DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 862 SO 026 021

AUTHOR Kang, SunJoo
TITLE History in the Global Age.
PUB DATE Dec 95
NOTE 28p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Citizenship; Citizenship Education; Global Approach; *Global Education; *History Instruction; Secondary Education; Social Studies; *United States History; *World History

ABSTRACT

This paper attempts to clarify: (1) the need to educate citizens to cope with contemporary global challenges and (2) the purpose of history and to examine the way to organize history in the global age. The document suggests that the purpose of world history and national history is to enable students to develop a global perspective and that world history should be viewed in all its aspects from a global perspective. The paper contends that the goal of history teaching must change from the focus of U.S. citizenship to that of world citizen. The text is divided into six parts: (1) "Introduction"; (2) "The Age of Global Interdependence"; (3) "Citizen Education in the Global Age"; (4) "Global Perspective in History"; (5) "History for Global Perspective"; and (6) "Conclusion." (EH)

History in the Global Age

by

SunJoo Kang

Ph.D. Student
Department of Curriculum & Instruction
Indiana University
sukang@indiana.edu
812-857-6544 (H)

December 15, 1995

Contents

Introduction

Traditionally, the goal of history courses has always been to prepare young people for citizenship However, the demands of citizenship to which this course must respond have been changed to keep up with the changes of world condition and America's place in the world.

In the 1880s-90s, United States history was introduced into schools and colleges. Since then, U.S. history, along with civics, has been the primary vehicle for molding a nation of immigrants into a nation of Americans. The emergence of America as a world power between two world wars required a more cosmopolitan identity for Americans in the early-20th century. That was the situation to generate and spread "Western Civilization" course in the 1930s. This course gave students an opportunity to identify American heritages that originated in Europe. Still, Europe was the only world at that time.

The Second World War made America recognize the necessity to acquaint with Asia, and Africa, as much as Europe, as American foreign policy and economic activity have become more concerned with the countries in those continents. Efforts were made to expand treatments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. "In most cases, however, non-Western histories simply grafted onto what essentially remained a story of the Western world." (Woyach and Remy, 1989; p.5) It seemed to be easier to add information about the rest of the world to existing Western civilization courses and textbooks than to think of a new way of presenting the history of the world. Instead, the result was an ungainly set of parallel regional histories that lacked coherence for students, demanded almost superhuman teacher competence.

The increasing interdependence of today's world suggests that these traditional history courses

be reconsidered, and reconceptualized for educating citizens who will be involved world affairs, and who will find themselves entangled in worldwide problems more deeply than ever before. Then, how should history course respond to the demand of citizenship education to cope with the changes of the world? In order to answer the question, we need to examine the competencies of citizens for which citizenship education should equip young people to cope with contemporary global challenge. This paper attempts to clarify the need and the purpose of history, and examine the way to organize world history in the global age. This paper suggests that the purpose of world history and national history is to provide students development of global perspective, and in order that, world history should be viewed in all its aspects from a global perspective.

The Age of Global Inte~dependence

Nowadays, goods, capital, knowledge, culture, crime, fashions. and beliefs all readily flow across territorial boundaries. Transnational networks, social movements and relationships are radically extensive in most areas of human activity. Moreover, the existence of global systems of trade, finance and production binds together in very complicated ways the prosperity and fate of households, communities, and nations across the globe. (MacGrew, 1992; p.66) These transnational activities have impacted each aspect of society in a complicated way. For example, the stock market change on Wall Street will spread to the stock exchanges of Sydney, Hong Kong, Tokyo, and London more rapidly than before a few decades. Expanding steel production in Latin America, East Asia, and Europe will be translated into contracting labor markets in Pittsburgh and Gary. Under the auspices of a growing number of multinational corporations (MNCs), production has become highly

transnationalized. Even the AIDS virus is spreading across the globe. These phenomena show us that problems. events, decisions, and activities in one part of the world come to have radical consequences for individuals and communities in quite distant parts of the globe. It is becoming a reality that telecommunications and jet travel are creating a "global village," and that burgeoning social and economic transactions are creating "one world without borders."

