about global issues is obviously not easy, but rather than abandoning the task altogether, we should recognize our limitations and seek ways to compensate for them.

The purpose here is not to provide an exhaustive list of encouraging signs, nor to pretend there are easy answers, but merely to cite some existing programs and to note that there are many other local, regional and national efforts planned or already underway.

Further, it is hoped that a listing of some available sources and resources will prove helpful to you in your efforts in this field. Although the enclosed bibliography lists but a small fraction of the materials, sources and programs available to teachers, it indicates something of the range and diversity that characterize international studies today, and suggests that resources are available that might serve to build units or courses with quite different approaches or emphases.

I hope you will find this bibliography helpful. It should be viewed as a first draft. Your corrections, suggestions for additions, deletions or revisions would be appreciated.

Sincerely

James M. Becker

Director

---

The copy of the original letter was provided by James Becker in 1996. The letter was written when he was directing
Later on, the Center for War/Peace Studies took responsibility for the Foreign Policy Association's publication *Intercom*, and some staff from FPA's School Services division joined the Center's staff. For example, Tom Collins the FPA regional director became the first director of the Center for War/Peace Studies School Programs. Lee Anderson and James Becker served as consultants and advisors to the Center's President, Robert Gilmore (Andy Smith, 1989).

In the mid-70s, the National Endowment for the Humanities made a major grant to the Center for War/Peace Studies to help conceptualize global education. "For the project, Robert Hanvey developed a short paper, 'An Attainable Global Perspective,' which galvanized thinking about the field in a way no single previous document did" (Smith, 1989).

In 1976, the Center changed its name to Global Perspectives in Education, and in 1988, Global Perspectives in Education merged with the National Council for Foreign Language and International Studies to create The American Forum for Global Education.

In an excerpt Jim Becker wrote for the booklet marking the anniversary of the American Forum (1990), he praised and

the Social Studies Diffusion Project at the Social Studies Development Center at Indiana University.
honored the achievements of those who were actively involved in the formation of the American Forum, and especially the efforts of Robert Gilmore:

When in 1970, Robert Gilmore and the Center for War/Peace Studies began an effort to improve and expand global perspective education in American schools, the hopes of all who had labored in this area were raised. Over the years there had been numerous, mostly short lived efforts to help schools improve their international programs. Few such programs could claim much success and two of the more recent and large efforts - the North Central Association Foreign Relations Project and Foreign Policy Association School Services Program were about to go out of business. What was needed was a coherent, sustained effort to make global perspectives an integral part of the curriculum in American schools. We would not be disappointed.

Over the next 25 years Robert Gilmore and the many other talented and dedicated people he brought into this arena systematically built a dynamic, productive organization. As one who spent most of his career promoting global perspectives in education I am deeply indebted to Robert Gilmore, the Center War/Peace Studies, Global Perspectives in Education and the American Forum for Global Education for mobilizing a dedicated group of university scholars, public servants, business leaders and elementary and secondary educators to create a solid constituency for an area that had lacked support.

Furthermore, they have produced and distributed some excellent reports cation can, fsuperior classroom materials. Their seminars, conferences and meetings have also been a boon to all who work in this important area.

I have greatly enjoyed the friendship and benefitted tremendously from the wise counsel of Robert Gilmore, Charlie Blommstein, Harlan Cleveland, Midge Longley, Larry Condon, Andy Smith, Tom Collins, and many others who played a role in this 25 year success story. There is a real cause to celebrate this premier effort to improve global perspectives in education. (Jim Becker's personal note.)
While these efforts to bring the field under one umbrella organization for the integration of global understanding in education in the U.S. schools were going on, was there international activity aimed at integrating the same approaches into a wider scope in education?

**UNESCO**

Global education as defined and discussed here was education with global perspectives in the United States; it was as national an approach as any other reform movement could be. To clarify this further I asked Jim Becker about the internationalization of the field, and he responded as follows:

There were lots of different efforts to do that. Certainly, UNESCO has done that for years and years. Lee Anderson and I did a paper for UNESCO: "International Understanding and Social Studies." It was presented at a UNESCO Conference. People from several different countries presented their views on how to promote international understanding. There is also a paper I did for UNESCO on teaching about disarmament. The paper was never published because the US withdrew from UNESCO at that point.

The 1969 Study was compatible with what UNESCO was doing. However, UNESCO, while working with all countries, is reluctant to use one country's views of the world. They certainly made use of '69 Study but not in a formal way. There is no international education system. Education systems are national, what is good for the nation is what is important. In American education system, there is not much the government can do unless it is supported by informal groups. On the other hand, government support is important because it legitimizes the effort.

(Conversation with J. Becker, July 2, 1997)

The establishment of UNESCO in 1945 after World War II
was regarded by many as the most important event in the field of international education in the postwar era (Becker, 1979).

A recommendation of the 1974 UNESCO General Conference “Concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms,” was made at its eighteenth session. Among its objectives were (a) “An international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels....” (b) “Understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life...” “Awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations” (Buergenthal & Torney, 1976).

This UNESCO recommendation has sparked numerous conferences and publications including International Human Rights and International Education, written by Thomas Buergenthal and Judith Torney (1976) and published by the U.S. National commission for UNESCO.

In his chapter “The World and the School: A Case for World-Centered Education,” in Schooling for Global Age, James Becker (1979) highlights UNESCO’s recommendations:

The UNESCO recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms adopted by the General Conference ... builds upon the progress made during the last twenty-five years in UNESCO member states. ... The Recommendation
offers an excellent set of guiding principles for educational policy in the field of international education. (Becker, 1979, p. 49-50)

**World Events and Other Projects**

MAP as a separate identifiable project lasted only from 1975 to 1979; yet it had a lasting impact on many of the individuals involved.

...what happens when MAP ceases to exist? Do James Becker and Gerald Marker merely change their clothes and don a new hat, alerting their audience to a new global need? A new global education project? One respondent suggests so: "Abolish MAP and I still have Jim Becker, Gerald Marker and Howard Mehlinger to serve as resources. MAP can stay or go, but keep the MAP people healthy. (MAP Final Report, pp. 89-90)

Indeed, there was life after MAP for Jim Becker, and he kept marching on:

From that I went to several projects. One was the "Japanese Textbook Study," another was the "Netherlands Textbook Study." The next international project was the "Mid-America International Studies Program" supported by the Danforth Foundation. It was pretty much a continuation of the work that began in the '50s and lasting throughout my career.

My experience has been that about every ten years there's a sudden interest in international affairs—triggered by world events.

The first one was Sputnik, '59. Then we had to know more about the world. '69 is the moon-landing. '79, the oil crisis. During Vietnam, a lot of people didn't want to talk about international studies, it was controversial. Besides, it was creating so much havoc in the country that many teachers were not terribly interested in dealing with it. Some did, but a lot of them didn't. In effect, every ten years, there was a new interest and I tried to keep the interest alive as long as I could, and there were
always some projects going on but whenever there was a special opportunity, like Sputnik or the moon-landing, one capitalized on this interest.

And `89 saw the fall of the Berlin Wall, another major event that had a global impact. Although Jim Becker had retired by then he was still with the Social Studies Development Center doing consulting work until July 1994.

The Foundations

It has been Jim Becker's experience that for new movements, government support was important because it legitimized the effort. When the federal government took a stand it was influential even if it did not provide funding. The federal government could not dictate policy, but it could help legitimize the movement. The government played a role, an important role but not a sufficient role. When the government did not allocate funds, people found other resources, often foundations would support the effort. Generally speaking, international or global education was seldom a priority for big foundations. For instance, the Ford Foundation spent millions of dollars on Area Studies at the collegiate level but not on Global Education at the pre-collegiate level.

There were small foundations like the New World Foundation, and the Longview Foundation. I generally had some money from these small foundations to do certain things, like bibliography or hold a conference for teachers. But beginning as far back as 1956, there was not a year went by that these projects didn't have a number of conferences for teachers, and some of them were not strictly global. We had a series on "Democracy
and Totalitarianism," and a series on "Asian Studies," we had some on Africa, different areas of the world. All involved something international, and they all involved working with teachers in schools identifying materials, in some cases producing materials. But not all of them were global. The major emphasis on what might be called global I started in the 70s continued till I retired in 1988. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995).

Danforth Foundation

The Danforth Foundation funded dozens of local and regional global/international education projects. Most projects incorporated collaborative efforts among local colleges and universities, schools and school districts and community organizations and foundations, and teacher education programs (Smith, 1988). Prior to the Foundation's decision to grant one million dollars over a five year period to International Education, James Becker and Andrew Smith were invited to make a presentation before the Board of Trustees to convince them that this money was important for the future of the field. Both James Becker and Andrew Smith were consultants to the Foundation when the Board decided to grant the money. At the end of the funding period, Andrew Smith prepared a report to the Danforth Foundation on International Education for the funding period 1983-88. Judith Torney-Purta (1988) prepared a review for the foundation. In her report, she noted that,

[the Danforth Foundation in its funding of the Grant Series in International Education since 1983 has made an extremely significant contribution to international education judged by any of several criteria --
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material about other cultures and world issues infused into school courses, the presence on school faculties of teachers who are prepared to deal with this content area, the existence of collaborative university school relationships, and the place given by local and state educational authorities to international education in mandates and budgets. The field of international education shows signs of new maturity which can be attributed in no small part to these grant initiatives. (p.1)

The Danforth grants were discontinued in 1988. (For a full list of projects funded by Danforth Foundation see Appendix-B).

**The Climate in the 80s**

In Urban and Wagoner's (1996) *American Education: A History*, we read the following regarding the political climate of that decade:

In the 1980s, the educational climate, like the political climate, was one of wide disarray. ...Reagan's victory presaged a substantial shift away from the focus on equalizing educational opportunity for the poor and minorities that had characterized the country, and he promised a new day for the United States. (p.324)

Among Reagan's campaign promises were the abolition of the federal Department of Education, and the return of prayer to a prominent place in the public schools. "Reagan also sought to trim federal education spending and, ...[t]he net effect of the Reagan-Bush era was a substantial diminution of federal financial support in every aspect of education. (p. 327-28)."
In 1981, Terell Bell, Secretary of Education, appointed a National Commission on Excellence in Education. The commission published its report in 1983 after two years of data collection, public hearings, and deliberations on the issues related to educational decline: *A Nation at Risk*. The public reacted to the report positively and the issues raised in the report were addressed by the media.

The leaders of this coalition, like Diane Ravitch, had been identifying problems such as those raised by the excellence commission since the mid-1970s. As an antidote to educational decline, these excellence supporters advocated a return to basic academic subjects and to traditional discipline policies in the schools. ...The critics of the report did not deny that a crisis existed in education. However, the crisis they saw was related to demographic and economic shifts more than to evidence of educational decline (ibid, pp. 334-35)

As for the global education front, "many of the trends, already underway in previous decades continued in the 1980s" (Smith, 1989). Smith accepts the impact *A Nation at Risk* has created and makes the following remarks:

The report, *A Nation at Risk*, popularized the need to strengthen the traditional school curriculum. With S.A.T. scores declining, and other concerns and other concerns about the schools rising, the report arrived at a propitious moment. As a result ...hundreds of subsequent national, state and local commissions and committees spawned by the report, high school graduation requirements and other academic mandates increased dramatically throughout the nation. A renewed support for the teaching of world history and geography was encouraged by these national trends. (p.22)

As for the funding, "the federal financial incentive for global education began to disappear. Over the next few
years, competition for declining financial resources heightened” (A History in Progress, 1995). Another important development in the 1980s was the escalation of the Cold War. “President Carter withdrew the United States from the 1980 Olympic Games in Moscow. Later that year, Ronald Reagan was elected president partly because of his promise to restore respect for American might around the world,” (Tucker, 1996, 51).

Star Wars was in the making. The specter of mass destruction accelerated the drive toward global awareness on a broader scale. At the same time, visual, heart-rending reports of famine and struggles for survival in the developing world alerted Americans to the serious nature of global realities. (A History in Progress, 1995)

According to Jim Becker, the 1980s were a time of great and varied activities in the field. The support by the Danforth Foundation for local and regional efforts and its emphasis on school and college and university collaboration was an important factor. “For the first time,” he remarked, “international/global education began to be seen as a desirable integral part of the curriculum rather than a temporary response to a real or presumed crisis.”

**Area Studies vs. Global Education:**

The 1969 Study was the first study to offer a comprehensive rationale for global education. How far did it deviate from its original intentions as the decades
passed and to what extent did it remain true to the vision of its creators?

If you start with the notion that what was argued for was a view of the world as a system, or a series of interrelated systems, and you put more emphasis on studying human beings as part of the species rather than only as members of certain nations or smaller groups, what has continued was the whole notion of one earth one species and a global system, or global systems, and that part still continues. (Interview with J. BECKER, March, 1995).

Anderson's (1979) emphasis was on the global economy and economic interdependence in his enormous work Schooling for Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education. Becker elaborated on Anderson's approach as follows:

Anderson, like most of us that were working on this at the beginning, had a political and economic kind of view, not that the cultural was unimportant but we did not have area studies, cultural studies background, and for some time, there was considerable tension between the area studies people and the global education people. Part of that had to do with politics competing for scarce resources. The government put up hundreds of millions of dollars for area studies, area studies centers became involved because the government insisted that if they are going to continue to support area studies they had to do things not only that would be useful to scholars but they had to provide information and insights that would be useful to the public more generally, and to the schools specifically.

The government put pressure on the area studies people, to do what they called "outreach". So, when the area studies people got into outreach they began working in the same kind of areas that the global studies people were working in. (Interview with J. BECKER, March, 1995).
The global education movement, started largely in secondary schools, later reached into the elementary schools. Area studies involvement in outreach programs led to more interaction with school teachers and thus the dissemination of global perspectives into the elementary schools in accord with the developing trend in global education.

Especially in Becker's book, *Schooling For a Global Age,* the 'dream schools' start with the elementary. Donald N. Morris's section is on "Elementary School Program," and Judith V. Torney's section (3), consists of analyses of "Psychological and Institutional Obstacles to the Global Perspective in Education."

There were a few projects that dealt with the elementary. But by large, the people who were involved, we were more comfortable working at the secondary level than at the elementary level. And as more people began to get involved then we began to get more elementary people. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995)

That was one of the changes in those years on the general consensus that global education should start from the elementary rather than a higher level.

Research says that the earlier you start the better results you get. Another thing is that at the elementary level there is more flexibility in the curriculum. Because, you have one teacher teaching several different things, so it is easier to integrate some of these things than at the secondary level where the curriculum is more rigid. American history is a requirement, and the notion is there isn't any room in the curriculum to add something about global studies, and world history which had been rather common at one
time seemed to recede in popularity for quite some
time; it was only in the eighties people began to say
we ought to teach more world history again. (Interview
with James Becker, 1995)

Teaching History with Global Perspectives

What was the curriculum like, in history as it was
taught before the world history that global education
advocated? Was it American history only?

If you go way back, it was taught as ancient history,
medieval history and world history, World history as
we think of it now, often times was not much more than
European History. One of the things that happened to
shape my views in this field, I mentioned the
association with the people at Northwestern University
like Dick Snyder, Lee Anderson, Chad Alger, but
another person that I worked with quite closely was
Lefter Stavrianos who was an historian, and he held
workshops for teachers and he wrote a book on world
history, really on world civilizations for high-school
level. He was a professor of history and he was a
great advocate of world history. Teaching world
history was not popular because it required a lot of
expertise, and objectivity to put the accurate
information together, and different kind of units of
analysis. McNeill and Stavrianos were the major
advocates of the whole notion of studying the world's
history rather than pretending that if you taught
western history you teach world's history. McNeill's
major contributions which certainly feeds right into
the global education is his notion that the story of
civilization is the story of borrowing ideas from
others and adapting them into your own culture and
that's gone on for ever. Marco Polo goes to the East
and brings back ideas and products and the Italians
and the Europeans use them in a way that may be quite
different from what the Chinese did. He said that the
story of human civilization is that of adapting ideas
that we borrowed from other people; and what has
changed is the speed with which that occurs now and
the volume of these changes but that's sort of the
story of the civilization, and of course that's
largely what the global education is about, the notion
that we have all these interactions and transactions,
and that help shape the nature of the world in ways that does away with the kind of isolated view of the world shaped in our own image.

