

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 113 267

SO 008 671

TITLE Global Studies Workshop: Amherst, Massachusetts, May 16-17, 1975. Report.

INSTITUTION Management Inst. for National Development, New York, N.Y.; Massachusetts Univ., Amherst.

PUB DATE 75

NOTE 21p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.76 HC-\$1.58. Plus Postage

DESCRIPTORS Collegé Instruction; Conference Reports; *Curriculum Development; *Global Approach; Instructional Materials; *International Education; Secondary Education; Social Sciences; Teaching Techniques; *World Affairs; World Problems

ABSTRACT

The conference report of the Global Studies Workshop held in Amherst, Massachusetts, May 16-17, 1975 is presented. The workshop provided a meeting place for educators from both the secondary and college levels to share concerns, ideas, and techniques in the teaching of global studies. Two key questions were addressed throughout the workshop concerned with the goals of a global studies course and the issues, concepts, and problems which such a course should address. Four goals for global studies were identified along with recommendations and suggestions for further action. A short narrative is presented on the Amherst interpretations of the sessions, based on the group meetings. The document concludes with a selected list of references, curricula, films, and other resources useful in teaching global studies. A list of conference participants is included in the document. (Author/JR)

* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED113267

58008671

REPORT
GLOBAL STUDIES WORKSHOP
Amherst, Massachusetts
May 16-17, 1975

University of Massachusetts
Management Institute for National Development
Co-Organizers

00002



Management Institute for National Development

230 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 889-5847
Cable: Institute, New York

GLOBAL STUDIES WORKSHOP

Amherst, Mass.

The Amherst workshop was designed to provide an opportunity for professors and teachers, involved in introducing global studies at their respective colleges and high schools, to exchange experiences. At both educational levels, some of the participants had two, three, or more years of experience in global education, others a first year experience, while still others were in the planning or introductory stages. Due to this similarity of involvement, there was no need to convince or persuade. This was a gathering of practitioners, and that commonality permitted an agenda which dealt directly with the practical problems of implementation.

While the institutions represented by the participants vary greatly in size, grade and academic levels, and structures, these distinctions did not interfere with workshop communication. As global education is so new, and as even the most experienced are just a few years ahead of the least experienced, questions of course design, teaching methods and materials, evaluation techniques, etc. were equally relevant to the secondary level, the undergraduate, and even the graduate levels. The basic problems of structure, too, are comparable, though their specific functioning in each institution differs.

It is exciting to be a part of the implementation process, to be moving from theory to practice, to be working with students rather than solely with concepts, to be doing rather than discussing what ought to be done. Problems indeed abound, and some are very difficult to handle, but they are problems of success-- more accurately, they are growing pains-- as American education focuses on interdependence,

The Institute is Incorporated under the New York State Education Law
by the Regents of the University of the State of New York

development, global systems, and transnational issues of greatest importance. Readers of this report will, hopefully, share in the excitement generated at Amherst, and are encouraged to contact any of the participants and enquire about their global studies programs, or contact MIND for information and assistance.

We should like to record our appreciation for the excellent cooperation and support given by the University of Massachusetts under the leadership of Drs. Stephen Guild, Joseph Marcus, and David Schimmel. The Lord Jeffrey Inn at Amherst provided warm hospitality, fine facilities, and quiet efficiency.

For the MIND staff,

Wilmer H. Kingsford
President

PARTICIPANTS

Post-Secondary Level

Dr. John Anderson
College of the Holy Cross
Worcester, Massachusetts

Mr. Laban Masimba
Clark University
Worcester, Massachusetts

Dr. David Conrad
University of Vermont
Burlington, Vermont

Dr. David Schimmel
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Stephen Guild
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Ms. Helen Seidler
School for International Training
Brattleboro, Vermont

Dr. Ezra Heitowit
Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

Dr. Frank A. Stone
University of Connecticut
Storrs, Connecticut

Dr. Mary Jacob
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, Massachusetts

Dr. Linda Swartz
College of the Atlantic
Bar Harbor, Maine

Dean Joseph Marcus
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Dr. Bahram Tavakolian
Mount Holyoke College
South Hadley, Massachusetts