It has been debated what the meaning of the growth of global interdependence or globalization is, what the main driving force(s) behind it is, and how globalization is reconstituting the world into a single social space.[1] Many scholars offer quite different versions of the global predicament, different kinds of global social architecture arising from the growth of global interdependence .(MacGrew, 1992; pp.69-73) Although the accounts for the phenomenon of the growth of global interdependence have been given quite differently in the field of social science, it has been identified that global interdependence has become a reality. To greater or lesser extent, a number of scholars see our era as one in which the nation-state, which has been dominant in world politics, is being eclipsed by non-state actors such as multinational corporations, transnational social movements, and non-governmental international organizations (NGOs). This process has been identified by many observers in every aspect of the world: 1) political aspect: the expansion of channels of communication interlinking governments; the growth of the number of non-state actors in world politics. 2) economic aspect: the growth of multinational corporations; the expansion of international trade and foreign investment; the development of economic policy at global level in

[1] In the field of International Relations, for example, Wallerstein, Rosenau. and Gilpin stress the primacy of one particular causal logic. Each of the three authors locates the causal logic of globalization in a specific institutional domain: the economic, the technological, and the political. On the other hand, Giddens and Robertson give weight to a multi-causal logic in accounting for globalization.

international organizations. 3) ecological aspect: the emergence of global concerns over depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, acid rain, deforestation and desertification, and nuclear waste disposal. 4) social/cultural aspect: recognition of the seriousness in drug and crime, the growth of global culture; coexistence of distinctive regional, national, ethnic, and religious cultures. (Anderson, 1990; pp.15-16)

As a consequence, many social problems have become globalized. Therefore, individual nations can no longer solve these problems and conflicts on their own -- if indeed they ever could. Their solution requires interdependent, cooperative action on the part of the entire world community. Only when we view the problems and human activities within a global setting, can we fully understand and solve them. Our survival and well-being may be intimately related to our capacity to understand and prepare effectively for the age of the global age.

Citizenship Education in the Global Age

Traditionally, we have viewed the world as a collection of independent nation-states only somewhat related to one another. This view has caused us to see the world from the viewpoint of our own nation. Citizenship education also has focused on the development of a good citizenship at the nation-state level. This has included "an understanding of the workings of local, state, and national government; a knowledge of the underlying principles of our government; skills in decision making and forming judgments; and attitudes that foster active participation in the system." (Cogan, 1981; p.8). However, contemporary world changes make us realize that the world is no longer a collection of separate nation-states. While the fact that nation-states are still main actors in world affairs cannot

be denied, they are no longer an absolutely dominant factor. It means that, to understand world affairs, it is required to be aware of diverse actors of which activities cross nation-state boundaries. In other words, today's world cannot be fully understood within a nation-state setting. Therefore, these contemporary world changes require us to rethink about citizenship education in the age of global interdependence.

There is a debate between the pluralist and the realist view concern' g citizenship education in the global age. The core of debate can be summarized whether teaching national loyalty and global responsibility are compatible or not. The pluralists argue that global and national citizen education training are compatible. As James Backer points out, "all people are capable of multiple loyalties and roles, as is evidenced by their simultaneous commitments to family, church, friends. clubs, and other groups and organizations." (Backer, 1980; p.38) On the other hand, although the realists agree that American students need to be better acquainted with the world, advocates of this view believe that "national literate culture" should be taught prior to international studies. As Hirsch (1987; p.18) states, "although nationalism may be regrettable in some of its worldwide political effects, a mastery of national culture is essential to mastery of the standard language in every modern nation. ... To teach the ways of one's own community has always been and still remains the essence of the education of children, who enter neither a narrow trivial culture nor a transcendent world culture but a national literate culture. For profound historical reasons, this is the way of the modern world, and it will not change soon." The realist view sees a conflict in teaching a national citizenship and a global perspective simultaneously as follows.

"There is no controversy about having simultaneous loyalties to the United States

and to transnational or international groups as long as the legitimate interests of the United States and those other groups are not seriously divergent. Serious and tragic conflict is a genuine possibility, however, in a world which as a whole does not exist under institutional arrangements that successfully moderate differences of interest or adjudicate them justly. When serious conflict does arise, there will be a strain on our multiple loyalties that forces us to think about what weight we shall give to each." (Fullinwider, 1994; p.26)

It is true that promoting a sense of responsibility that crosses ideological, cultural, and national boundaries is a complex and controversial undertaking. We may, sometimes, confront the situation that brings us the question: How much weight should we give to our own nation's interest and global interest? How should we manage conflict between national and global interest? "This is the crux of the matter when we wonder about global education's implications for citizenship and loyalty." (Fullinwider, 1994; p.26) This issue arises because the nation-state is still a major actor in world affairs and a basic unit to keep security of the world, although its function in world affairs has become weaker than before. Therefore, the need of training citizens responsibility, which is traditionally upheld as a core of citizenship education, cannot be ignored.