World History is taught in the sixth seventh or eighth grade, depending on how the school is structured, but they have some kind of a world area or world studies course where they generally focus on a particular region of the world. The purist would say global has to do with the interrelated nature of the world, not the separate units in it. But a lot of area studies people argue that. (Interview with Jim Becker, March 1995)

Perceiving the world as one interconnected system, ignoring differences, looking at it as one big group of people on this planet earth contradicted the notion of multiculturalism in which people are studied in separate units.

**Global vs. Multicultural Education: Becker’s view**

From area studies to global education and from here there is a road to multiculturalism.

If you talk about what it was like in ’69 or ’70, I think most of us who saw the world becoming more interrelated, more interdependent didn’t realize how strong resistance to that notion would be. Economically, there didn’t seem to be any way that this trend was going to slow down, there were going to be more multinational kind of efforts and more global companies. What was hard to see at that point was the power, a reaction against this.

And strong local ties, and ethnic and national concern would offer stronger resistance to the whole notion that as the world becomes globalized we lose important identities, characteristics that we’ve had for centuries.
Alger’s View on Multiculturalism

There seems to be two contradictory notions at work here. On the one hand, there is no question that society is becoming more and more globalized, yet at the same time an increasing awareness of our roots and cultural diversity leaves no room for doubt that we are a multicultural society. How do the two notions co-exist? There is a tendency to assume that people working in multiculturalism cannot function with those working in global education.

Let me first say something with certainty and then of lesser certainty. I absolutely believe that global educators must deal with multiculturalism. My preferred world would be one in which multiculturalism is ensured, perpetuated and preserved because I think these are as important as natural resources. A multicultural world is as important as preserving all kinds of plants and all kinds of animals. One reason is that we need to preserve a diversity of approaches, attitudes, of how to solve human problems because we may need to have some of these some day. The other thing is, that homogenization of the world would be just exceedingly boring! It's enjoyable to go to another culture and experience it. So, I think that the global education should celebrate the appreciation of a diversity of cultures, and global educators themselves should be from a culture, identify with a culture and be able to represent that culture. At the same time, they should study, in a dispassionate way, other cultures. Now, here comes then the problem: whether new technologies of communications and travel, are inevitably going to homogenize, I wonder. On the other hand, we also have to recognize, this is something I've learned not so many years ago that there never have been unchanging cultures. Cultures always develop and grow and change.

Alger's candid remarks on the way cultures change and borrow from one another brings up a bittersweet reality, and a dichotomy between the past and the present; the
fluidity of cultures buries some precious authenticity as they blend into one another with the flow of globalization in an attempt to catch up with the present:

They are not static. So, we shouldn't tell that culture X must stay static so that we can look at it as kind of a museum. You see, I can't decide for them but I'm a little fearful that there are some parts of the world that I traveled to and that I enjoyed being there, and the next time I go there I will see McDonald's. I want to tell them you can't have a McDonald's but how can I tell them? You see, these problems are a part of global education.

(Interview with C. Alger, May, 1995)

Differences of Opinions

Since global education did not come value-free, on the contrary it was born into a different set of value system, it brought along a lot of baggage in terms of differences of opinions, priorities, perspectives, approaches and backgrounds. Jim Becker's realistic approach to such differences sheds light on the facts and dilemmas that global education was based upon.

Everybody plays some small part in the world and understanding how the world enables you to do something about changing the world; and I think that's the strong revolutionary part of what Chad Alger preaches. He says, "Oh, I'm not a revolutionary, I am talking about things we've always done about people and about how they worked with other people." But the revolutionary thing is the whole notion that every individual plays a part in shaping the world and understanding the world so that if you believe that the world would be better off if resources were distributed. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995)

Going back to the differences of opinion, the major differences between Jim Becker's work and Chad Alger's work
seemed to be a matter of approaches, not of substantive issues. Becker conceived of himself as a practitioner whereas to him, Alger was an idealist, a scholar, and an intellectual. Becker believed in the same causes as Alger such as the crucial significance of community involvement in achieving peace, yet he did not see this happening in the near future:

I think one of the differences would be that Chad is much more idealistic, especially his notions about peace. I don't have any quarrel with the goals he has. I think he is unrealistic about the extent to which you can achieve some of those, and also the time it takes although he knows how much time it takes, to try to get a community like Columbus, Ohio to look at itself in terms of its role in a larger world. I think it can be accomplished, and he's demonstrated that this can be done, I think it is terribly unrealistic to expect that that can take place within the next five hundred years and especially on a world-wide basis.

Becker's motives were basically 'let us do what we can and what works today,' rather than spending time on theory. Yet Becker fully acknowledged the significance of Alger's work:

I have certainly made a great deal of use of Chad's work; his work is a major contribution in this field and probably his whole unique 'your community in the world' effort has had more impact in getting more people to see that they do play a role in the larger world than anything I can think of. He is going to say, 'how do you convince people that they ought to know something about the world?' Well, just show them they are already in it, that their lives are already affected by it, whether they already know it or not, they play a part in it. The question is whether they are going to play a part that is in their own best interest if they understand something about how the world works, or are they going to shoot themselves in
the foot because they don't understand that there are consequences to whatever lifestyle they live, and there are consequences to where they set their thermostat and what product they buy; and all those things are roles they play participating in making the world the kind of world it is. If you think of the world as big as it is, today is the result of millions of individual decisions made over the years often times without much thinking about what the consequences are. But that's the way the world works; the impact of those decisions people make influence policies, the leaders, and trends and developments and so that the more you understand about it the more likely you are to make decisions that are more helpful to the world in the direction you want to see it go. I think Chad's basic contribution demonstrated that this can be done. (Interview with J. Becker, March, 1995)

Jim Becker, although not using the same terms, was talking about individuals as actors in the world system and their pursuit of knowledge about the part they played; in Alger's terms, "the empowerment of those individuals." For other differences of opinions among the people in the global education field, Jim Becker went on to say:

Some of this is philosophy and some of it is strategy too; Lee Anderson's views, for example, are often seen as being very radical. Part of that stems from his philosophy, from his notion of how the world's economic system developed and how it has been dominated by the West and, today especially, by multinational corporations, and life of equality and opportunity for different kinds of groups. Part of it of course, is strategy; that is, if you are going to teach about creating a world that is more equitable, in which the distribution of the world's resources are done more fairly than given the fact that we live in a society with the particular part of the country, or particular part of the world that's been very successful in accumulating resources and in using these resources and some would argue exploiting other people's resources. Then, how do you teach about that in a way that is likely to be acceptable? You can argue that those who are in power never give up power freely. Ten percent of the world's population controls most of the world's resources; how do you teach about
that in a way that serves to highlight that situation and to rectify it someways so that there will be more equal distribution? In that case you go back to this whole philosophy of what are our loyalties and identities and responsibilities and our rights and our privileges by virtue of who we are in terms of if we are a member of a species: we are all members of the same species, then do we have any obligations to all other members of the species? Should we help other members of the species to get their share of these resources? That's where it gets sticky. Some people say "what do we have to do with that? We are born into this society and so it happens to be a wealthy society, and why should we worry about the rest of the world?" That's one kind of identity, and that's where multiple identities, multiple loyalties and conflicting loyalties come in. And then you say, while we're part of an American democracy, what kinds of rights, obligations, duties, responsibilities do we have in terms of American democracy? Are those more important than anything we have to do with the world's total population? Is it the species member versus the member of a particular nation? And then you carry it down to your own community and your own religious group; so how do you divide up these loyalties? And I think there are different views amongst the people in this field on how you do that. And I'd say part of its philosophy is whether you believe that an equitable distribution of wealth is a desirable thing or even if they think it is a desirable thing whether it is something that can be done, whether you have to work for that or whether you start with the assumption that I am one individual and have very little influence and how wise is it to spend my whole life beating my head against a stone wall trying to make the world better for millions of other people who I don't know and will never see.

This not only makes me miserable but it does not help anybody else much anyway. And that's quite a different philosophy from everybody plays some small part in the world and understanding the world how it works enable you to do something about changing the world; and I think that's the strong revolutionary part of what Chad Alger preaches.

But I think the major differences in philosophy have to do with how much can the world be changed and how much change should be done through education and what is the role of education to make these changes. Some people are really pessimistic; they say education
doesn't change the world, education really responds to
the changing world; and to expect that education will
lead the way is to be terribly naive. The whole
system, at least in this country, education is a
function of national governance, and so education is
likely to represent what governments are trying to
achieve. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995)

That comment reminded me of Robert Hanvey, and I asked
Becker about him.

Bob is probably more pessimistic. Bob feels that what
we can do is very limited and what education can do is
especially limited, and we are very unrealistic to
expect that educators in education is going to play a
major role in changing the world. Technology is going
to play a major role. There are trends and
developments that education ought to be aware of and
they capitalize on, but we should not pretend that we,
the educators are the ones who are playing a major
role in making these changes. He would argue that
computers and the new technology, especially when you
get computers and the fax machines, and telephones,
everything hooked up is already drastically changing
the way many people see themselves in the world. The
problem with that of course is that you get an
information highway as they call it but that’s the
control of some; not everybody has access, or the same
access to it although it does have the potential of
providing more information than has ever been the case
before. And that provides the public to do things that
people have not done before. I am not so sure that we
differ a lot on philosophy, but we do differ in
potential education and what prospects are for human
beings for doing better than they have done before. I
mean human nature is what it is, and so, trying to
improve human nature, trying to change drastically may
not be terribly productive, you can adapt to it, make
the best of it, I guess, not to expect major changes.

Social changes affect the schools and then schools try
to adapt to the change that is occurring in society.
Opposition/Controversy

The entire discourse about global education discussed here should not sound like it has been received all very positively by various enterprises and/or by diverse sectors in society; on the contrary, global education created a whole range of controversy. Some did not make much sense, some were very important. Differences in how we view the world created different perceptions of global education.

In an attempt to assess those controversies we will discuss them into two categories here: those that came from external sources outside the field, and those intrinsic to academia.

There are these people who feel that teaching too much about other countries, about the world generally undermines our patriotism; it is important to kids to know their own country, and that they identify within the field a kind of loyalty and a responsibility toward their own country. I think that’s a question you can debate; how much do you have to emphasize your own and how much do you have to emphasize others. (Interview with J. Becker, March 1995)

Did this kind of patriotism have any kind of political direction as well? Did the idea that global education or global understanding was not as important as national history or national understanding come from a particular group of people with a political agenda, or was it shared by those with various political perspectives?

There is a variety of expressions for this, and certainly a great range of groups. For example, during the cold war, there was a strong group that felt that our security was being undermined if we learned too much about what we thought then was alien kinds of
philosophy. There were those people who thought we should not teach about the Soviet Union because learning about the Soviet Union would undermine our own resolve, our own values, that some people might succumb through the communist propaganda and so we shouldn't study the Soviet Union. There were other people who felt, “We ought to study the Soviet Union to know your enemy.” This was the enemy. The more you know about the enemy, the more likely you are going to be able to defeat them. That was in sharp contrast to other groups who felt that we all live in the same world and we have to understand the Soviet Union, understand their point of view, that they are not just the enemy but that they have ideas that we need to understand in order to negotiate with them. They had this idea about two deadly spiders in a bottle and somehow they have to figure out a way in which they could view each other not as mortal enemies but as human beings; they had to find some way of living together. So you had all kinds of views on how to teach about the world, all the way from “it is a dangerous world, you get to know your enemy” to “it is a small world and you get to know people so that you can work out some way of negotiating with each other and that they are not pure devils that can't be dealt with, but they are human beings who may have, from our viewpoint, misguided ideas but that we ought to be able to figure out some way of working this out.” And of course if you have one of those beliefs or the other, you have quite different notions of what you teach about. In the 50s and 60s, a lot of states passed resolutions about teaching about communism. That was a big controversy then. Some of them said you had to teach about the evils in communism and others said that you had to teach about communism as a different philosophy of life. (Interview with J. Becker, May, 1955)

It was very much a question of whose knowledge was it? Would we teach how they saw communism or would we teach how we saw communism? Was it going to be their knowledge or our knowledge of communism?

This was at a time when states passed loyalty oaths; teachers had to swear that they had never been communist. There was a lot of what at this point seems to be overzealous kind of effort to deal with communism. These kinds of things demonstrate the
conflicts that exist in teaching about the world generally. There is the manifestation that is found today in this business of multiculturalism; there is a strong sentiment at many places against teaching multiculturalism. And that notion stems from a somewhat different idea; that is that American civilization is based largely on western civilization and that you cannot understand what it is to be an American unless you really study western civilization and that America's civilization deserves a large share of the curriculum and that most of the people who provided the ideas and the bases for our American democracy come from the West and that what we ought to study is the West.

This is in sharp contrast to the notion that America's never been just made up of one particular kind of people; it has been always a very mixed bag. Although we tended in history to ignore many of the groups whether it was the Asians or the Africans who may have come as slaves.

Demographics have never been static; they have undergone constant change, and the present day composition of the population is quite different from what it was in the beginning, in the seventeenth or eighteenth centuries.

Partly it stems from the notion of "is America's major reason for existence, is it an idea or is it a collection of people?" And those people who argue that it is an idea say that the idea of American civilization is western, pure and simple; and all the people who came, and no matter where they came from, Asia, or Africa or Middle East or Latin America, they came because the idea of America attracted them and what we have to do is to emphasize that the only kind of thing that gives us any kind of unity is the idea of America; and when you try to get somebody to explain whose idea of America is it we are talking about, that gets much more complicated. It is a persisting notion that the whole idea of America is a very mixed bag, representative of ideas that were brought here from all over the world.

The idea that America was western alluded to the fact that the West was dynamic, open to change, the idea of
progress and growth; but those terms are not associated with the west any more because east and west are equally involved in the same idea of progress with the same dreams.

Look at the Pacific Rim area, you can argue growth and dynamism has run amok there more than in America. But that's part of the controversy that the basis for the part of the controversy is the notion of "is there some kind of unifying principle that we call America?"

According to you how should it perceived?

You can argue that the pressure for one world is great while we are already one world in terms of technology. You can send letters all over the world, you can get messages all over the world; space satellites give us pictures from all over the world; in that sense it already is one world. But the question of what kind of one world will it be, will the symbols of this one world be the golden arch of McDonald's, or will it be something else? And how do you preserve the best of the indigenous cultures so what one world represents is the best human beings can be.

Not just one group is going to dominate and so the rest of the world will be made in the image of a particular group. And history sort of suggests that while one group may dominate for some period of time there is no evidence that one group stays in power for ever. If you look at the British, the French, the Portuguese, the Dutch, all of them at one time were considered to be, at least from the westerners' point of view, the dominant force, all of them of course lost that. So, I think the notion is, yes, there will be one world but what kind of a "one world" will it be? How do you try to alleviate the kind of hurts that produce the negative aspects for most of humanity, and how do you accentuate the positive aspects?

This diversity is obviously terribly important; a diverse world is more interesting than a single unified kind of world; but you can't have the kind of diversity that says you have to be for us or against us; there has to be tolerance for different points of view, and certainly our democratic notion is that if we hear all points of view, whatever we decide to do will be better for having heard all those points of view although we have to often times pay more
attention to some than others. But all points of view ought to be given a hearing; that's why we say we worry about the tyranny of the majority, the majority does not listen to the minority. And also, the business of power being centered in relatively small groups; this has been largely, a white male society. Are you going to change that so that all groups and both genders play a major role; and the argument for that is that will we be better off if we can maximize the use of talent no matter where it is from than if we restrict the use of talent and power to certain groups whether they are white males or whatever?