Mr. George Young
School for International Training
Brattleboro, Vermont

Secondary Level

Mrs. Dorothy Dillon
Kent Place School
Summit, New Jersey

Mrs. Pamela Ramsden
Summit High School
Summit, New Jersey

Dr. John J. Kelley
Waverly Central Schools
Waverly, New York

Mr. John Rorke
Millbrook School
Millbrook, New York

Mrs. Betsey Moore
Montville High School
Montville, New Jersey

Mr. Walter Schaeffler
Oak Knoll School of the Holy Child
Summit, New Jersey

Resource Organizations

Dr. Edward F. Babbott
M.I.N.D.
New York, New York

Mrs. Heath Drury Boote
M.I.N.D.
Lynn, Massachusetts

Mr. Wilmer H. Kingsford
M.I.N.D.
New York, New York

Dr. Lewis W. Pike
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

Ms. J. Carlisle Spivey
M.I.N.D.
New York, New York,

Ms. Deborah L. Truhan
M.I.N.D.
New York, New York

Observers

Mr. Enno Becker
College of the Atlantic
Bar Harbor, Maine

Miss Sarah Bruder
Oak Knoll School of the
Holy Child
Summit, New Jersey

Mrs. Sally Conrad
Burlington, Vermont

Mrs. Anne H. Kelley
Waverly, New York

Ms. Linda Scott
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Massachusetts

Miss Carole Starr
Oak Knoll School of the
Holy Child
Summit, New Jersey

AGENDA

Co-Chairmen

Stephen Guild Edward Babbott

May 16th

Opening Session: Introductory remarks by the Co-Chairmen
 Self-introduction by each participant
 Panel Discussion: Global Studies on the College Level
 Discussion Leader: David Schimmel
 Discussants: Frank Stone
 Ezra Heitowit
 Stephen Guild

Group Discussions: A. Structures: Interdepartmental and administrative supports, student recruitment, program funding, faculty rewards
 Discussion Leader: Joseph Marcus
 B. Content: Curriculum development, methods of presentation, materials and bibliography, evaluation, student motivation
 Discussion Leader: David Conrad

Evening: Showing of the film "The Little Island" (an animation of the concepts of Truth, Beauty, and Goodness, and the effect on one single idea)
 Discussion Leader: Linda Scott

May 17th

Panel Discussion: Global Studies at the Secondary Level
 Discussion Leader: Walter Schaeffler
 Discussants: Pamela Ramsden
 Dorothy Dillon

Group Discussions: Continuation of focus on structures and content

Group Reports: General discussion

Closing Session: Round-table review of the workshop, and suggestions for future directions and further communication
 Final remarks by the Co-Chairmen

AMHERST WORKSHOP: DISCUSSION SUMMARY

The purpose of this workshop was to provide a meeting place for educators from both the secondary and post-secondary levels to share concerns, ideas, and techniques in the teaching of global studies. There was ample opportunity for significant dialogue during the two days, and although there were few definitive answers to come out of the meeting, many important questions were raised.

One of the most striking features which became evident almost immediately was the many different approaches to teaching global studies. The variety of course names for approximately the same orientation of subject matter illustrates this diversity: global development, global survival, world education, global interdependence, international development, international affairs. It was abundantly clear from the presentations made by both the college and secondary school presenters that there are numerous and varied paths to approach the teaching of global studies. These ways ranged at the post-secondary level from a full freshman year multi-disciplinary program; projects which offer courses, sponsor workshops, produce material, and/or maintain central resource files; addition of global approaches to existing departmental courses; to inclusion of specific short courses for those planning a career in international agencies. All the institutions were committed to helping students broaden their global horizons, but each had chosen methods appropriate to its specific needs and staff.

At the secondary level, the approaches varied from offering a trimester course to increase students' awareness, through semester courses, to a full year's course and to the reorganization of social studies 7-12 around a global development theme. As at the college level, the methods, materials, and teaching techniques varied tremendously, but there were strong threads which tied the secondary school efforts together. These schools had structured their courses to help students move away from reliance on their own national perspective to learn, both cognitively and affectively, about the interdependence of the world. At the same time, the courses aimed at helping students relate their growing knowledge of global interrelatedness to other courses and to everyday problems. The secondary school group also reported that they emphasized learning skills such as research techniques, paper writing, analysis of primary sources, library work, etc. A number of the participants emphasized that if other skills such as introductory geography, introductory economics, introductory statistics, and familiarity with chart and table interpretation were included at the secondary level, students would be more completely prepared for coping with global studies material, both at the secondary school and college levels. All of the institutions teaching global studies reported strong student and faculty interest and enthusiasm for this area of work.