However, it is also true that "a world view -- that is, seeing oneself and human beings generally as members of a single species on a small planet -- is what is most needed today." (Becker, 1979; p.44) Today as never before, all human beings live in a multiboundary world, not simply a world of nation-states, but one with a diversity of worldwide systems in which all people affect, and are affected by others around the globe. Humanity is increasingly threatened by problems that cannot

be solved by actions taken only at the national level. Nation-state borders cease to be protected against communications technology that brings in the cultural values of other societies, or against migrations of the disadvantaged and persecuted, effects of economic stress in other countries, drug dealers, AIDS, or acid rain. Accordingly, it is indeed necessary to prepare young citizens for understanding and for coping with the innumerable problems that will face them in the near future.

To illustrate, many Americans continue to revere the nation-state and insist on policy making sovereignty in the world where many of the issues are transnational. These issues, however, do not respect political or geographic boundaries, and they cannot be fully resolved by the actions of a single state. In other words, as citizens, people select their leaders and express their views on major issues, and most issues of public policy now have both domestic and multinational components. It is clear to most educators that there is some merit in both views. Our process of political thinking or political socialization will have to adjust to new circumstances in world affairs. This does not mean abandoning the past, nor does it mean ignoring transformations that challenge some of our core assumptions and require some new thinking. At this time, as John J. Cogan (1981; p.8) argues, "we need a broader concept of citizenship -- one that includes a global perspective." People will and should continue to be active, and be interested in problems and issues surrounding their own national groups. They will also need to view these issues and problems within larger global perspectives.

In this context, in order to help students play an effective role at this time, citizenship as well as global education programs should provide them with substantial information and practical strategies to see the relationship between global issues and local concerns, and to effectively involve them in local, national, and world affairs. What are the information and strategies to help young people understand public issues that involve them in national as well as global nature?

Global Perspective in History

The problem is how we can help young people understand the increasing interdependence of the world, and the close linkage between their local communities and the world community. The National Council for the Social Studies called for global perspective in all social studies education, defining it as developing "the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to live effectively in a world possessing limited natural resources and characterized by ethnic diversity, cultural pluralism, and increasing interdependence." (Merryfield, 1991; p.11) The global perspective would allow us to see the increasing global interdependence and the issues and problems that are caused by the growth of global interdependence. The knowledge and attitudes that require young people to learn can be identified in the following five dimensions of global perspective by Robert G. Hanvey: perspective consciousness, state of the planet awareness, cross-cultural awareness, knowledge of global dynamics, awareness of human choices. (Hanvey, 1982; pp.162-167)

Perspective consciousness is a dim sense that we have a perspective, and that others have different perspectives. State of the planet awareness is the awareness of prevailing world conditions and developments. Cross-cultural awareness is awareness of the diversity of ideas and practices to be found in human societies around the world, of how such ideas and perspectives compare, including some limited recognition of how the ideas and ways of one's own society might be viewed from other vantage points. Knowledge of global dynamics is some modest comprehension of key traits and mechanisms of the world system, with emphasis on theories and concepts that may increase intelligent consciousness of global change. Awareness of human choices is some awareness of the problems of choice confronting individuals, nations, and the human species as consciousness and knowledge of

the global system expands. In sum, young people should be able to recognize a variety of perspectives in the world, and develop the attitude to appreciate other images of the world. They should be able to understand global issues and events in depth and appreciate and benefit from diverse cultures. They should also be able to appreciate diverse actors in world affairs and the growth of interdependence and interconnectedness between groups, societies, and communities. Furthermore, it is necessary to understand conflict image between commitment of national loyalty and the world responsibility. These are the knowledge and attitudes specifically required for students who will be citizens in a global age.

How can we teach students this global perspective? In this paper, the focus will be given to history. In other words, it focuses on how history can contribute to citizenship education in a global age. Many Social Studies educators believe that one of the valuable vehicles to develop the global perspective is a world history. Harward Mehlinger (1982; p.12) points out that "world history is a necessary part of being an American citizen today. World history is part of the necessary knowledge, skills, and understanding to be a responsible citizen in a democratic society, to know certain things that only world history can provide... We have to find some reasons why it is essential and then start pushing." A world history course can help students develop the global perspective in four respects. These are the "things that only world history can provide."

First, as Douglas D. Alder and Matthew T. Downey (1985; P.14) point out, "a high school course in world history that helps students understand how other societies and cultures came to be the way they are offers an indispensable part of this preparation [living in a community larger than the nation-state]" It is history that explains how the present came to be, further, it suggests vision of future. History links the present with the future as well as with the past. "We cannot understand

the present without a suitable sense of the past; and conversely, we cannot make proper use of the past without a suitable sense of the present." (Vor. Laue, 1981; p.10) Therefore, a world history course provides an understanding of how we came to be the way we are and how contemporary global conditions came to be. A world history can help students perceive a reality of increasing global interdependence.