The Climate of the 90s

When George Bush campaigned for the presidency in 1988, he rode the wave of political popularity that still adhered to the Reagan presidency while simultaneously fashioning his own identity. One of the ways that he accomplished these dual objectives was by campaigning on the issue of educational improvement. None of Reagan's main educational proposals - school prayer, tuition tax credits for private school students, or abolition of the Department of Education- had been enacted into law. This allowed Bush to distinguish himself from Ronald Reagan by couching his discussion of education in a general context. Bush promised that if he was elected, he would become an "education president." (American Education: A History, p.340)

The 90s brought faster access to information with more advanced and sophisticated computer and on-line systems. The professional organization of global educators American Forum in Global Education has web-sites and on-line services for information gathering and for access to other resources. Dissemination is not as big an issues as it had been in the past, during the early years of education with global perspectives. The fact that the world was rapidly changing and globalizing still held true. Governor Bill Clinton of Arkansas, chairman of the National Governors'
Association, who was one of the chief advocates of "global perspectives in education" at the governors' conference in Traverse City, Michigan in 1987 became the U.S. President, and is at present serving his second term, the last presidential term of the century.

As for the objectives of global education, the expectations for the nineties raised in the preceding decades were partly fulfilled, and some of the questions were answered. Nonetheless, one of the major tasks, that of conceptualization, was still a work in progress. The need and prospects for global education are stronger than ever. Looking at the past thirty years of global education I would like to reiterate what William Faulkner wrote, "The past is never dead. It's never dead. It's not even past."\(^\text{10}\)

The concepts, areas and concerns that were recurrent in the conversation with Jim Becker and Chad Alger and also in their work and the work of Lee Anderson, and other relevant literature on the issues will be discussed and synthesized in the following chapter.

CHAPTER 5
ABIDING CONCEPTS, EXPANDING AREAS AND CHANGING CONCERNS IN GLOBAL EDUCATION

"My country is the world, and my religion is to do good."
Tom Paine (1792)

In this chapter, I will revisit those concepts, areas and the concerns that were recurrent in chapters two and four, both in the literature review and in the conversations with Jim Becker and Chad Alger, as well as in the works of Anderson, Alger, and Becker. This chapter will synthesize the following topics: conceptualization of global education, AEGIS and conceptualization efforts revisited, controversy, teacher education, peace education, multicultural education, diffusion, dissemination and networking, collegiate/pre-collegiate cooperation, evaluation, and towards a new millennium. A discussion and a summary of the chapter is given at the end.

Conceptualization

One of the long debated areas of global education is its conceptualization. In the 1969 Study, we read that

...the adequacy of our conceptions of international education depends in large measure upon the adequacy of our images of what the world is like. (p.17)
that article, Hanvey argues that "Stage 1 says, 'hold on, there are other actors, many of them richer and some more influential than most nations,' ...the orientation is transnational rather than pro-national, altruistic and compassionate and environment protecting" (p. 2). However, he believes that it is time to move on to Stage 2 which, according to him, "...accepts the self-interest of individuals, groups and the nation as legitimate. It seeks to serve those interests within the context of a sophisticated awareness of global conditions and trends" (p.7). What Hanvey proposes in this paper is a new approach to global education with an expanded definition to facilitate the solution of individual, group and national problems. Yet, in so doing, Hanvey seems to have distanced himself from the more liberal, peace-minded global educators.

Robert Leestma offered his version of conceptualization in his "Elements of Global Education" (1978) as follow: Unity and diversity; International human rights; Global interdependence; Intergenerational responsibilities; International cooperation. Leestma (1979) underscores the significance of his first element in "Looking Ahead - An Agenda," stating that

that article, Hanvey argues that "Stage 1 says, 'hold on, there are other actors, many of them richer and some more influential than most nations,'...the orientation is transnational rather than pro-national, altruistic and compassionate and environment protecting" (p. 2)\(^1\) However, he believes that it is time to move on to Stage 2 which, according to him, "...accepts the self-interest of individuals, groups and the nation as legitimate. It seeks to serve those interests within the context of a sophisticated awareness of global conditions and trends" (p. 7). What Hanvey proposes in this paper is a new approach to global education with an expanded definition to facilitate the solution of individual, group and national problems. Yet, in so doing, Hanvey seems to have distanced himself from the more liberal, peace-minded global educators.

Robert Leestma offered his version of conceptualization in his "Elements of Global Education" (1978) as follow: Unity and diversity; International human rights; Global interdependence; Intergenerational responsibilities; International cooperation. Leestma (1979) underscores the significance of his first element in "Looking Ahead - An Agenda," stating that

It is essential for every citizen to understand more about the ethnic diversity and cultural pluralism of the world at large. For both educators and students, getting to know and communicate with people from other cultures at home and abroad is of fundamental importance for personal growth as well as for the survival and progress of mankind (p. 234).

Leestma's conceptualization is the first to include a multicultural perspective on global education.

In reference to his definition of global education, Lee Anderson (1979) introduced four types of competencies to improve people's chances of being more effective and responsible participants in the world system. They are: awareness of involvement in the world system; decision making; judgement making; and, exercise of influence. Anderson's strong point is that he frames his conceptualization within the 'world system.'

Muessig and Gilliom's (1981) perspectives in global education were worded differently but included similar notions stated in the previously cited works: Spaceship Earth; Human species and diversity of cultures; interdependence of human relationships; multiple loyalties. In the above categorization, 'multiple loyalties' was used as a unique item that did not exist in the earlier conceptualizations.

Alger and Harf's (1985) work reflected an effort towards building a system to organize content with global perspectives in the following areas: values; transactions (political, military, economic, social);
actors; procedures and mechanism; global issues. What was new in Alger and Harf's work was that the 'actors' were introduced as a separate entity that needed to be dealt with in the context of global education. Alger and Harf's emphasis on 'connections' justifies the existence of 'actors' as a distinct category. 'Actors' represents the connections between humans in all other categories, i.e. values, transactions, procedures and mechanism, and global issues. Without the actors we cannot talk about the connections.

Knief (1986) built his domains within a much broader organization of global education content: human values/culture; global systems (economic, ecological, technological); global issues and problems; global history. (See Table-4 for a summary of conceptualizations)

These concepts were all compatible with those in the 1969 Study. Conceptualization efforts have become an ongoing endeavor for global educators. Others such as Steven Lamy (1990), David King (1980), Tom Collins (1980) joined the above group with each entertaining a new set of concepts for a comprehensive approach to global education.

Despite all these worthwhile efforts at conceptualization of global education for almost two decades (1970-1990), the debate over achieving a unified view of global education continued well beyond the 90s. Becker
(1988a) notes that a coherent and unified view of global education has not yet emerged.

In essence, the process of developing a concept of global education is both intellectual and ethical. It involves an analysis of individual and social needs, including the student, the teacher, society, the resources, including the materials and experiences available and the structures - the institutional setting. (p. 6)

James Becker's approach can be better explained by his conclusive statement that conceptualization is not a magical activity to solve problems or resolve differences of opinions. He sees it as "a never-ending process, taking into account present conditions, future needs, and the process of change" (1988a, p.7).

**AEGIS and Conceptualization Efforts Revisited**

In September 1986, representatives of some 75 organizations or programs related to global education from across the country agreed to pursue the formation of an alliance to advance the preparation of American youth for life in an international and interdependent world, and they met in Wingspread, Wisconsin, to explore the creation of a general umbrella organization for the different elements of the field. After extended discussions over the succeeding year, the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies (AEGIS) was launched in the fall of 1987, and chaired by Ronald Herring (Smith, 1989). One of the important tasks AEGIS undertook was to tackle the
difficulties related to values and the teaching of controversial issues in the classroom. AEGIS drafted standards for promoting a balanced approach to those controversial issues. (See Appendix-I for “AEGIS Charter, and A Statement of Goals and Values”).

Another task AEGIS undertook was to delineate a unified conceptualization of global education by asking for suggestions and input from its board members. (See Appendix-C for a complete list of board members, and James Becker’s response letter).

The fact that the world is becoming more interdependent, and that human interactions are more transnational than ever before in history gives the movement its stamina and dynamism; and it is for the same reason that this movement is more difficult to conceptualize than some other short-lived educational reforms that emerged around the same time as global/international education did. The constant change that the world is experiencing in every aspect of life (in trade, tourism, technology and communications) and interdependence, set the stage for global education: a need for a new look at how we teach about the world in schools so that we can better prepare students for a new century; and for this there is no one simple blueprint or prescription. However, as evidenced by the decades-long venture of these leaders and other global
educators, change does not happen by blueprint or prescription. Achieving change is a demanding, arduous and laborious process, and it can neither be achieved single-handedly nor is it a one time activity. It requires the involvement of many different people over the course of their careers at various levels and with various duties and responsibilities. In short, it is a lifelong endeavor.

Anderson (1979) and Tye (1990) agree that global education is a movement. "Global Education is a social movement within education in contrast to being a specific domain of education," says Anderson. And Tye(1990), adding to that, states that "...advocates of a social movement, in order to be successful, probably need to make alliances with a variety of like-minded people. Networking of all kinds has been shown to be powerful change strategy," (p.137). And that has been the case among these three pioneers of global education; their cooperation with like-minded people brought the field to where it stands today.

When we look at global education as a movement, there appear to be three levels of consideration for a global educator: personal, social, and academic. Naturally, these are socially interactive, not exclusive circles. At the personal level a global educator ought to come to terms with the idea of multiple loyalties, i.e. loyalties at local, state and global level. Anderson, quoted in Joyce and Nicholson (1979, 99), defines global education as “education
for responsible participation in an interdependent 'global society' one in which we will have multiple loyalties depending on the level of issues involved. Some issues are purely local, some national, and some are nation-interdependent." In Education for a Global Society, (1973), Becker elaborates on multiple loyalty as follows:

...it is important to recognize that people can and do have many loyalties simultaneously - loyalties to family, church, local authorities in some matters, and to international institutions on other matters. Nationalism often assumes that all loyalties should be focused at the state level, especially when there is a real or imagined threat to the nation. Loyalty may well stem from the expectations of services - protection, health education - and multiple loyalties may well develop as the anticipated services flow from many sources - local, national, and international. (p.23)

As Jim Becker (1988a) points out, the concept of 'multiple loyalties', and the notion of interdependence generate the need for the kind of citizenship that is capable of looking at the events from a local, national and global perspective depending on their points of origin.

At the social level, the realization of interdependence is crucial. The notion of interdependence is not a simple phenomenon to internalize when the education system is nation-state centered rather than world-centered. The conventional practices in education do not leave much room for the discussion of the interconnectedness of the world's nations. James Becker, in his speech at the CCSSOS meeting (1985), states very aptly that "[the] complex developments
have changed the nature of our involvement in international affairs. ... The interconnectedness of causes and effects poses a challenge and an opportunity for educators.” In another article, Becker's (1988a) views on interdependence point at a contrast with the existing educational system: “On the global scale a new sense of interdependence seems to be emerging, new scarcities and general social and economic instability seems to be undermining the social consensus on which the existing models of education are based” (p.6).

The ultimate goal of global education in the final analysis is “the recognition of the need for wider and more varied human identity than has been provided by the nation-state in the past” (Becker, 1973, 24). In a parallel mode of thinking, Alger (1993) asks the following question regarding the self-determination in the context of an interdependent world:

Before expending lives acquiring sovereignty the meaning of sovereignty in an age of global interdependence (transport, marketing, finance, ecological, etc.) must be carefully considered. How sovereign is any state in the present global economy? Does any state have sovereignty over its environmental problems, unemployment problems? ... This kind of thinking encourages us to ponder the possibilities for coping with self-determination issues in terms of a more diverse world than the traditional state system model of sovereign states. (p.46)

The state of the world today is such that nations are interdependent and interconnected in many ways. Global education offers a world-centered perspective in a nation-
state-centered education system. This is the challenge James Becker (1971) elaborates on:

"We already live in a transnational world where political boundaries and jurisdictions of governmental unity are of less importance than in the past. ... No country today has the power to protect or to assure prosperity in isolation. To gain control over our destiny, our sovereignty must be pooled with other nations in various international organizations. It is a matter of getting back the capacity to manage our affairs by mutual restraints and reciprocal concessions worked out with other countries.

Lee Anderson (1979) is of the same opinion when it comes to globalizing the content of the social studies curriculum. He strongly believes that one of the challenges of global education is to globalize the content of citizen education. Yet, as Becker (1973) points out, nation-states are not very enthusiastic about changing their status quo.

Perhaps the most dangerous lag in our time is the failure of nation-states to come to grips with the imperatives of globalism. The nation-state has for 200 years been largely uncontested as the chief actor on the world stage. National allegiances and national sovereignty have been widely accepted as the supreme good. (p. 12)

Controversy

Global education received a less-than-cordial welcome by some groups opposed to the idea of “global.” Tye (1990) divides those who are threatened by and therefore opposed to global education into two groups:

The first group, mostly comprised of religious fundamentalists, see it as a manifestation of secular humanism which threatens their deeply held religious beliefs. The other group is made up of individuals and
subgroups, often interlocking, who see global education as a threat to the promotion and dominance of American ideals throughout the world. (p. 137)

A member belonging to the latter group that Tye describes above attacked Becker’s *Schooling for a Global Age* in an Indiana local newspaper as follows (See Appendix-D for the copies of controversy):

...James M. Becker...’father’ of Global Perspectives in education, His book SCHOOLING FOR A GLOBAL AGE is the ‘Mein Kampf’ for creating world-centered schools in the U.S. ...Urge your State Representatives and Senators to sponsor, or support, a bill to outlaw teaching world citizenship in the schools of Indiana.
(Kokomo Herald, Dec. 3, 1981, p.3)

Another major case of controversy was a paper prepared by Gregg L. Cunningham and circulated by Thomas G. Tancredo, director of the United States Department of Education’s Denver office in 1985: “Blowing the Whistle on Global Education.” The paper targeted its charges against the curriculum materials prepared by the Center for Teaching International Relations (CTIR), part of the Graduate School of International Studies at the University of Denver. Consequently, some schools dropped global education, while some others chose to ignore the idea of including global perspectives into their curriculum. As a result of the heated debates over the charges the paper created, Stanley Wronski, Professor Emeritus of Education and Social Science, Michigan State University, and past president of NCSS,
accepted the Board’s invitation to chair an ad hoc committee
to analyze certain provocative claims made in the
Cunningham-Tancredo paper. The committee on global education
submitted a report entitled “Global Education: In Bounds or
Out?” (1987) to the Board of Directors of National Council
for the Social Studies which was published in Social
Education, addressing all the claims and accusations against
global education. Jan Tucker, then the President of NCSS,
thanked the committee “for responding to [a] call in such a
professional and timely fashion. Their collective thoughts
represent an important contribution to our thinking in the
continuing effort to link the past and present to our future
as it unfolds into the 21st century.” The report brought a
clearer perspective to the accusations in the Cunningham-
Tancredo paper.

Education Secretary William Bennett was also among
those opposed to global education. His words were quoted in
a news article following the meeting of the Study Commission
on Global Education in 1989 (which included Arkansas
Governor Bill Clinton as one of the members). See Appendix-E
for the members of the Study Commission of Global
Education.) “When I hear ‘geography’ and ‘history,’ I’m
pleased,” said Bennett; but “When I hear ‘global
perspectives,’ I’m usually a little nervous.” He saw global
perspectives as an invitation “to suspend judgment and get wishy.” Dr. Clark Kerr, the Chairman of the Commission and President Emeritus of University of California, said at a news conference that since Bennett had not taken the opportunity to read the report, his comments “would have to fall in the area of opinion rather than judgment.”