Second, a world history also provides students with an opportunity to be exposed to different times and places so that it can help them gain knowledge beyond our borders: a variety of human cultures and ethnic groups everywhere. As a need of world history course, William McNeill (1982; pp 3-4) points out that "we should use our very best talents to create world history courses that are coherent, vivacious and that we as teachers can believe in. We must give to our students some sense of the cultural complexity and fascination of the world in which they must live, and convince them it is better to know about things than to fumble around in the dark, stumble on odd and often uncomfortable surprises, which is what happens if you don't know how the cultural world around you is put together." In the pluralistic world, more citizens than ever before are traveling outside the United States, becoming involved in international trade, consuming international products, and finding themselves involved in worldwide problems. Therefore, it is necessary to understand those pluralistic characteristics of the world and to be exposed to diverse ideas and beliefs that cause people to act differently. A world history can provide those understandings.

Third, in particular, history leads students to enter into other times and places to see how the past looked to the people living in it. In the process of explaining why those people behaved as they did, they necessarily need to investigate the motives and assumptions of people in the past. Students must try see the world as others *saw* it. Thus, history can helps students recognize that people may

hold different perspectives, and to develop attitudes to respect other perspectives

Fourth, if a history course is designed to focus not only on content questions but also on how to think critically, history would be a valuable vehicle to teach critical thinking skills such as how to evaluate documents, how to generalize, how to synthesize, and how to look for causality and continuity as well as change

We can see the values of a world history as a vehicle to teach the global perspective. We may argue that it is a necessary course to educate citizens in the global age.

History for Global Perspective

Many efforts to infuse global perspective into the history curriculum appear to be significantly increasing. In some instances, these efforts are reflected in a broadening of the curriculum to include other countries and cultures Such efforts are also made by offering several strategies such as a "system approach," "comparative approach," and "parallels between present and past." (Benitez, 1994; pp.142-144) Such approaches are a step in the right direction. Yet it would seem that all world history courses should have some essential content and some persistent intellectual concerns. These are not evident in the world history curriculum today. What kind of world history should we teach for students who do not have any intention to be a professional historian, and who just will be citizens? What should be a substantial content of world history to help students understand their world in which the students themselves will confront as citizens and human beings?

First, world history should reduce the West-centered view on world history.

According to Kevin Reilly (1989; p.21), teaching world history for citizenship at this time

means "reducing the centrality of Western history. The world history course must become less Western as it becomes more global. It requires new perspectives, new approaches, and new questions that accommodate its wider vision." For several decades, western civilization has dominated the center of the world history, and other peoples and civilizations are added onto its outer edge. "It has sought primarily, often exclusively, to teach students about the development of the values and institutions that were formulated in the Mediterranean world, took root in Europe, and eventually spread throughout Northern Eurasia, much of the Americas, and even parts of Oceania." (Gordon, 1989; p.61) This course has served the purpose to explain the origin of American heritage and to find their identity.

However, such an approach is likely to cultivate in students a distorted perspective of non-Western regions. Although most students exposed to a "world history" course may think that they are really learning world history, this approach, in fact, may lead them to the perhaps unintended conclusion. They may think that "most of the important historical developments have occurred only in the "West," even though non-Western areas, China, India, South Western Asia (the Islamic state), and the Eastern Mediterranean basin societies, were considerably more impressive in their accomplishments." (Lockard, 1982; p.71). The danger of misunderstanding enters only when we forget that it was distorted, and come to believe that it really is the history of the modern world. One of the failures of history teaching in past decades has been the failure to make this point clear. At this time, world history should be separated from Western civilization which had been about the West and the Westernization of other continents, with Europeans at the center, Americans on the side, and everyone else in the edge. World history and Western civilization were inherently and fundamentally different, and they cannot be combined in any fashion.

The Western civilization-centered world history can no longer be an appropriate course to educate citizens in the global age in which the citizens should be able to view issues and problems from a global perspective. Rather, the Western-centered courses promote their ethnocentrism, and prevent them from understanding contemporary global challenge. It is because this world history course is too much centered on the Western experience as a reference to understand today's complex world. It is because "such a focus on Western culture, accompanied by fragmented views of other cultures, often undercuts the most significant contributions of study of world history -- the understanding of interrelationships between peoples, countries, and continents." (Becker, 1991; p.75) To survive in an increasingly interdependent and less Western-dominated world, Americans must learn to view history in more global terms. Geoffrey Barraclough (1967; p.10) has noted the particular necessity for a global view in the study of contemporary history:

> "One of the distinctive facts about contemporary history is that it is world history and that the forces shaping it cannot be understood unless we are prepared to adopt worldwide perspectives; and this means not merely supplementing our conventional view of the recent past by adding a few chapters on extra-European affairs, but re-examining and revising the whole structure of assumptions and preconceptions on which that view is based. Precisely because American, African, Chinese, Indian and other branches of extra-European history cut into the past at different angles, they cut across the traditional lines; and this very fact casts doubt on the adequacy of the old patterns and suggests the need for a new ground-plan."

Indeed, it seems clear that history that we should teach today is a world history focusing on the evolution of universal and diverse human beings and cultures not just for male heroes, wars, and Western civilization but for all human beings. It does not mean that world history is simply a conglomeration of national histories. Rather it requires a different way of viewing world history. It is a view to see the planet and its human being's history with a global perspective. The principal role of world History in a global age is, hence, to create all human beings' public identities as it aims at discovering the common human past all human beings share. For that, world history must search for the links and connections across political and cultural boundaries. It must embrace some broad overview which recognizes interaction between societies and regions.

Second, world history should be chronologically organized.

A world history course can be organized according to one of three basic criteria: by cultural/geographic region, by topic, or by chronological period. (Reilly, 1989; p.24) In the cultural/regional approach, each civilization is treated separately. Each "challenge" and "response" can be seen as a unique unit of historical investigation. The problems of a cultural/geographical approach to teach world history have already been described through examining a Western-centered world history course in this paper. In the topical approach, chapters or whole books may focus on one topic such as "city in history" or "women in history." This approach is useful to explore one topic in depth and thoroughly. However, because it isolates selected aspects of history from the wider social context in which they are situated, and it treats historical facts so many bits of background information to help explain conditi ns of the present. (Dunn, 1989; p.231) It does not allow us to understand human beings' history from a broad perspective.

Most historians and teachers of history prefer a chronological approach. If history content

is organized by digging up the past and by removing people and events from their historical context, the integrity of history will be destroyed. The people and events of the past can only be understood when viewed within a larger context in which they existed. As Ross E. Dunn (1989; p.220) argues , world history "would be chronologically organized -- that is, it would have a narrative structure, though a looser one than U.S. and European surveys often have. Students would follow a world time line that stirs awareness of the interrelations of societies from one century to the next, and that invites continuous comparison of events occurring in di erent parts of the world." If understanding of the process of world change through time, how the present came to be, is the principal purpose of a history instruction, it can be fully accomplished through chronological approach.

Third, the content of world history should be organized to help students draw a "big" picture of human beings' evolution.

The most common blueprint for organizing a world history course has been simply to divide human beings into cultural or civilizational units, then to address each in turn, usually covering its history over a span of several centuries. Most textbooks take this approach, and indeed most educators and publishers seem to have assumed that world history just be primarily the serial study of a variety of foreign cultures plus the West. (Dunn. 1989; p.218) It is just a collection of each history of culture or nation in different parts of the world, not a world history which can give us a more integrated and dynamic conception of the world past.

Then, is it possible to create models of world history courses that will have a coherent and real relevancy for the world of everyday for students who have no intention of becoming professional historians, but who are going to be citizens? What should we teach and how should we teach them? These questions common to all teachers seem to be persistent and troublesome for world history

researchers today. It is not difficult for teachers to recognize the futility of trying to "cover" world history. It is because the concept of "coverage," examining all civilizations, and all nation and people's histories from ancient times to the present, is impossible to sustain. Anyone attempting to do this either omits most of history by default or moves so rapidly that each epoch and each civilization can only receive cursory attention. It is obvious that a world history course needs to be reconsidered in both respects to structure and to what students should be expected to learn

A critical issue to organize world history is "selection": what should we include or exclude from world history? It is necessary to cut ruthlessly in order to make the course manageable. What should be ignored and what should be saved? What criteria are needed in order to make these choices? The need for establishing priorities has never been more urgent, and has never had teachers facing such a bewildering range of options. The challenge of world history is to find the appropriate criteria for "selection" and accurate words for the organizing terms and concepts, so that teachers may focus on what truly is significant in human beings' history as a whole. Although each civilization and people has developed in a unique way, it is indispensable to look at world history to explicate the process of all human beings' development at this time. If a world history course is to provide such a broad overview of the world past, and a concentrated illustration of how the world came to be in its present state, world history should focus on the world's pasts which are all colliding, interacting, and intermixing. Ross E. Dunn suggests a way in which a world history be organized. (1989; p.220)

> "Each primary unit of the course would be organized around an important chain of events (and I use the term 'event' broadly to include relatively long-term developments) whose impact was wide enough to involve peoples of differing cultures

in a shared experience. These 'big' events would provide the common reference point for investigating and comparing other events and trends that related more narrowly to particular civilizations and cultural groups."