As states adopted education with global perspectives into curriculum, the controversy against it became more vocal and public. Following the “Minnesota in the World and the World in Minnesota” global studies program in Minnesota, an exhaustive report entitled The “Radicalization” of Minnesota’s Public School Curriculum: The Case of Central America prepared by Katherine Kersten (1988), an attorney and a parent in St. Louis Park, slowed down the efforts in global education in that state considerably. The report focused on the study of the Central American affairs in public schools, especially on the involvement of Central America Resource Center (CARC), presented as a radical left-wing advocacy group, “as the regional organization best suited to assist the state’s public schools with teacher training and curriculum development on the subject of Central America” (p.3). An article “Selling Globaloney in the Schools” by David Brock (1998), backed the report, and using the evidence provided by Katherine Kersten, complained
that “the nuclear-freezers have turned their attention to Central America - and to propagandizing American schools. And with the help of Minnesota’s department of education, they’re starting to make progress” (p.22).

Kersten’s allegations drew support from Lynn Cheney, chair of the National Endowment for the Humanities; David Roe, a member of the University of Minnesota Board of Regents; and David Dorn, director of international affairs for the American Federation of Teachers. From the state’s standpoint, the timing of the controversy could not have been worse; the controversy placed the state’s global education proponents “under the gun” (ASCD Curriculum Update, January 1989).

Another article “What is Global Education?” published in Concerned Women, (1991) is a good example to the first group of opposition described by Tye (1990). The article claimed that the citizens of Iowa were recently told that their kids needed “world-class education.” However, as the article complained, that “Iowa’s Department of Education plans not to give us “world-class” education but global education.” The article (see Appendix-D) further elaborated on the concerns of parents that global education would teach about the earth goddess Gaia, and warns parents:

[they] should be looking for new global education curricula being introduced in other states’ schools.
God’s Word warns us all to be aware of these false teachers in Romans 1:25: “They exchanged the truth of God for a lie, and served created things rather than the Creator - who is forever praised."

With the onset of a public uproar about global education, the Iowa Department of Education released a memorandum (March 22, 1991) to the taskforce members (See Appendix-F for the full document), addressing the distortions that were used to put global education in a bad light. The memo explains the controversy:

...some aspects of global education ...have come under increasingly hostile attack by various individuals and groups. It apparently began with a small number of right-wing fundamentalists, whose voices have reached other groups such as farmers and state legislators. ...there seems to be an organized effort out there to undermine what we are trying to accomplish through global education. (Memo by Cordell Svegalis, March 22, 1991)

The memo sought cooperation for a strong collective response to fight publicly against those groups trying to put a stop to global education. In addition, Dr. William L. Lepley, Director of the Iowa Department of Education, sent a memo[ to the members of the Iowa General Assembly] to clarify the concerns raised over A Guide for Integrating Global Education Across the Curriculum and Catalog of Global Education Activities, Lesson Plans and Resources that the Department developed with the guidance of over 50 educators. An article published in the Cedar Rapids Gazette (February 14, 1991) by Helen Hunter (see Appendix-K for a copy of the
article) claimed that “A ‘world-class’ education is a
dangerous idea. She warned the public that “John Goodlad, an
education “change agent” (whose book “Teachers for Our
Nations Schools,” will be used to “retrain” Iowa teachers
...in a two-day conference) says even parents, and the
general public must be reached with this new teaching.” She
continued to share her insights as follows:

We can hope many teachers will resist these educational
reforms. ...we can thank the good teachers who still
graduate with absolute value of right and wrong and who
are patriotic Americans who will defend their country’s
sovereignty.

Dr. Lepley, in his memo, reiterates the Department’s
commitment to global education and states that global
education and ‘world-class’ education are not the same, and
the “focus of global education is on helping students
understand the interconnectedness of the world around them.”

Another newspaper article by Phyllis Schlafly reflects
a similar prejudiced approach to global education (see
Appendix-D for the article):

Should a little band of ideologues be allowed to
impose their dogmas on the public schools? Should
self-appointed thought-controllers be allowed to re-
write textbooks, censor ideas they don’t like, and
impose their theories of life, government, politics
and culture...?

Despite the antagonistic efforts to execute global
education before the public eye, and all the negative
publicity and fanfare against it, Becker’s (1990) attitude is calm and optimistic:

Despite the inevitability of global interdependence and even though there is growing recognition of the need to develop a citizenry educated in the newer realities of our world, ...there are forces in this country opposed to global education.

Even so, there is hope. Many states have mandated global studies. Those mandates have not had a marked impact yet at the school level, but they add legitimacy to the movement. It is at the school level where real reform will have to take place. If teachers are given time to reflect and plan together change will occur. (p.82)

Jan Drum (1986) makes the following suggestions in dealing with the controversy during the implementation of an innovative idea or approach:

Stay out of the crossfire. Don’t get involved in the political battles that inevitably erupt within a school system. And don’t try to advance your work by fostering controversy. You need all the friends that you can make. (p.64)

To avoid conflicts of interest and further controversy, Drum makes the following points on developing programs with schools:

- School staffs generally don’t trust outsiders, so it is important to establish credibility.
- Change begins with small experiments
- Successful little experiments lead to bigger ones
- Flashy, non-controversial public programs help build a trustworthy image
- Time is best spent with those who are receptive; they’re often able reach others more effectively and easily
- You can’t do much until you have administrative support
Solicit honest appraisals of your program so you can adjust course before causing a political upheaval.

The current system blocks most interdisciplinary efforts.

Some projects work better outside the school. (1986, pp. 64-65)

Tye’s (1990) advice to the proponents of global education is that they should be proactive about the movement by creating a rationale, gaining community support, and engaging people in discussions about world conditions and how they are effected by them, and by sharing the accomplishments of the movement. Indisputably, Tye’s, Drum’s, Becker’s and others’ advice, expertise and attitude in handling controversial circumstances had results and kept the path clear for global education to progress.

Teacher Education

The first concern of the 1969 Study was to define international education in such a way that planning and developing future curriculum, basic research, and programs in teacher education would be conducted fruitfully. Chapter 5 of the Study is entitled “Teacher Education within a World System.” The rationale for better teacher education is evident, the question is how, and the answer is embedded in the elaboration of “within a world system.”

The changes brought by technology have created unprecedented conditions for human interaction on a global scale. ...[T]he education of teachers is a focal point around which major efforts must be concentrated.
if a change in educational objectives, encompassing a world view, is to find its way into the content and structure of American education. (Becker, 1969, p.234)

The 1969 Study acknowledges the efforts of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in adding an international dimension to American higher education, and cites the position AACTE has taken:

Without teachers whose own knowledge and attitudes are in tune with the demands which world society now makes for the application of new knowledge, there is little chance that new perspectives can be introduced into the structure and content of modern education, in the United States or anywhere else. (p. 235)

Anna S. Ochoa (1986), in "Internationalizing Teacher Education," states that teacher education has been slow in responding to the call for greater attention to global perspectives. She also believes that teacher education is a vehicle for school reform, and starting from the elementary level is not too early. She believes that if acquiring global perspectives is left to secondary levels, teachers face a population with attitudes that are more clearly defined and less susceptible to change. Torney-Purta (1979), C. Anderson (1982) are of the same opinion, so are Don Morris(1979) and Jan Tucker (1982;1990). Ochoa strongly believes that involvement of experienced elementary school faculty and university faculty is crucial in disseminating information and identifying a network of institutions and individuals concerned with international teacher education.
It was, in effect, as Becker (1985) states, the absence of
teacher involvement, or consideration of improving teacher
education accordingly that made short work of previous
school reforms:

The basic lesson to be drawn from previous reform
efforts is that unless we study them we are doomed to
repeat earlier mistakes. Most of the reform efforts
of the 1960s were oblivious to school and classroom
realities. ...[T]he teacher who is beleaguered by
multiple daily preparations and the citizen who is
overwhelmed by the tax increases may be more receptive
to improving existing than creating new program.
(p.15)

Charlotte Anderson pioneered the integration of Alger’s
“your community in the world” idea in an elementary
textbook. C. Anderson (1982) points out that “[s]ome of the
most effective and widespread strategies used in global
education are what can be called ‘link lessons.’ These
lessons illustrate the myriad ways people around the world
are linked to one another,” (p. 172).

In the’90s, teacher education with global perspectives
is still not at a point where it ought to be, i.e. not all
teacher training institutions have programs with global
perspectives. Becker (1990) criticizes the situation as
follows: “We have not yet paid enough attention to involving
teachers at the school level in acquiring new insights and
information, (p.71)” and the reason for the lag is due to the
fact that the “curriculum frameworks conceived 60–80 years
ago. The future is here and our children and youth should be prepared to live in it (p.82)."

Gilliom (1993) is more optimistic; although he admits that change usually comes slowly and incrementally, he sees glimpses of hope, quoting Becker (1991), in the growing number of states that "passed resolutions, created positions, and appropriated money for global/international education (p.45)' He believes that

[t]he chances of achieving significant change are largely dependent on faculty members coming to understand the rationale for global education, buying into the significance and the urgency of the movement, and recognizing potential global connections in the courses they teach. (ibid.)

Merry M. Merryfield (1997), who has done extensive research in teacher education with global perspectives, mentions that The National Governors' Association noted in their 1989 report that teacher preparation was inadequate in global education and that that was a major obstacle in the ability of the United States to meet the economic, political, and cultural challenges of today's world. Merry Merryfield's (1990) Teaching About the World: Teacher Education Programs with a Global Perspective reviews 32 programs with major attention towards preparing secondary social studies teachers in the United States with profiles from each program. In the study, she points out "that the movement for global perspectives in American education is relatively recent. The first teacher education program began
at [the Center for Teaching International Relations] (CTIR) in 1969" (p.85). The number of these programs has reached thirty-five in her most recent edited volume work *Preparing Teachers to Teach Global Perspectives: A Handbook for Teacher Educators* (Merryfield, 1997). She reports, that “Today, teacher education in global perspectives is mandated by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education in the 1995 NCATE Standards and supported through many activities of professional organizations such as the American Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development, the Council of Chief State School Officers, and the National Council for Social Studies” (p.1). Merryfield's (1997) findings in her most recent work conclude that

...new scholarship and technologies are constantly adding new knowledge and improving access to information. The information age places on teacher educators the responsibility of connecting teachers to a constantly changing world, updated information, and new technologies. (p.20)

This observation becomes more significant especially when one considers the fact that “the role of the school as the sole arbiter of social change is limited (Becker, 1969, 236). Therefore,

the success of an international emphasis in America's colleges and universities will depend on the creation of a new educational environment able to foster a more enlightened and perceptive outlook on the part of all who participate in it: the teacher, the undergraduate, the graduate student, the college professor, and the plain but new-fashioned American citizen, a citizen with a world view. (Becker, 1969, 246)
Peace education

Starting in early 1970s peace education became part of the global education agenda (Reardon 1973, 1988). The need for understanding conflicting human behavior in an interdependent world was as important as learning about the dynamics of interdependence. As Elise Boulding (1988) states, “it is important to acknowledge two universals: the universal of conflict and the universal of the bonding impulse” (p. 146).

In (Anderson and Becker, 1976) "International Meeting of Experts on the Role of Social Studies in Education for Peace and Respect for Human Rights" (A UNESCO Conference in Michigan), one of the areas that needs instructional materials is stated to be "peace studies" and studies of cooperation and collaboration as well as studies of conflict and competition” (p.28). It is recommended in the paper that Civics is an appropriate area of "special concern to the UNESCO Recommendation on international education-international understanding, co-operation, peace and human rights" (p.26).

Becker (1973; 1980; 1985) incessantly underscored the importance of peace education within education with global perspectives. In Teaching about Nuclear Disarmament, (1985) he gives a detailed history of peace education efforts in
the United States in an attempt to display the roots of the need for peace education in schools.

The period from 1900 to beginning of World War I witnessed the greatest efforts in modern history to build a realistic basis for world peace. ...In 1910 Andrew Carnegie, a Scottish immigrant, successful businessman, and philanthropist, set aside $10 million to establish the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace to "hasten the abolition of international war."

The American School Peace League was formed in 1909 "to promote, through the schools, and the educational public of America, the interests of international justice and fraternity. (p.17)

Becker(1980), in "A Case Study on `Cooperation Between Schools and Other Institutions and Bodies With a Contribution to Make to Education for Peace, International Understanding and Disarmament" argues that "cooperation between schools and other institutions is an essential step in bringing about needed changes in school programs in these critical areas" (p.65). According to Becker, peace education should question facts, values and attitudes. It is the responsibility of education to eliminate irrational prejudices which, unfortunately still exist in many educational materials and practices. He notes that "[m]isconceptions, cultural ignorance, and prejudice encourage tolerance for injustice, create obsessive fear of the enemy, and thus lend support to the arms race"(1985,30).

Alger (1993) strongly defends the view that peace is attainable:

As we near the beginning of the Twenty-First Century, we believe that those who are striving to create a world that is more supportive of a fulfilling life for
all humankind have an unusual opportunity. We also believe that those who may assume that a more peaceful world is unattainable lack understanding of the progress we have made in our quest for peace in the Twentieth Century. They should re-examine their scepticism. (p. 77)

Multicultural education

Anderson, Alger and Becker all believe that the quest of global education should be to connect rather than divide people. This belief also recognizes the diversity of humankind. As Becker (1974) states very clearly,

[global education should focus equally on the unity and diversity of the globe, the contrasting demands of these two aspects of one reality, and the conflict between the general necessities of survival and the preservation of justice and dignity of actual people and societies. ...As Rene Dubois has said, "as we enter the global phase of human evolution it becomes obvious that each man has two countries, his own and planet earth. (p. 681)

Anderson's (1979) extensive analysis of the growth of global culture makes a distinction between interconnectedness and interdependence with regard to the globalization of the human condition. From a sociological/anthropological perspective, he arrives at a final point where we see a global culture co-existing in uneasy relationships with traditional sub-global cultures.

The emergence of a common global culture does not eradicate all of traditionally diverse regional, national, and local cultures. Rather the development of a global culture creates a structurally complex cultural system in which global culture co-exists in uneasy relationship to traditional, local and microcultures. (p. 317)
Christine I. Bennett (1990) notes that throughout the 1970s and 1980s educators have made a case for multicultural and global education. However, she states that the evidence of multicultural and global perspectives is not found in classrooms, and that is due to the fact that novice teachers do not receive much encouragement in the development of global or multicultural perspectives in their teaching, although they experience it in their preservice education. Nevertheless, Bennett is optimistic about the marriage of multicultural and global education:

Despite the separate histories, rationales, identities, and special interests associated with global education and multicultural education, there is sufficient similarity in their goals and content that it makes cooperation at least possible. Cortez notes that "both reform movements seek to improve intergroup and global understandings and relations, to improve intercultural communication, to reduce stereotyping, and to help students comprehend human diversity without losing sight of the traits that all people share." (p.276)

Bennett also refers to Becker's emphasis on "basic human similarities," as well as the cultural perspectives signified by Hanvey. Yet, she points out that, "[t]ypically ... global educators neglect the importance of culture and alternative world views associated with different peoples and nations (p.276)." Merryfield's (1992) extensive involvement and research in teacher education with global perspectives show that converging pre- and in-service teacher education with multicultural global perspectives
through Professional Development Schools started changing that trend considerably in recent years.

**Diffusion, Dissemination and Networking**

In the sustainability or institutionalization of a movement, diffusion, dissemination and networking of ideas seem to be extremely crucial. In this section we will examine the role of professional organizations, cooperation between collegiate and pre-collegiate institutions, the significance of the evaluation and assessment of the programs and projects, and the importance of key individuals who provide leadership in this context.

The leaders of professional organizations have opportunities to influence their social system and therefore, "[k]ey individuals in the widespread diffusion of information are those who maintain ties with a wide diversity of people. Such individuals seem to play many roles and are, therefore, important communication agents" (Becker, 1977, p.9). Becker’s Diffusion project in 1973 produced a comprehensive book on Educational Leadership and Change. In that book (Becker & Hahn, 1977), educational leaders and those educators who see themselves as educational change agents are given detailed guidance as to how to deal with different aspects of dissemination as one is involved in an educational change activity:
Dissemination is more than a series of communication channels through which information flows. To be successful it requires the interaction of people in a purposive effort to communicate and effectively utilize knowledge. People are better at getting people to act than are impersonal media. Successful dissemination generally requires a team approach. (p.8)

Jan Tucker (1982) too underscores the significance of personal involvement in carrying the message of global education:

People, not text books, appear to be the primary carriers of the global education culture. As more people understand the need and become productively involved in their own settings, global education achieves a potential for releasing local energies and resources for school change to a degree unknown in the era of packaged curriculum. (p.213)

The fact that progress occurs slowly in the case of adopting change stems from the dichotomy of being uncomfortable with the status quo but being resistant to change at the same time. This continues until a behavioral change occurs as we see others supporting the change (Jan Drum, 1986).

Person-to-person communication is the best kind of initial contact. Print and other media are probably most effective with audiences that are already predisposed to be receptive. (Ibid., 65)

**Collegiate and Pre-collegiate Cooperation**

Another area of emphasis for the dissemination of global education is the cooperation between schools and universities. Dialogue between teachers and scholars is imperative in achieving change. A two-way communication...
would facilitate the adoption of innovation.

In a case where university researchers persistently try to change schools, and school staff frequently express resentment about what they perceive as a lack of understanding about schooling on the part of universities, even the well-intended reform ideas of university researchers often conflict with the practical day-to-day realities of school life.

In order to improve and expand international/global studies in the nation's schools and colleges, this information must be available to and used by a great number and variety of individuals, groups and organizations, including: leadership and general membership in professional education associations, teacher organizations, state departments of public instruction, school and college administrators, accrediting agencies, publishers, parent groups, alumni, special projects, school boards, key individuals at the local, state and national level, and a host of other groups which help set the agenda in the nation's schools and colleges." (Becker & Hahn, 1977, 29)

**Evaluation**

A final area of concern is the evaluation of projects and other efforts and activities of innovation. As succinctly stated by Lockwood (1997):

*Effective change agents, reformers, or school leaders share the ability to evaluate their efforts without defensiveness and use the results of their evaluations to progress toward their vision of an improved school or improved schooling in general.* (p.234)

One of the significant bodies of literature in education with global perspectives I encountered in this
study happens to be the numerous evaluation reports prepared by the project directors and/or by project team members. The points raised upon the completion of a project shed light into the future activities in an attempt to avoid the mistakes of the past. Some good examples to those evaluation activities are "Report of the Field Services Board," (November 1975) prepared by the board of directors, where the recommendation was to prepare a Leadership Resource Kit and distributed for trial use. The Final Report (December 1975) for "A Program in the Diffusion of Innovation Relating to the Social Education of Youth" that James Becker directed between 1971-1975 includes insights, observations, recommendations and guidance for future activities. The report very aptly states that "...projects such as [that] need to be judged not so much on what they have done as on what they are prepared to do" (p.3). "A Final Report on the Mid-America Program for Global Perspectives in Education" (1979) was prepared for the Lilly Endowment by the Mid-America Program which was directed by James Becker and Gerald Marker. This 90-page-long comprehensive report includes detailed information about the program activities in addition to the detailed self- and outside evaluation. As stated in the report, "[p]rojects also need to be judged by what they and those most intimately involved in projects

James M. Becker was the first Chairperson of the National Council of Social Studies Field Services Board.
learn and are better able to do as a result of having participated in planning and carrying on project activities" (p.67). A report prepared for the “Research Study of International (Citizen) Understanding /Global Education Projects" by James Becker and Merry Merryfield (1982) where the “leadership, training and materials provided by the six projects which were the focus for [the] report and by other similar projects are cause for optimism regarding the future of the global education/international understanding movement” (Foreword). “Report to the Danforth Foundation on International Education” (19 February 1988), prepared by Andrew F. Smith of The American Forum: Education in Global Age, is a summary evaluation of the field starting from its inception. The report concludes that "specific problems which still need to be resolved are: (1) clearer identification of content; (2) application of skills to that content; and (3) the relationship of values and attitudes to that content" (p.17).

A report presented to the Council of Chief State School Officers by H. Thomas Collins is Global Education and the States: Some Observation, Some Programs and Some Suggestions (no date on the report). The insight Collins shares is that “what state educational leaders decide to do can make a significant difference [in global education]” (p.61).
Towards a New Millennium

All three leaders, Becker, Anderson and Alger were officially retired from their academic positions by the 1990s, but they all maintain their active involvement in the field. As we are nearing the end of the decade and standing at the threshold of a new millennium, where did Jim Becker see the leadership for global/international education coming from in the future?

Obviously a bit of it comes from academic communities and institutions, places where individual faculty members have an interest in it and have graduate students doing their dissertations on it. Merry Merryfield at Ohio State is one example. Several of her students are now out teaching. Then, there are teachers in elementary or secondary schools. Many of them have traveled or have developed a greater sense of the world and thus have gained knowledge of the field. ...Any individual that has traveled, lived abroad and has a concern about issues such as the environment, trade, communications can have an impact. More recently, a number of people learn about global/international because of their interest in computers and technology. ...I don't think we have to worry too much about leadership -it comes from people who are genuinely involved and interested and is tied to major events that shape the world. (From an interview with Jim Becker in 1991)

In a conference in Taos, New Mexico on January 21-23, 1994 that the Stanley Foundation called "Revisiting an Attainable Global Perspective," they invited some twenty "old pros" who have used "An Attainable Global Perspective," and who have demonstrated some kind of careful attention to the document. Among the fifteen to twenty participants, who each have fifteen or more years in the field of global/international education, were Lee Anderson,
Charlotte Anderson, and Chad Alger. (See Appendix-G for the list of participants; Jim Becker, although invited could not attend for personal reasons.)

Participants in the January '94 conference were mostly from the ages of 50-70, and they were mostly white men. They were mostly from an academic or social studies discipline. In the past 15-20 years, however, this group of people has been mentoring, challenging, teaching and connecting with younger people who are not all white and male. And during this time, global education has become an accepted educational goal throughout the U.S. It was time to hear the wisdom and voices of this younger generation. Alger was deeply impressed with the way those two conferences were organized. He shared his experience as follows:

As we talked, my feeling was that the leaders of the movement have come a long way in their understanding and their thoughtfulness. I thought it was very creative that they were struggling to identify younger people and to have a second conference to make sure that there was another generation coming along. I was very impressed with this meeting. I said to myself, 'this IS a movement, that's a movement that's not going to die.' (Interview with Chad Alger, May, 1995)

Discussion

In the previous two chapters the theme was the role of leadership in creating 'continuity and change' in global education over a thirty-year period. As dichotomous as it

---

3 The lists of participants for both conferences were provided by the Stanley Foundation.
sounds, we have seen that it is almost a must that change and continuity occurred simultaneously in order for a systemic change to take place in an educational environment.

The reason for the rapid increase in the volume of such interactions was mainly due to technology, trade and tourism. And as their volume increased, the impact of the interactions increased as well. What that means is that the reasons enforcing a change do not come only from the social environment that one educational system is placed in, they also come from the world system that all social systems are situated in. Anderson (1982) agrees with those who say that education mirrors the society:

The primary motor that drives educational change lies outside of the educational system itself and is located in the larger societal setting in which the educational process is embedded. Thus, social change generates educational change, albeit not by any simple formula of linear translation or through an automatic, conflict-free, and resistance-proof process. (p.155)

This affirmation reflects an important phenomenon in the sense that some reflections become refractions at the boundary between two environments of dissimilar nature. The boundary between the two environments that we are referring to here is the boundary between the status quo of the society and the forces that pressure the environment for a change. The new set of circumstances creates its own environment in the larger social system which reflects on the dynamics for further change as the change process permeates the present societal setting. The dynamics forcing
a change, on the other hand, refract as they find their way into the new setting. So, the change process does not come back as the mirror reflection of what goes on in the medium that has been penetrated but, rather, as a continuity of the driving forces, somewhat skewed, but far-reaching at the same time.

Let us examine this situation in the context of global education. The changing nature of the world caused by increased interdependence through trade, technology, transactions, and tourism presents a new set of challenges in education. In that sense, the change in one setting, which is the larger social setting in this case, sparks a change in the education system. When the education system reacts to the new set of circumstances, it becomes obvious that in order to keep up with the changing needs of the society at large, there needs to be a systemic change in education, and the way education views the world. This, in return, presents a need for a global look at the issues that go beyond the present social system. To be able to reflect the same social changes, which are in effect coming from the world in which the society is a small part, there needs to be a fundamental change in the mind set that the curricula are based on so that education can deal with the new social environment outside the school. Thus comes the behavioral change where the systemic change in education requires a
different conceptualization, and different perspective of
the societal setting.

Conventionally, we treat the national society as a unit
of analysis implicitly, if not explicitly, assuming the
nation state to be the largest and most inclusive
social system in which the educational process is
embedded. This [is] ...an erroneous assumption. The
world system, not individual societies within this
system, constitutes the appropriate unit of analysis in
understanding modern educational change, since the
social changes trigger educational change take place
within the world system; they are not internal to
particular societies. (Anderson, 1982,155)

In discussing how far has global education had come in the
last thirty years, Alger had the following views:

If I stand back and view some of the main tendencies of
American society today, we haven't gone very far in
achieving our goals. If I look at the U.S. Congress,
and their unilateral tendencies, it reveals that the
goals of global education, as I see it, haven't reached
the members of the Congress very well. We're not very
collaborative when it comes to United Nations
peacekeeping. We are not very collaborative when it
comes to human rights. We drag our feet when it comes
to environment-- all of these things have been key
issues in global education and it seems to me that our
government isn't taking a global perspective. Maybe the
people are doing better, sometimes I think they are.
Now, what folks in Washington say is that everybody
wants their taxes cut, they want their taxes cut so
that they can consume, consume, consume. It seems, in
the macro, the spirit of the society doesn't suggest
that we've achieved a great deal. On the other hand, I
was encouraged from what I thought was the growing
vision and improvement of the vision of the leaders in
global education [in the conference in Taos, Mexico in
1995.] It seems to me that we've a long way to go in
outreach into the society. Internationalization has
already happened. The issue is: Can you perceive it?
And then when you perceive it, do you know what to do
about it? That's the issue.
In the Mid-America Project Final Report the advice given in the context of achieving change in education is very substantive and it is not time or project bound by content:

Perhaps the best advice to those who seek changes in education is to try to do so in such a way that in the process of achieving the particular change advocated at that time, the individual and group involved will be better able to cope with subsequent proposals for change. In other words, change in schools should be a learning process for all those involved. (p.12.)

Summary

Despite some differences of opinions in details, and the styles in which the three founding fathers approached education with global perspectives, these concepts of world-centered education, interdependence among nations and the fact that we all have multiple loyalties as we share the earth with other human beings remained to be the abiding and fundamental concepts of the movement. With changing times, the concerns of the field changed too. Conceptualization is not major question any longer; dealing with controversy has become easier as the movement paved its way into state offices of education. At the beginning, the number of people who were actively involved were quite small. In the 90s, there more people involved with diverse background, ethnicity and gender. Using Becker's (1985) words, "...given the nature of our complex educational system, what takes place in the nation's classrooms is unlikely to change
without more effective leadership at the national, state and local levels" (P.14). And it was that effective leadership encompassing a wide array of duties and activities with strong and sustainable ideas that carried the banner of global education for over thirty years.
CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

"There are no passengers on Spaceship Earth. Everybody's crew."
Marshall McLuhan.

Summary

There has been no movement in history without a leader or leaders. Global education is no exception to this. The three global education leaders in this study were architects, designers, engineers, advocates, administrators, promoters, teachers, endorsers, critics, and most importantly practicing agents of global education. Their involvement was not a cosmetic participation in a fashionable movement with a catchy label. Their feet planted solidly in the past, their awareness of the shortcomings of the existing educational system, and their vision for the future helped others understand the need for a systemic change in the way we look at the world in education.

Undoubtedly, these educators did earn the reputation they had as the leaders and founding fathers of the field through the hard work that they displayed incessantly for nearly four decades. There are few articles or studies that do not cite one or all of them in discussing, presenting, or
reconceptualizing global education. If not their names, it is the “Columbus in the World, the World in Columbus,” project that is used as the reference to an interdependent world, in the context of the significance of local links to the rapidly globalizing world. However, in addition to their prolific careers, their leadership skills, and their perseverance in disseminating an innovation for nearly four decades were as important factors as their publications were in creating and sustaining a reform movement.

The forefathers created a social change in a unique sense in the history of education; they saw the emerging changes the world was experiencing and acted upon them to enable the schools and teachers respond to the changing needs of education. Within the time frame of this study the movement has gone through the following stages interactively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1960s</th>
<th>Innovation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970s</td>
<td>Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980s</td>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990s</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000s</td>
<td>Renovation (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 1960s were the time when the idea of international/global education was new, and there was a conspicuous effort towards striving for excellence in education. With the launching of Sputnik (October 4, 1957) by the Soviet Union, to excel in math and science became a national
imperative for the U.S. The educational reform projects and new ideas for curricular changes mushroomed in the sixties and seventies nationwide. Some of them had very short lives and some were long lasting. That was the decade the federal agencies, and the Office of Education expressed considerable interest in international /global education. By the auspices of the U.S. Office of Education, *An Examination of Objectives, Needs and Priorities in International Education in U.S. Secondary and Elementary Education* (1969) was produced by James M. Becker and Lee F. Anderson.

The 70s brought recognition, acceptance and foundation for the global education movement. Major works of the field such as "Your Community in the World" (Alger, 1971), "Attainable Global Perspectives" (Hanvey, 1976)¹, *Schooling for a Global Age* (Becker, 1979), and *Schooling and Citizenship in a Global Age: An Exploration of the Meaning and Significance of Global Education* (Anderson, 1979), were produced during that decade.

The increased emphasis in schools, colleges and universities on the study of other peoples and cultures during the 1960s and early 1970s gave states a reason to review their involvement in educational reform. This development was encouraged by private foundation and federal

---

¹ The original work was published in 1975; the 1982 edition was used in this study.
government support for language and area studies centers at major universities around the country. Several states including New York, North-Carolina and Indiana launched statewide efforts encouraging the development of courses in "non-Western cultures."

The adoption of resolutions or guidelines for global or international education in a number of states—Florida, Michigan, Minnesota, New Jersey, Utah, New York, and North Carolina set precedence for others to follow.

The 1980s was a period of economic stagnation and changing competitive markets for United States businesses. The changing world situation and the United States' diminishing position in the world precipitated over two dozen education reform reports making recommendations on how to deal with the world situation. Becker's and Andersons' (Becker, 1979) world-centered education called for an education to prepare each student as a participating member of the human species with the skills and knowledge to engage in solving the problems of the human race. The participatory citizen is expected to work with on the problems of the earth. Students as individuals, students as the members of the human species, students as the inhabitants of planet earth, students as the participants in a global society, and students equipped with competencies required to live intelligently and responsibly as
individuals, human beings, earthlings, and members of global society were the goals of the curriculum of that approach. Beginning with the publication of *A Nation at Risk* (1983), the U.S. was overwhelmed with reports concerned about education. It was clear that the United States was losing its dominance in the economic and educational arena. A stagnant economy and falling test scores were taken as evidence of a nation which was losing its preeminence. The reports that emphasized economic and technical excellence claimed that it was the schools' job to prepare individuals for the high-technology jobs of the postmodern era. The various governors' commissions also issued reports expressing this concern.