It means that we can structure the world history focusing on major events, which have large and long-lasting influence on a specific broad region as well as on the world as a whole. These events would allow students to see common or interconnected human beings' experiences, and to understand currents in world history. However, this does not mean to ignore the importance of studying cultures in history. The study of particular civilizations themselves gives students an opportunity to explore diverse cultures and perspectives in the world. Therefore, those studies are important processes to be studied. The important thing is that each civilization should not be irrelevantly studied as just a fragment of world history, which would "limit and confuse the teacher's efforts to help students see the `big picture' of world change in whatever age is being studied." (Dunn, 1989; p.220) It is because a world history is concerned primarily with offering the deeper currents of story, with the narrative of cultural change and encounter. It is because world history is concerned with defining the common realms of experience that all human beings share.

Fourth, world history needs to consider the discontinuity between history up to 1500 A.D. and that since 1500.

However, there are some problems to drawing the common realms of all human beings' experiences from ancient to the present by searching interrelation and interconnection between cultures, peoples and events. Although global interdependence has been growing throughout much of world history, only in the modern era (after 1500) has the scale of interdependence rapidly become

worldwide and obvious. In fact, "for periods of world history up to about 1500 A.D., a region-based structure may have to predominate in so far as the formation and style of each of the major civilized traditions must be explained, and trans-cultural and trans-regional connections are less important except over a very long term. For periods after 1500, by contrast, region-based world history is taught at the risk of obscuring any comprehensive understanding of modernity as a global, perhaps *the* global event." (Dunn, 1985; p.332) McNeill, Stavrianos, and others generally agree that interaction was considerably less important before the European overseas expansions. It is since the late fifteenth century when direct contact between nearly all the widely-scattered societies in the world eventually is getting intensified.

It is possible to find trans-regional and trans-cultural interaction even before 1500. Few societies were completely isolated from each other. While they existed in varying degrees of isolation, there were periods of great trans-regional interactions (although they were a very long-term interaction) For example, there was the spread of iron, the flowing of Greek commerce and culture from 800 B C. to 200 B.C., or the expedition of the Mongols. However, it is clear that 1500 A.D. marks a watershed after which the interaction between societies, regions, and continents increased dramatically, leading up to the present universal and interdependent human society. Thus, some people distinguish these characteristics of discontinuity in world history. This discontinuity means intensifying global interconnections since 1500 A.D. called "global history." *The Times Atlas of World History* uses the word "global" in a way to indicate the particular era: the period from 1870 to the present "the Age of Global Civilization." Stavrianos and his collaborators also, in their textbook, state that global history began in 1500. That date ended the age-old separation between Eurasia and the other continents. (Douthit, 1991; p.296) Therefore, to them, global history means

"the era of global history,": "a state of mind peculiar to the age in which Europeans began to explore and colonize other continents, then it has to be treated as discontinuous with the classical tradition of western thought." (Douthit, 1991; p.296)

The world affairs since 1500 cannot be fully understood just with separate exploration of regional and cultural development. It is necessary to examine interactions between societies, peoples, and cultures in far distant regions to appreciate world changes since 1500. It is easly found that an event that happened in a far region brings large and long lasting influence to the other part of the world or to the world itself in the world history since 1500. In world history up to 1500, we cannot easily find those kinds of events. Furthermore, the influence of those events cannot be described as a core content to understand world history up to 1500. Nor can they be a clue to infer the "global" interdependence in the world history up to 1500. Rather, it is necessary to give students an opportunity to explore a variety of regional civilizations in that history and find commonality and difference among them. Comparative studies can give students a richer grasp of common nature of diverse institutions and ideologies that constitute the world history and offer students the entire world as the field of historical inquiry.

Fifth, the importance of national history should not be ignored.

Despite the growth of global interdependence, the nation-state continues to exert a "strong" influence in world affairs. No "global community" has emerged to replace the nation-state. Still, people belong to a nation, "national history addresses the question `who are we?' directly. As long as national states remain the most important locus of power over human lives, national history surely will remain critically important in answering the questions of our public identity." (McNeill, 1988; p.130) What should be considered in organizing and teaching national history is to help students

understand their national history within a global context: how other people affected our lives and how we affected other peoples' lives. Such an effort to see U.S history in the context of world history can be found in *Charting a Course: Social Studies 21st Century* recommendations. (1989; p.14) It recommends to combine study of the United States with study of the world by teaching American history as part of the general story of humanity -- including cultural, economic and political systems -- in recent centuries.