This was the assembling stage; the materials produced, the conferences, the projects, the networking were more intense than before, global education was being constructed at different levels (i.e. elementary and secondary) with different crews and with the involvement of professional education organizations, funding foundations, and scholars through hard work and labor.

Endorsement by all the major education associations, the National Governors Association and numerous business and professional groups meant that by 1990 global education was largely seen to be desirable though there are very strong disagreements about what, when, where and how it should be taught or incorporated in the curriculum.

(Jim Becker’s personal notes, 1989)
The 1990s saw the emergence of a new generation of global educators who maintained the good work of the founding fathers; the number of educators believing, practicing, researching in global education and working on its dissemination and diffusion into curricula at leadership levels has grown considerably. The research in teacher education (Merryfield, Bennett, Tye and Tye, C. Anderson; Wilson), in the convergence of multicultural education with global education intensified.

The new millennium might witness a renovation in the field with new set of emergent issues and concerns with a larger and more diverse group of scholars, educators, and administrators believing in an education system with global perspectives.

Conclusions

The facts appeared and reappeared in the findings that trade, tourism, technology, and transnational transaction increased the speed of global activities and created the interdependence among the world's nations starting from the beginning of the century; interdependence became more apparent after WWII.

The increasing interdependence presented a serious need for a reform in the way we educate the youth in schools, and global education introduced some answers and approaches to that need with a systemic change in the way we teach about the world.
"International/global studies should be viewed as interdisciplinary involving the arts, humanities, sciences, technology and mathematics as well as foreign languages and the social studies," says Jim Becker (May 15, 1990) in his personal notes. It is that interdisciplinary nature of the field that facilitates the covering the global issues and concerns at different levels. Global peace and conflict resolution, global ecology and environmental protection, human welfare and human rights are among those issues that need to be integrated into the curriculum for the youth to be prepared for a world-centered perspectives in education as we approach the twenty-first century.

In his interview (1995), Becker further clarifies the presentation of "change" in the context of "new" as follows:

There had always been some transnational interactions, may be not entirely new, but their scope, volume and the immediacy is what has changed. That is the point McNeill, the historian, makes. Internationalization, as he calls it, is really a matter of increased interactions, and that the number of people involved has increased tremendously.

**General Observations**

One of Alger's observations is that many people no longer say that they have to internationalize. They don't say that anymore because they know that they are, and Alger sees it as one of the greatest achievements of global education.
There was a time, back in those days when we always said we have to internationalize, myself included, when I inclined to think it was all for the good. But this is where the folks in the International Peace Research Association helped me out. It is absolutely important that we teach young people that it is neither necessarily good nor necessarily bad, it just depends. It's happening.

We have to start deciding for ourselves which technology we want and which we don't, which we are going to accept, and which we are not going to accept. It seems that all the time we have just accepted it, and a lot of it is technology that is speeding worldwide connections, but some of it is good, some of it is bad. We have to be dispassionate to decide right. Like everything, like automobiles, highways, radios, everything else, it can be used for good purposes and bad purposes. That's very important. My feeling is that most global educators have overcome that bias towards thinking that it is all good.

Becker's views are complementary to and consistent with the overall circumstances presented within the context of "change and continuity."

Education is basically a conserving activity, most of education is designed to carry on ideas, notions and traditions within whatever society the education is taking place. But especially in countries like the [U.S.] it has some contradictory purposes. One is to carry on whatever people think the American tradition is; another is to help individuals to achieve the best they can, and a lot of new knowledge, new information, and new ideas come along and education deals with these, and many of these will contradict the old traditional notions of how to deal with things. (JB Interview, March, 1995)
Research Questions

1. What was the role of leadership in creating an environment conducive to educational change? (i.e. Jim Becker's works, his cooperation with Lee Anderson and Chad Alger; the formal/informal connections between the federal government, funding agencies, and global education leaders).

The role of leadership in achieving educational change and continuity through global education was significant especially in generating, developing and promoting the ideas that later became the cornerstone of the movement; and in developing the connections between people, agencies, organizations, and institutions through teaching, writing, editing, chairing, lecturing, and taking on various other active duties at such establishments that were influential in educational circles. Persistence, patience, willingness to work with different people was key to the leadership in global education.

Starting with the 1969 Study, and earlier, the works of Becker, Anderson and Alger created the intellectual backbone and impetus that global education movement needed to gain momentum. In addition, as we have seen in chapters 2 and 4, the role of a leader in a movement is not merely to be well known and to have good ideas about the field. In the case of this study, what has become apparent is that leadership comes from being able to influence a number of
organizations and publications not only by being an editor or an author, but by participating in the committees and chairs of those organizations and publications, by advising and consulting the administration of some, and in some other cases, by continuous active membership. Becker's connections and liaison with the people at the government offices and funding agencies created a network of enthusiastic people who saw a need for global education at our schools. The three leaders in this study made the best use of each other's works and ideas to maintain continuity in the discourse, in addition to being actively involved in the key positions of various organizations and institutions that had a say in policy-making issues, in developing standards, and in the decision-making processes of state legislatures. What they were doing in the long run and in the big picture was disseminating the ideas of the movement in an interdisciplinary and multilateral way as they built a perennial dialogue between different enterprises.

The people in the network of global education grew in time, and the changing profiles of gender, ethnic and academic background of the newly recruited global educators added new blood and new dynamics to the field. The three leaders encouraged the diversity, supported different perspectives on issues, reviewed the expectations and objectives of the field in their writings, lectures, and administrative duties.
The concepts they developed, and ideas they promoted over the years prevailed in the field for thirty years, creating a foundation, a basis for the definition and conceptualization of the field, for curriculum development and teacher education, for strategies to deal with controversy, and for dissemination and networking. The most comprehensive of these ideas and concepts were multiple loyalties, world-centered education, peace education, global interdependence, global perspectives as a mind-set rather than as a curriculum add-on, and interconnectedness in the context of the planet earth we all share.

2. How did the political, social environment, policies and agencies contribute to or impede upon the change global education envisioned in the last thirty years?

The world events influenced the level of interest in global education both in academic and political circles, as well as among funding agencies. Starting with the Sputnik (1957), other major events, i.e. end of Vietnam War, moon-landing (1969), oil crisis (1979), the fall of the Berlin Wall and emergence of newly founded former Soviet Union Republics (1989) either accelerated the efforts of diffusion of global perspectives in education or created a further panic over U.S. losing power in the world arena. In that regard, timing was crucial in promoting the idea of global perspectives in education. Global Education became easier to
endorse when U.S. foreign policies expressed a need for better understanding of the world.

With the Johnson administration, with the Carter and Clinton administrations as well, however, governments created higher expectations than they could fulfill in global/international education; yet, their official endorsement helped to legitimize the movement in other circles. At different periods, as the government changed hands, new political agendas created controversy against global education (ex: William Bennet’s standing against the idea of global education the U.S. secretary of education); however, such controversy and negative influence was not long-lasting and could not totally stop the movement if slowed it down for a while.

3. What kind of controversy did global education create among various interest groups such as academic, pre-collegiate vs. collegiate, intra-departmental, political, and other?

For most Education, Political Science and/or International Relations Departments global education did not come as the priority for research or funding at universities. Those faculty members who were interested in global education contributed to the field despite the lack of recognition by the department head or the Dean of the College. The committed faculty went out and found their own
funding for research (ex. Anna Ochoa’s Teacher Education Project at Indiana University), or they paved the way for raising an interest for pre-collegiate research and implementation at the collegiate level (ex. Merry Merryfield’s work with Professional Development Schools at Ohio State University, Jan Tucker’s efforts at Florida International University.)

Education in the U.S. is a function of the States and universities have a great deal of autonomy. In that environment the influence usually came from the state departments of education or public interest voiced through professional organizations, and funding agencies who could create an impact on the state. Federal funding could spark an interest but states had to energize it.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

It is my hope that the general intent and completion of this study be seen as a contribution to the evidence of the significance and need for practical, visionary leadership in global education. In Becker’s words, there is no international education system: all education systems are local or national. Yet as we approach the new millennium we have to be able to break down those barriers of nationalism, and we need to work simultaneously at local, national and international levels; that is where the world is going. In
this line, there are some areas that need closer look and
attention in future research. The following represent some
of those considerations:

- More in depth and comparative studies of the works of
  leaders that were fundamental in the construction of
  the field;
- more analytical work on the history of global
  education;
- qualitative research on the different approaches to
  the conceptualization of the field.

"Improvements in international global studies, like
improving practice in education more generally, depend
upon many factors including the extent, quality, and
availability of the research and development work; the
clarity and appropriateness of the goals and
objectives that guide such efforts; the degree to
which the needed intellectual and material resources
are identified and mobilized to assist teachers,
professors and other educators in schools and colleges
in their attempts to improve international studies;
and the insights and commitments of those most
responsible for making the changes. (Becker, 1981, 7)

A Final Word

James Oswald, a global educator and an educational
reformer, says "Our time at bat came and we swung," and I
will repeat, it is our time at bat to swing.

The 1990s is a wonderful era for starting up a new
social studies- multicultural, multiethnic, rigorous,
and global of course. ...Don't forget to inquire of
young people to determine what they're interested in
and will tolerate. For goodness sakes, don't be naive
and apolitical. On the other hand, maybe these are the
essential requirements to undertake what needs to be
done. If not you, who? If not now, when?" (Oswald,1993)
An Afterword by James M. Becker:

AFTER WORDS — LOOKING FORWARD

Today in contrast to twenty-five years ago, when global education was new, we are all internationalists. How could we be otherwise? We live in a world tied together by trade, communications, information and entertainment. A world where the Japanese economy has a major impact on the value of the dollar, where a civil war in the Balkans sparks an angry debate in Congress. We have a global network of military bases and alliances and frequently dominate decisions made in world organizations such as the World Bank and the United Nations. The United States cannot be an island to itself no matter what some Americans prefer. As educators charged with helping children and youth to prepare for facing the realities of an independent and culturally diverse world we have little choice but to strengthen the global dimensions of the curriculum.

The case for global education has largely been made by development and events—the internationalization of the economy, expanded use of technology linking people and places the world over, daily providing "living room" images and impressions of what were once "far off places with strange sounding names." Despite these developments global education has not yet become an integral part of the curricula in most schools. In that regard the schools may well reflect the views widely held in the larger society. A recent CNN/Time (1995) reports that 73% of U.S. adults think the country should reduce its involvement in international politics. The same poll found that Americans are more ignorant of foreign events than citizens in other advanced countries. It also found that the amount of foreign news in television and in newspapers is dropping. While many business and political leaders may see "internationalization" as inevitable, necessary, desirable and wave of the future, much of the public seems more skeptical of any benefits deriving from our increased interdependence.
The globalization of the American economy has created many social dislocations that challenge notions that we all benefit from increased involvements in the world market. The idea that we all gain from free trade, unrestricted movement of capital and labor or the decline of nationalism may play well in major U.S. financial and political centers but often arouses little enthusiasm among most Americans, many of whom feel these developments are far from removed from if not detrimental to their interests.

Global education if it is to help today’s students understand how the world works and win widespread public support must do more than maintain that whatever serves the system and those who run it also benefits all Americans. Global education, in its efforts to help students to become responsible, productive citizens and caring human beings, must be more sophisticated in its approach to the costs and benefits of increasing globalization. We need to be more sensitive to the culture and ethnic ties that bind U.S. citizens to their communities. We need to view internationalization as not necessarily good but as a condition that, properly understood, can help advance the interest of our nation as well as benefit local business and community interests. Our roles as educators is not only to help students to understand current realities but for them to develop the skills, attitude and values need to shape a better world. This is our never ending concern.
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Danforth Foundation Grants in International Education
## The Danforth Foundation

**GRANTS AWARDED IN INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION**

*September, 1983 - December 1984*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council of Chief State School Officers</td>
<td>Workshop on international education for curricula specialists, 81-37-7</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Association of Greater St. Louis</td>
<td>Consultant to assist in planning and expanding metropolitan area activities in international education, 82-2-3</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Association of Greater St. Louis</td>
<td>Part-time of staff person to work with schools on international education, 82-2-4</td>
<td>$5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Palomas de Taos</td>
<td>Consultation with selected school districts for advancing programs of international studies, 82-2-5</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University - Social Studies Development Center</td>
<td>Mid-America International Studies Project, 84-20</td>
<td>$159,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University - Social Studies Development Center</td>
<td>National consultations on international studies in schools, 84-21</td>
<td>$40,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University - Laboratory of Educational Development</td>
<td>Directory of resources in international studies, 84-22</td>
<td>$7,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Nations Association of Greater St. Louis</td>
<td>International education project with schools, 84-23</td>
<td>$7,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Consortium of St. Louis</td>
<td>International educational project with schools, 84-23-1</td>
<td>$68,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Southern California, Center for Public Education in International Affairs</td>
<td>Resources in global studies for schools, 84-24</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Global education seminars and teacher conferences, 84-32</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship &amp; Public Affairs</td>
<td>Institute for teachers in international studies, 84-33</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University, Mershon Center</td>
<td>Improvement of world studies text books, 84-34</td>
<td>$24,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution/Organization</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.</td>
<td>Consultation with consortia in support of international education in schools, 84-35</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver, University of: Center for Teaching</td>
<td>Leadership conference on global education, 84-35</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Relations</td>
<td>Consultations with school faculty on international education, 81-39-8</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Learning, Inc.</td>
<td>Cultural enrichment in schools, 84-38</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Springboard to Learning, Inc.</td>
<td>Resources in global education for schools, 84-39</td>
<td>76,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Consortium of St. Louis</td>
<td>Consortium of schools, colleges, and community agencies to strengthen international education in schools, DF84-43-1</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.</td>
<td>Consultations with consortia in support of international education in schools, 84-44</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida International University</td>
<td>Consortium to assist schools in international education, 84-45</td>
<td>73,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanford University</td>
<td>Consortium to assist schools in international education, 84-46</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for the Study of World Politics</td>
<td>Graduate study for persons preparing to teach international studies in colleges and universities, 84-48</td>
<td>250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota, University of</td>
<td>Consortium on international education in Minnesota schools, 81-39-9</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne Arundel County Public Schools</td>
<td>International education seminars for teachers in central Maryland schools, 82-2-7</td>
<td>8,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Learning Inc.</td>
<td>Development of a collaborative in New Jersey on international education, DF-85-4</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Consortium of St. Louis</td>
<td>Coalition of schools, universities and community agencies to strengthen international education in schools, 84-43-1</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Denver: Center for Teaching</td>
<td>Professional growth of teams of teachers in international education, 85-3</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution/Organization</td>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.</td>
<td>Strengthening of regional collaboratives in international education in schools, 85-12</td>
<td>97,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Vilens Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs</td>
<td>Excursion of Boston area collaborative in international education in schools, 85-13</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Las Palomas de Taos</td>
<td>Extension of local collaboratives in international education in schools, 85-14</td>
<td>37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio State University, Mershon Center</td>
<td>Collaborative effort in world history with schools and universities 85-16</td>
<td>15,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Consortium of St. Louis</td>
<td>Consortium of schools, universities and community agencies to strengthen international education in schools, 84-43-2</td>
<td>100,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Consortium of St. Louis</td>
<td>Seminars for teachers in international studies, 84-43-3</td>
<td>10,228</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL $1,338,879
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A STATEMENT OF
GOALS AND VALUES
FOR
THE ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATION IN GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

Our personal and national well-being are profoundly influenced by a fundamental change occurring in the world: a vast and irreversible increase in the importance of international factors on what previously have been local, regional, or national patterns of human thought and behavior. The members of this Alliance are concerned with the implications which these changes have for elementary and secondary education systems in this country. Recognizing that education in this field will deeply affect the character of our students and our society, we set forth below the goals and values which will guide our work and provide standards for its assessment.