As Paul Kennedy, Dilworth Professor of History at Yale University, notes, "you only properly understand your own country when you remove the ethnocentric spectacles, examine the history of other countries, and put your own nation within the larger context of global development." (Kennedy, 1988) This perspective will lead students to be able to describe American's place and its role in the world within a global perspective, so that they can elucidate problems that Americans face, judge the direction of political, economic, and cultural development that Americans should take, and eventually, effectively participate in shaping the future of America.

Conclusion

The teaching of world history suffers from many unresolved problems. Howard Mehlinger (1982; pp.7-12) examined the difficulties of teaching world history in secondary education in the following four respects: 1) the problems of getting acceptance of both school boards and students for world history at the high school level, 2) the difficulty of teachers' obtaining training in world history, 3) the problem of course purpose, and 4) problems with finding suitable course texts.

First, most high school graduates will have never studied about any part of the world other

than the United States, unless perhaps in a geography course in the fourth grade or something. Second, it is not easy to find any college or university that has a well designed program to prepare high school world history teachers. Third, there are the problems for teachers to clarify purpose and to select content of world history when they try to teach world history. Fourth, there are few textbooks to be available. Furthermore, all but three or four of the available world history textbooks, are still Western centric. Despite their claims to a global approach, most works devoted considerably more attention to Western Europe and its extension, North America, than to Asia, Africa, Latin America, or Eastern and Southeastern Europe. Only a small number of global histories truly accord Asia, Africa, and Latin America the sort of comprehensive attention that they deserve. These problems are still obstacles standing in the way to teach world history in secondary schools. Therefore, in order to make world history play a valuable role in preparing students for living in a global age, searching the way to resolve the following problems are urgent needs. In order to help world history teachers, it is needed not only to develop programs of world history teachers but also to clarify the purpose of world history. And, a research base concerning the selection and organization of world history for teachers to refer is required. Furthermore, it is necessary to develop textbooks which are not Western-centric, and are suitable for students in the global age.

Bibliography

Allardyce, Gilbert, "Toward World History: American Historians and the Coming of the World History Course," *Journal of World History*, 1(1), 1990. pp.23-76.

Anderson, Lee F., "A Rationale for Global Education," in Tye, Kenneth, ed., *Global Education: From Thought To Action* (Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1990) ED326970.

Barraclough, Geoffrey, *An Introduction to Contemporary History* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1967)

Becker, James M., "The World and the School: A Case for World Centered Education," in James Becker, (ed.) *Schooling For Global Age*. (New York: Mcgraw-Hill, 1979) ED116 126.

Becker, Jamese, "Teaching Global Perspectives," *Today's Education*, (April-May 1980)

Benitez, Helena, "Globalization of United States History: Six Strategies," *Social Education*, 58(3), March 1994, pp.142-44.

Charting a Course: Social Studies 21st Century recommendations. A Report of the Curriculum Task Force of the National Commission on Social Studies in the Schools, 1989.

Cogan, John J., "Global Education: Opening Young Children's Eyes to the World," *Principle*, 61(2), November 1981. pp.8-11.

Craig A. Lockard, "Global History, Modernization, and the World-System Approach: A Critique," in Joe C. Dixon and Neil D. Martin(ed.) *World History Teaching Conference* (Colorado Springs, Colorado May 12-14, 1982) ED259961 (Aiso in The History Teacher, 14(4) August 1981. pp.489-515)

Day, Billie, "Global History," *Social Studies*, 74(1) Jan-Feb 1983, pp.34-37.

Douglas D Alder and Matthew T. Downey, "Problem Areas in The History Curriculum," in Matthew Downesy (ed.), *History in the Schools*, National Council for the Social Studies Special Interest Group for History Teachers, Bulletin N0.74 1985.

Duthie, James, "The Current State of History Teaching, Theme: Why Teach History?" *History and Social Science Teacher*, 24(3), Spring 1989. pp.135-38.

Douthit, Nathan, "The Dialectical Commons of Western Civilization and Global/World History," *History Teacher*, 24(3), May 1991

Dunn, Ross E., "The Challenge of Hemispheric History (1000-1500 A.D.)," *The History Teacher*, 18(3), May 1985. pp.329-38.