We intend our work to serve the student, this nation, and our world.

THE STUDENT

We seek:
1. To develop individuals with expanded capacities for effective citizenship, vocational competence, and intellectual and social growth in a world that is diverse, complex, and increasingly interdependent;
2. To strengthen our society's ability to pass on to our young an understanding of those traditions and values of our heritage which undergird our democracy and the principles and commitments which sustain it; and
3. To provide educational experiences which heighten moral consciousness, develop the capacity for individual choice, and encourage acceptance of community responsibility at all levels.

THIS NATION

We seek:
1. Citizens committed to our democratic system and to overcoming the obstacles which prevent full realization of the values upon which it is based. Among these values are human dignity, protection of individual rights, consent of the governed, a government with limited powers, and freedom and equality under the law;
2. A nation committed to improving its citizens' abilities to understand and interact with other cultures and societies, building on its own experience in forming political community among people of diverse racial, ethnic, political, and religious backgrounds; and
3. A nation capable of wisely providing for its own security, sensitive to the impact its security policies have on other nations; and acting in ways which promote international peace and the growth of free societies.

OUR WORLD

We seek:
1. A world which responds to human needs, respects human rights, values freedom, preserves the global environment, seeks non-violent resolution of conflict, and protects the richness of diverse cultural heritages while recognizing that realization of these goals is constrained by human limitations and the distribution and use of power in the world;
2. A world in which one's commitment to one's own country is complemented by a growing acceptance of responsibilities that cross ideological, cultural, and national boundaries.

We recognize that promoting a sense of responsibility that crosses ideological, cultural, and national boundaries is a complex and controversial undertaking. For some, a sense of world responsibility seems to require abandonment of a commitment to one's own nation. For others, a commitment to one's own nation precludes the pursuit of world responsibilities. We affirm the wisdom — indeed the necessity — of a commitment to both one's own nation and the world. We seek a world in which people of other nations make the same commitment. Because our society encourages free and open criticism of particular governmental policies while maintaining a fundamental loyalty to our common political community, we see no contradiction in such joint commitments.

Therefore, an education with a global perspective develops in students the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required for living successfully and responsibly in a changing nation and world. Global education is multi-discipli-
nary, offering instruction about a changing world in the arts, humanities, sciences, and technical sciences, as well as in the social sciences and in foreign languages. It is also an education which provides opportunities for students to examine complex issues from a wide range of views and value positions, requiring educators to nurture a free and responsible exchange of ideas.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS

In pursuit of these goals, we seek an education which develops in elementary and secondary students:

1. A knowledge of the histories, languages, and institutions — political, economic, religious, artistic, humanistic — of other cultures, as well as their own;
2. A knowledge of the interconnections among world regions, events, and peoples, and an appreciation for the complexity that is inherent in these relationships;
3. An understanding that contemporary issues and world cultures have been shaped by a multiplicity of historical, religious, political, economic, and geographic factors;
4. An ability and willingness to consider historical and contemporary world events and issues from the perspectives of people whose culture, value orientations, or life experiences — gender, age, opportunity, ethnic background — are different from their own and, in so doing, develop a deepened understanding of their own standards and goals;
5. An understanding of the nature of conflict and of approaches for managing it constructively;
6. An ability to think analytically about complex national and international issues, to distinguish fact from opinion, and to recognize bias, advocacy, and propaganda; and
7. An ability to make informed personal and public policy decisions and to participate in local, national, and international decision-making processes.
AEGIS BOARD OF DIRECTORS

James Becker
Social Studies Development Center
Indiana University
2805 East 10th Street, Room 120
Bloomington, IN 47405
812/336-3838
Home: 906 Commons Drive West
Bloomington, IN 47401
812/332-4245

Jeffrey Brown
Global Learning, Inc.
40 South Fullerton Avenue
Montclair, NJ 07042
201/783-7616

Suzanne Charlton
Center for International Education, SSA 201
California State University - Long Beach
1250 Bellflower Boulevard
Long Beach, CA 90840
213/494-6432 or 498-4106

Ronald Herring
Center for Research in International Studies
Lou Henry Hoover Building, Room 200
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-6012
415/723-4581

Effie Jones
American Association of School Administrators
1801 N. Moore Street
Arlington, VA 22209
703/875-0728

Margaret Lunetta
World Affairs Council of Philadelphia
206 South 4th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19106
215/922-2500

Barbara Miller
Social Science Education Consortium
855 Broadway
Boulder, CO 80302
302/492-8154

Robert Pickus
World Without War Council
1730 Martin Luther King Jr. Way
Berkeley, CA 94709
415/845-1992

Timothy Plummer
The Asia Society
725 Park Avenue
New York, NY 10021
212/288-6400

Ronald Schukar
Center for Teaching International Relations
University of Denver
Ben M. Charrington Hall, Room 210
Denver, CO 80208
303/871-3166

Andrew Smith
The American Forum
45 John Street, Suite 1200
New York, NY 10028
212/732-8606

Mary Soley
Foreign Policy Association
1800 M Street, NW, Suite 295N
Washington, DC 20036
202/293-0046

Susan Wilkes
Arkansas International Center
University of Arkansas at Little Rock
33rd and University Streets
Little Rock, AR 72204
501/569-3282
ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATION IN GLOBAL AND INTERNATIONAL STUDIES

MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS

FULL MEMBERS

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION
AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS
AMERICAN FORUM: EDUCATION IN A GLOBAL AGE
ARKANSAS INTERNATIONAL CENTER
THE ASIA SOCIETY
ASSOCIATION FOR SUPERVISION & CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT CENTER FOR TEACHING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS FOUNDATION
ETHICS & PUBLIC POLICY
THE EXPERIMENT IN INTERNATIONAL LIVING
FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION
GLOBAL EDUCATION MOTIVATORS, INC.
GLOBAL EDUCATION PROGRAM IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
GLOBAL EDUCATORS
GLOBAL LEARNING
INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION CONSORTIUM OF ST. LOUIS
INTERNATIONAL STUDIES EDUCATION PROGRAM
NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE SOCIAL STUDIES
NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR PUBLIC POLICY
NORTH BAY INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROJECT
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
OHIO UNIVERSITY
RAMAPO COLLEGE OF NEW JERSEY
REACH CENTER FOR MULTICULTURAL AND GLOBAL EDUCATION
SOCIAL SCIENCE EDUCATION CONSORTIUM
SOCIAL STUDIES DEVELOPMENT CENTER
STANFORD UNIVERSITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEBRASKA AT OMAHA
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA
VIRGINIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
WORLD AFFAIRS COUNCIL OF PHILADELPHIA
WORLD WITHOUT WAR COUNCIL, INC.

ASSOCIATE MEMBERS

FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
KENT STATE UNIVERSITY
REFORD-MCCANDLESS INTERNATIONAL
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY: CLIO
UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT

252
AEGIS
The Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies

MEMORANDUM

November 21, 1990

TO: All Board Members
FROM: Pam Wilson
RE: Immediate Attention to Retreat Agenda

At the Board Meeting Sunday, the Board decided to hold its annual retreat in Washington, DC on January 12 & 13. In preparation, all agreed to move promptly on one request:

*Each of you agreed to spend a little time and write a single page paper on the following question:*

*What are the points of confusion, the evidence you have in your day-to-day work, that are do to inadequate conceptualization of the field?*

*These points could be areas of definition, questions regarding the relationship between global education and other areas of study (such as citizenship education), or fuzziness of content or methodology. These are only some of the points you might find to be hindrances to the effective and efficient conduct of your work.*

This single sheet should be sent to reach me **no later than December 4th.**

I will take the material with me to Washington on December 5th and meet with Mary Soley and Barbara Miller the following week. At that meeting, we will summarize your remarks into a brief "Concerns About Conceptualization" paper that will be used to draw up an agenda for at least one day of the Board retreat.

The day(?) of the retreat will be used to examine these concerns and draw up an outline for a conceptualization project which could address them. This outline will be used to formulate a proposal which Keith Payne and others are willing to take to funders for support.

**Time is critical if this is going to be a useful exercise.** Barbara, Mary and I will work with what we have; we urge you to make your input.

Mail your ideas to me at 4 Stratton Place, Portland, ME 04101; or FAX them to me at 207/774-8807. As last resort, you could FAX them to Mary by Monday morning, December 10 at 202/833-2369.

Thanks for your help in this endeavor.
Inadequate conceptualization in global education is not a major problem in my day-to-day work. The work of Lee Anderson, Bob Harvey, Willard Knaip, Steve Lamy, Chad Alger, William McNeill, Diane Ravitch, The California Framework, Iowa's Global Education Program, Dick Remy and Bob Woyach, Scientific Views of the World (ASAS-Science for All Americans) and others provide valid and useful guidelines for those who seek to develop materials or internationalize courses or curricula. Trying to define the field is an interesting intellectual exercise but without relating it to a specific context is largely an exercise in futility.

Frankly I am bothered more by what seems to be an effort to achieve a "consensus conceptualization" than by confusion and inadequacy in current conceptualizations. It might be useful to develop some guidelines that could help local curriculum builders in their efforts to improve and expand the international dimensions of their programs, but consensus building conceptualization efforts strike me as more how-many-angels-can-fit-on-the-end-of-a-pin exercises.

Trying to create a distinct, separate field called global education in a world that is already largely globalized may be unnecessary or at least a questionable strategy for improving and expanding the international dimensions of education. It may be a good way to delay the infusion of global thinking into existing courses and curriculum. GES may have been right when he said every profession is a conspiracy against the public and the same may apply to some of the disciplines, by making a field the province of a group of experts (so-called) we may see if it will have little value to the rank and file.

Bringing together those individuals who have written extensively or intensively on the topic to make sure we understand where they are coming from, and understand the similarities and differences among them, and the problems and implications in trying to develop and implement programs based on their views might be useful. Seeking a consensus conceptualization seems (to me) to be fruitless and only raises suspicions of trying again control of questionable field.

This is a hasty reaction typed in my own error-prone style. My hope is it provides some food for thought.

Jim Becker

---

MID AMERICA INTERNATIONAL STUDIES PROJECT
Supported in part by the Deedworst Foundation.
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CONTROVERSY ARTICLES
Promoting International Citizenship

His book, SCHOOLING FOR A GLOBAL AGE, is the "Mein Kampf" for creating world-centered schools in the U.S. On page 108 of his book, he quotes: "We want to promote global citizenship and foster political action and cross-cultural involvement."

Dr. Negley, you should close your eyes, what we're going to say about your 'global' program will just be too awful for you to see.

Mr. Harold Negley, Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Indiana, has been severely attacked by irate citizens after the Mantoost Report and Dr. Negley's Indiana IN THE WORLD program was introduced. The program promoting interdependence, world government, world citizenship and socialist redistribution of wealth.

Although Mr. Negley bitterly denies that the program includes these revolutionary and anti-American features, the irate citizens, leaders, organizers, teachers and other students whom he has approached, have approached the Mantoost Report to say: "We've seen the materials - the program is as bad as you say it is!"

Now, Mr. Negley, let's look at Mr. James M. Becker's book, "Schooling For A Global Age"...

He has long urged that all citizens accept world citizenship. He takes an active role as a key figure in many one-world organizations that are using their wealth and power to destroy the world's political and cultural involvement. As a world government. WARNINGS: H.R. 3211 has been introduced in Congress by Rep. Paul Simon to end Global Perspectives education in all schools across America, using many millions of tax dollars to indoctrinate our youth into actively helping build the "New World Order."
Foreign Trade Zone to open at Indianapolis Airport

The Greater Indianapolis Foreign Trade Zone is scheduled to open December 1. Three years in the planning and construction, the zone will occupy a new 40,000 square-foot building at Indianapolis International Airport.

The facilities will include warehouses, light manufacturing and sales offices.

The 14-acre zone was approved by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Foreign Trade Zones Board. It is expected to pump millions of dollars into the Indiana economy and create as many as 800 new jobs. Many companies of neighboring states will do business through the Indianapolis zone because they do not have one set up yet in their area.

Under federal law, a FTZ is literally "outside" the United States. The zone is a site within the country where foreign and domestic merchandise can be sold, repackage, or used in manufacturing without formal customs procedures. By duties are collected on the goods until they leave the zone to enter the U.S.

Merchandise from abroad can be brought into a zone without payment of duties - used in the assembly of products - and then exported without tariff or quota restrictions. If the products are sold in the U.S., duty is not paid until products actually leave the zone, giving firms the use of their money longer - and goods are exempt from Indiana warehouse taxes.

Cost, and other incentives, attract many foreign businesses to the trade zones.

There have been 39 such zones approved in the U.S., however, only 38 are fully operational at this time.
Panel: Bring world into the classroom

Secretary Bennett casts dissent

NEW YORK, (AP) — America's schoolchildren are "globally illiterate," according to a report released Tuesday that urged schools to stress world history, geography and knowledge of other cultures.

For the report, "The United States Prepares for Its Future: Global Perspectives in Education," drew a quick broadside from Education Secretary William J. Bennett who criticized "global education" as an invitation "to suspend judgment and get wishy-washy."

The report by the 15-member Study Commission on Global Education, chaired by former University of California President Clark Kerr, does not call for new courses, but urges that existing courses, from history and geography to biology and physics, be "infused with a global perspective."

THE REPORT URGED that elementary schools, especially, encourage children to examine "a variety of cultures, present and past, at home and abroad," and learn "basic physical and cultural geography" and other skills.

In high school, students should study in-depth "at least two other cultures, including a non-European culture," said the report.

"You can read about Dick and Jane, as we did in the '50s and '60s. Or you can read about Juan, Maria and Lee. Global perspective doesn't mean a whole new course. It just means doing what we're doing better," said Andrew Smith, head of Global Perspectives in Education Inc., which conceived the project.

"If state and local school authorities take this report seriously, and I'm confident they will, and apply its findings and recommendations with enthusiasm and intellect, we should see a significant escalation in the ability of our students to become active participants in the development of future American public policy," said National Education Association president Mary Hatwood Futrell, who served on the panel.

The panel had sought a meeting with Bennett but was turned down. Bennett, who has said that American schools and colleges should emphasize U.S. history and Western civilization, said in an interview that the new report had not allayed his concerns about global perspectives.

"When I hear 'geography' and 'history,' I'm pleased. When I hear 'global perspectives,' I'm usually a little nervous," said Bennett. Often, he said, the call for a global perspective is also an invitation "to suspend judgment and get wishy.

At a news conference in the Manhattan headquarters of the Rockefeller Foundation, which helped fund the panel, Kerr said that since Bennett had not taken the opportunity to read the report, his comments "would have to fall in the area of opinion rather than judgment."

PANEL MEMBERS conceded that the teaching profession would have to be upgraded considerably before the report's recommendations could become reality.

The commission included Arkansas Gov. Bill Clinton; teacher union presidents Futrell and Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers; writer Michael Novak of the American Enterprise Institute; and Ernest L. Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Phyllis Schlafly

Globalism Threat To Education

Should a little band of ideologues be allowed to impose their dogmas on the public schools? Should self-appointed thought-censors be allowed to rewrite textbooks, censor ideas they don’t like, and impose their theories of life, government, politics and culture on a captive audience of children in the public school classroom?

That’s exactly what has been happening in the last few years, and parents are just discovering it. These ideologues have rewritten textbooks all the way from primary readers to high school social studies books and thereby imposed their peculiar dogmas on required reading materials for students, kindergarten through 12th grade.

This new orthodoxy is called “globalism.” The authoritarians who impose it are determined to expunge patriotism and appreciation of American institutions and culture from school textbooks.

Let’s look at how global education is defined and mandated for New York public school children. All quotations below are taken directly from the official 1985 document on Global Education issued by the New York State School Boards Association.

This document promulgates its commandments with all the finiteness of a coming down from the mountain.

“Global interdependence is a reality,” it says, “and a global perspective helps students realize that, by learning about the interrelated systems of the world, they better prepare themselves to participate effectively in a democratic society.”

On the contrary, effective participation in our democratic society would be better achieved by teaching students about the U.S. Constitution, and its interrelated system of checks and balances, which has preserved our freedoms for nearly 200 years. Global education censors from students the reality that American independence is the foundation of our freedom and prosperity.

From globalism’s false assumptions, its high priests proceed to ordain their precepts and policies, while censoring the views they disapprove of. Globalism is the antonym for patriotism. Emphasizing and infusing global interdependence means that the globalists have censored education in U.S. independence. Precluding that schools can teach participation in democracy by teaching “respect” for foreign cultures is patently dishonest.

In the entire Action Plan for Global Education, there isn’t a single mention of the U.S. Constitution, independence, institutions, heritage, traditions, heroes or freedoms. It’s as though America doesn’t exist as part of the globe.

A memorandum circulated in the Seattle public school system clearly reveals that the global education cult knows perfectly well that what it is doing is offensive to American citizens, and so it is trying to hide it from the public. The memo admits that “the term ‘Global Education’ is an extreme, political hot potato.”

Thus this memo, written by Jim Grob of the Rockefeller Project, advises Seattle school personnel not to use the term “global education” or even the word “global” at all. Instead, school personnel are instructed to conceal global education under what he calls a “temporarily safe term” — “multicultural/international curriculum development.”
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MEMBERS OF STUDY COMMISSION ON GLOBAL EDUCATION
GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES IN EDUCATION

PREFACE
Report of the Study Commission on Global Education
By Clark Kerr

The members of the Study Commission on Global Education wish to thank all those who have given generously of their time and knowledge as we have considered the directions that global education might take in the coming years. Staff and Commission members have met with and interviewed a number of policy makers and educators, including state and national leaders as well as a number of classroom teachers and curriculum developers. We especially wish to thank Robert Freeman, President of Global Educators and one of the founders of the Bay Area Global Education Program, for his detailed and helpful comments on several drafts of this report.

We wish to acknowledge gratefully the financial support of the Exxon Education Foundation, The Ford Foundation, and the Rockefeller Foundation.

The staff of Global Perspectives in Education, Inc., and particularly its President, Andrew F. Smith, have provided support and advice throughout the life of the Commission. We also wish to thank the Commission's co-directors: Marian L. Gade, Willard Kniep, and Franklin Wallin. Maureen Kawaoka has provided administrative and secretarial assistance to the Chairman with her usual great skill and care. Harlan Cleveland, Chairman of GPE, Inc., has served as an ex officio member of the Commission and has also contributed one of the three supporting papers that supplement our report. We also wish to thank John Goodlad and Willard Kniep for their supplementary papers.

We trust that this report will generate discussion at school, district, state board, and association levels, and that its central theme of education for United States citizenship in an interdependent world will serve as a guide for educators and policy makers.

STUDY COMMISSION ON GLOBAL EDUCATION

Harlan Cleveland
Chairman of the Board of Global Perspectives in Education, Inc.,
Dunn, Herbert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

John I. Goodlad
Vice Chairman of Study Commission on Global Education,
Director, Center for Educational Renewal, School of Education
University of Washington

Clark Kerr
Chairman of Study Commission on Global Education
President, University of California
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MEMO

TO: Members of the Iowa General Assembly
FROM: William L. Lepley, Ed. D., Director, Department of Education
DATE: March 21, 1991

I have become aware in the past few weeks that there are significant concerns among some Iowans about the purposes and goals of global education. I know that many of you have been questioned by your constituents about the issue, and I'd like to take an opportunity to clarify the facts so that you will be well-informed.

Some of the concerns about global education include that it advocates eastern religions, vegetarianism, animal rights, population control and worship of the earth. Some citizens fear that global education is designed to lead students to a new-age religion or that it will undermine democracy and patriotism and lead to a one-world government. In addition, Iowa agriculture groups have expressed a concern about activities advocated by the Department of Education that seem to portray agriculture in an unfavorable light. I hope this letter will clarify both the facts about global education and the Department's position on this topic.

Global education is part of the school accreditation standards which went into effect July 1, 1989. The standard states:

The (local school) board shall adopt a plan which incorporates global perspectives into all areas and levels of the educational program so that students have the opportunity to acquire a realistic perspective on world issues, problems and prospects for an awareness of the relationship between an individual's self-interest and the concerns of people elsewhere in the world. The plan shall include procedures for a review of its effectiveness.

The standard leaves the specific approach to global education to the discretion of each local board. Developing the local approach is part of the district's standard curriculum development process, which includes the involvement of both citizens and educators.

With the guidance of over 50 Iowa educators, the Department has developed two resources to help districts implement the standard: A Guide for Integrating Global Education Across the Curriculum and Catalog of Global Education Activities, Lesson Plans and Resources. These publications are provided as an aid to local school districts; as with most Department curriculum guides or resources, their use is not required.

In the curriculum guide, global education is defined as "an approach to learning which promotes greater understanding of the world as an interconnected aggregate of human and natural systems. These systems operate within a single planetary life-support..."
system on which the destiny of all humankind depends. The purpose of global education is to promote long-term human survival by developing greater respect for and cooperation with our fellow human beings and greater concern for the environment on which all people depend for their very existence. In essence, global education represents an extension of good citizenship to the global dimension.

Global education is designed to introduce students to different aspects of all cultures: literature, art, music, history, traditions, languages, religions, family life, social structures, eating patterns, and contributions to civilization.

Global education does not undermine patriotism. Instead, it helps students understand that in addition to their loyalty to their community, state and nation, they have a responsibility to the world as a whole. It helps them understand that decisions made by one person or one nation can have world-wide impact. It does not promote any religion over another. It advocates respecting our planet, not worshipping it.

Some citizens think that global education and world-class schools are synonymous. Although both the global education standard and the recent report by the Iowa Business and Education Roundtable, World-Class Schools: The Iowa Initiative, are linked to the Department of Education, they are very different in nature. The Roundtable’s report calls for higher standards for academic achievement, a focus on results in education, stronger systems of staff development for educators and other improvements to ensure that Iowa students are world-class competitive. The focus of global education is on helping students understand the interconnectedness of the world around them.

The concerns of agriculture groups over selected activities in the global education resources may be well-founded. I think it’s important to keep in mind, however, that the concerns seem to center on five or six activities out of nearly 1,500 included in the guide and catalog, and that these resources were compiled by a committee of Iowa educators to help ensure that they would not be biased. Nonetheless, I assure you that any bias against agriculture was unintentional. I have asked that the committee that developed the documents be convened again in April to review the guide and catalog. The Department will sponsor a meeting in May to allow the public to make comments and express their concerns. The review and any recommended changes in the materials are to be forwarded to me by July 1, 1991.

The Department remains committed to the importance of the Iowa global education standard in preparing young people to be successful citizens, family members and employees. However, we will continue to listen to seek understanding of the concerns of Iowans so that the materials to assist teachers are of the highest quality and represent multiple perspectives. Please contact me if I can be of further assistance.

W.L.L.
March 22, 1991

Dear Global Education Task Force Member:

As you may have heard, some aspects of global education—in particular, some of the activities in our activities catalog—have come under increasingly hostile attack by various individuals and groups. It apparently began with a small number of right-wing fundamentalists, whose voices have reached other groups such as farmers and state legislators. I don't like to sound paranoid, but there seems to be an organized effort out there to undermine what we are trying to accomplish through global education.

Rumors, distortions, and fabrications have all been used to put certain aspects of global education in a bad light. For example, it is charged with promoting vegetarianism, Eastern religions, anti-patriotism, and a one-world government. Defending global education has become increasingly difficult, especially in light of heated discussions in the legislature over copies of excerpts of the activities catalog being passed around and denounced.

A discussion at the Iowa Global Education Association Steering Committee three weeks ago did not produce any consensus on strategies for responding to the situation. A global education issues committee has been formed at the Department of Education to discuss the issues, and to develop a position paper response.

My purpose in writing to you is twofold. First, the issue of the catalog needs to be addressed. Shall we place a moratorium on its distribution? Do we simply need to change a few of the activities that seem to be the focus of most of the wrath? And if so, to what extent must we give in to special interest groups who feel threatened by the implications of some of the activities (like those which appear to suggest alternatives to diets based on meat-eating)? Since I have always tried to conduct our work by consensus, I believe (and members of the administration here agree) that the Department of Education should not change the catalog unilaterally.

Secondly, I have agreed to re-convene the Global Education Committee on Tuesday, April 2, in order to seriously consider how to respond to these issues. The following week, I will conduct a staff development session for Department of Education staff members to present a draft of a position paper in support of global education. Ideally, the Committee and the Department will reach consensus on this position paper.
In early May, I plan to have a second meeting of the Committee to which the general public (fundamentalists, farmers, legislators, and anyone else who wants to come) will be invited. The purpose will be to allow people to express their concerns directly to us, and for us to respond. I hope a majority of the Committee will be able to attend one or both of these meetings. The bottom line is that, while some people think that there are only a couple people in the state pushing this ‘global education thing,’ we are all in this together. I would hate to see the whole global education effort ruined because we failed to come up with a strong collective response that indicated a broad base of support for what we are doing.

The initial meeting will be held in room 3 North at the Grimes Building, beginning at 9:30, on Tuesday, April 2, 1991. I hope you can come. In the meantime, please do some thinking about what we should do to counter those who are trying to undermine our efforts. If you can’t make the meeting, I hope you can write down your thoughts and send them to me.

I have responded to some of the concerns in an article that will be appearing in the next DE Dispatch, but we all need to come up with sound philosophical responses in order to more effectively articulate the reasons for the importance of global education. Thanks for your help.

Sincerely,

Cordell

Cordell Svengalis

P. S. I am enclosing a copy of the letter Dr. Lepley sent to the legislature yesterday in response to their very vocal concerns.
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STANLEY FOUNDATION'S CONFERENCES
First Conference

Revisiting "An Attainable Global Perspective"

January 21-23, 1994
Taos, New Mexico

Chadwick Alger
Mershon Center
Ohio State University
Columbus Ohio

Charlotte C. Anderson
Education for Global Involvement, Inc.
Chicago Illinois

Lee F. Anderson
Northwestern University
Evanston, Illinois

Charles Bloomstein
Joyce-Mertz-Gilmore Foundation
New York, New York

Leon Clark
Program in International Education
American University
Alexandria Virginia

Jan Drum
Rediscovering Fire
Muscatine Iowa

Maurice A. East
Elliott School of International Affairs
The George Washington University
Washington, DC

Seymour Fersh
Brevard Community College
Cocoa, Florida

Bob Freeman
Kapaa, Hawaii

Bob Hanvey
Bloomington, Indiana

David Hoopes
Intercultural Press, Inc.
Melbourne Beach, Florida

Williard Knip
American Forum for Global Education
New York, New York

Robert Leestma
U.S. Department of Education
Washington, D.C.

George Otero
Taos, New Mexico

Andy Smith
American Forum for Global Education
New York, New York

Kenneth Tye
Education Department
Chapman University
Orange, California

Nancy van Ravenswaay
North Bay International Studies Proj.
Tiburon, California
Second Conference
An Attainable Global Perspective
for the Twenty-First Century

June 10-13, 1994

Elsie Begler
Latin American Studies Center
San Diego California

Peter Downing
CTIR
University of Denver
Denver, Colorado

Kirk Bergstrom
Worldlink
San Francisco California

Dorothy Dunn
Cooper-Hewitt National Museum of Design
New York New York

Pedro R. Bermudez
Miami, Florida

Enzil Scott Evers
Silent Mind
Monterey California

Emily Blare
Parker, Colorado

Jean Gardner
New York, New York

Tony Chambers
East Lansing Michigan

Beth Gragg
Manomet Massachusetts

Adrian Chan
San Francisco, California

Paul J. Haakenson
School of Education
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana

Rhonda Chittenden
Ames, Iowa

Katy Hansen
Orange City, Iowa

Jaimie P. Cloud
The American Forum for Global Education
New York, New York

Jay Harris
Westerville, Ohio

Steve Cochran
York Community Highschool
Elmhurst, Illinois

Amanda Heekin
Taos, New Mexico

Barbara C. Cruz
University of South Florida
Tampa, Florida

Lisa Henning
Muscatine, Iowa

Charles F. Dambach
National Peace Corps Association
Washington, D.C.
Zarina M. Hock  
National Council of Teachers of English  
Urbana, Illinois

Tracy Hyer-Suffern  
New York, New York

Jean Kenin  
Taos, New Mexico

Linda A. Korbel  
ACIIE, Office of the President  
Des Plaines, Illinois

Cathy Lawrence  
Brooklyn, New York

Margie Legowski  
World Wise Schools  
Peace Corps of the United States  
Washington, D.C.

David Levine  
Learning Alliance  
New York, New York

Jeff Martz  
World Solutions  
Petaluma, California

Andrea Maxie  
Division of Curriculum and Instruction  
California State University, LA  
Los Angeles, California

John McClusky  
Parker, Colorado

Lisa McGettingan  
St. Norbert College  
DePere, Wisconsin

Paul McIsaac  
New York New York

Tom Millard  
Pewaukee, Wisconsin

Anne D. Moran  
President, Immaculate Heart College Center  
Los Angeles, California

Gary Mukai  
SPICE  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Marc Murai  
Silent Mind  
Monterey, California

Lucia Nunez  
SPICE  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Helen O'Hara  
International Education Network  
Seattle, Washington

Patrick O'Leary  
Davenport, Iowa

Rosalind Paige  
Textiles and Clothing Department  
Ames, Iowa

Lynda Plummer  
Bright Ideas School, Inc.

Margaret Seip  
New York, New York

Doug Siglin  
World Wildlife Fund  
Washington, DC

Reinhold Steinbeck  
SPICE  
Stanford University  
Stanford, California

Mary Steinmaus  
The Stanley Foundation  
Muscatine, Iowa
Theo Sypris
Kalamazoo Valley Community College
Kalamazoo, Michigan

Jan Drum.................... Recorder
Rediscovering Fire
Muscatine, Iowa

David Tremaine
REACH Center for Multicultural and Global Education
Seattle, Washington

Jill Goldesberry......... Facilitator
The Stanley Foundation

Bob Hanvey ............... Reactor
Bloomington, Indiana

Hettie Mary Worley
Ethical Culture School
New York, New York

George Otero.............. Facilitator
Taos, New Mexico
APPENDIX H

JAMES BECKER'S LETTER OF CONSENT
October 25, 1997

To Whom It May Concern:

Yasemin Alptekin-Guzertem, a candidate for a doctor's degree at Ohio State University, did in conjunction with her dissertation interview me for an extended period of time on March 24, 1995, and for shorter periods at other times. Following the interviews they were transcribed and sent to me for corrections and reactions. This will confirm my satisfaction with the accuracy of the data and views attributed to me in the transcriptions.

I also provided Yasemin with documents, letters, reports, newspaper clippings, articles, books, and unpublished materials relating to global education and my role in its development over a period of more than 30 years. In addition I provided names of individuals, projects, agencies, and institutions that played a key role in the development of global education over the past 30 years.

During the time Yasemin was working on her dissertation frequent phone conversations, faxes, and letters were used to check, verify, and correct aspects of the study related to my role in the development of global education. The conclusions and interpretations are, as they should be, Yasemin's. However, I can attest to the accuracy of the data and information I provided.

It was a pleasure to be of assistance to Yasemin in this important study.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
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