Dunn, Ross E., "Central Themes for World history," *in Paul Gagnon ed.), Historical literacy: The Case for History in American Education* (Boston, Massachusetts: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1989)

Dunn, Ross E., "Approaches to Teaching World history," in Joe C. Dixon and Neil D. Martin(ed.), *World History Teaching Conference* (Colorado Springs, Colorado May 12-14, 1982) ED259961

Fulinwider, Robert, "Global Education and Controversy: Some Observations," in John Fonte & Andre Ryerson, *Education for America's Role in World Affairs* (University Press of America, Inc. lanham, Maryland, 1994)

Gordon, Michael, "A Western Civilization Approach," in Remy, Richard, and Robert Woyach (eds.), *Approach to World Studies: A Handbook For Curriculum Planers* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1989)

Hanvey, Robert, "An Attainable Global Perspective." *Theory into Practice*, 21, Summer 1982. pp.162-167. EJ 269 219.

Hartoonian, Michael H, and Hilary Stock, *A Guide to Curriculum Planning in Global Studies*, Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison, 1992. ED356176

Hertzberg, Hazel W., "Students, Methods and materials of Instruction," in Mattew Downey(ed.), *History in the Schools*, National Council for the Social Studies Special Interest Group for History Teachers, Bulletin, 74, 1985. pp.25-40.

Hirsch, E.E., Jr, *Cultural literacy: What Every American Needs to Know* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1987)

Hoffmann, Stanley, "What Should We Do in The World?" *The Atlantic Monthly*, 264(4), October 1989.

Johnson, Donald, "Academic and Intellectual Foundations of Teacher Education in Global Perspectives," *Theory into Practice*, 32(1) Winter 1993. pp.3-13.

Kenndy, P. "Learning from History: Do Our Politicians Understand the Need?" *Courier Journal* (Louisville, Ky, February 21, 1988) D1

Kniep, Willard M., "Social Studies within a Global Education," *Social Education*, 53(6), October 1989. p.399(5).

Lamy, Steven L., "Global Education: A Conflict of Images," in Kenneth A.Tye(ed.) *Global Education from Thought to Action* (1991 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development)

Lefeber, W. "We Need Fresh Scholarship to Understand Changed World Realities," *The Chronicle*

of Higher Education, 24 (May 24, 1989) p.A40

McNeill, William, "Europe in World History Before 1500 A.D.," *The History Teacher*, 18(3), May 1985. pp.340-344.

McNeill, William H., "Pursuit of Power: Criteria of Global Relevance," in Bernard R. Gifford(ed.), *History in the Schools: What Shall We Teach?* (Macmillan Publishing Company: New York, N.Y. 1989)

McNeill, William H . "The World History Survey Course," in Joe C. Dixon and Neil D. Martin(ed.) *World History Teaching Conference* (Colorado Springs, Colorado May 12-14, 1982) ED259961

Mehlinger, Howard, "World History in Secondary Education," in Joe C. Dixon and Neil D. Martin(ed.), *World History Teaching Conference* (Colorado Springs, Colorado May 12-14, 1982) ED259961

Reilly, Kevin, "A World History Approach," in Remy, Richard, and Robert Woyach (eds.), *Approach to World Studies: A Handbook For Curriculum Planers* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1989)

Remy, Richard, and Robert Woyach, "The Need for Alternative Conceptual Approaches to World Studies," in Richard Remy and Robert Woyach (eds.), *Approach to World Studies: A Handbook For Curriculum Planers* (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1989)

Remy, Richard c., et al. *International Learning and International Education in a Global Age* (Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, Bulletin 47, 1975)

Smith, Andrew, "A Brief History of Pre-Collegiate Global and International Studies Education," in John Fonte & Andre Ryerson, *Education for America's Role in World Affairs* (University Press of America, Inc. lanham, Maryland, 1994)

Thornthon, S. T., "Should We Be Teaching More History? *Theory and Research in Social Studies Education*, 18(1), Winter 1990. pp.53-60.

Thornton, Stephen J., "What Can Children Learn from History?" *Childhood Education*, 63(4), April 1987. pp.247-251.

Tucker, Jan L., "Global Change and American Citizenship Education: The Vital Role of History" *Social Education*, September 1990. ED337404

Turker, Jan L., "Social Studies for the 21st Century," *Social Education*, 52(3), March 1988. p.209(6).

Tucker, Jan, and Peter Cistone, "Global Perspectives for Teachers: An urgent priority," *Journal of*

Teacher Education, 42(1), January-February 1991 PP.3-10. EJ 429286.

Vocke, David E., "Those Varying Perspectives on Global Education," *The Social Studies*, 79(1), Jan-Feb 1988. p.18(3).

Von Laue, T.H., "What History for the Year 2000?" *The History Teacher,* 15(1), November 1981.