Two key questions which were addressed either explicitly or implicitly

throughout the two days dealt with the goals of a global studies course and the issues, concepts, and problems which such a course should address. Four of the primary goals which were identified for a global studies course were:

- to attack ethnocentrism through the development of intercultural awareness, communications, and experience, and through an evaluation of American culture in relation to the rest of the world;
- to help students recognize that mastery of hard technical knowledge is essential to the field of development;
- to encourage students to be aware of and understand social change by giving them a deeper understanding of the complexities of development, political philosophies, and ecosystems, and by providing an understanding of the techniques of, and possibilities for, evolving greater social justice;
- to help students become involved in the world at a conscious level by actively working to better the human condition.

One of the key questions which was raised from this discussion was about the purpose of a course in global studies. Should the course be designed to affect students' life styles, or should it, rather, provide students with the ability to view global problems from more than one prospective? Both points of view were represented.

Five main issues, concepts, or problems were identified as being essential to include in global studies courses:

- interdependence of the nations of the world, emphasizing global problems which must be dealt with and the absolute need to deal with them in a global context;
- resource management: human resources (both in terms of population planning and migration of peoples, as well as the fair and equitable use of available labor), food production and distribution, mineral resource development and processing, and conservation of the environment;
- comparative economic and political systems, including "bridges" among these systems (MNC's, transnational organizations, etc.)
- the "shock" of the future which is almost upon us, and the study of how societies can adapt to these imminent changes;
- construction of models for aid, not just for developing nations, but for all societies, so that the resources and the talent of the world can be shared more equitably.

Administrative and structural problems, such as the appropriate educational level for global studies to be introduced into the educational

system, the appropriate administrative aegis for global studies, and the most effective procedures for implementing a global studies course all were discussed. It was agreed that global studies was a subject which could be understood by students at many different educational levels and that it was not a matter of when to present the subject, but how to present it that was important at each level.

The problems of fitting global studies into the post-secondary institutional structure were discussed at length. Should the program be independent, or should it be included within a university department? If within a department, which one? Where should the university support come from, and what reasons can be given for supporting a global studies program rather than new programs in other areas? What institutional support exists for global studies teachers in terms of professional recognition and advancement?

While specific solutions to these kinds of structural questions would necessarily vary with the individual institution, it was suggested that strong administrative backing is necessary to make a global studies program successful, and to attract this kind of administrative support, the program probably should be implemented on the basis of existing faculty. The "threat" existing disciplines feel from a new course which would compete for funds, personnel, or students, was pointed out. Strong multi-disciplinary faculty backing, therefore, was considered essential to insure the success of a new venture such as this. It was noted that if faculty backing came from senior rather than junior staff members, there would be a better chance for success.

Another persistent question was the evaluation of global studies courses, difficult because there is no academic discipline of global studies and because it is an area where students and teachers search together for understanding of complex and difficult problems. Most teachers give the normal kinds of tests, quizzes, and papers in order to evaluate student understanding and progress in the global studies course. But the puzzling task is to know whether the course has made a real difference in the students' perceptions and outlook. Some teachers have tried to gauge the effect of the course by watching carefully the students' academic decisions after completion of the course-- choice of college courses and majors, vocational decisions, extra-curricular involvement, "life style" decisions, etc. A number of participants, however, felt such subjective criteria were not valid for measuring the impact of a global studies course, and they urged development of evaluative designs which would yield more accurate data. There was a general feeling that the evaluation area as a whole is one which will take a great deal more thought and work before any concrete knowledge of the effectiveness of global studies courses can be judged.

Recommendations and Suggestions for Further Action

At the conclusion of the workshop, requests were made to develop plans which would permit continuation of the dialogue started at

Amherst, and a number of possible ways of remaining in touch were suggested:

- establish a consortium of the institutions interested in global studies to exchange information and to work for outside financial support through cooperative grant requests;
- develop some sort of formal communication network among the post-secondary institutions, among the secondary schools, and between these two levels. One aspect of this cooperative relationship could be an arrangement for colleges and universities to send global studies faculty (and students) to high school global studies classes and guidance departments to inform them of global studies courses available on their respective campuses;
- maintain contacts and momentum by organizing periodic workshops, such as the Amherst one, around topics or themes or material of mutual interest.

The overwhelming feeling at the end of the two days was one of shared enthusiasm for the need for global studies. The variety of courses being offered, the imagination with which they are being conceived, and the enthusiasm of those offering them attest to the vitality of this area. There are significant problems to overcome, as the summary of the discussions clearly shows, but there is a sense of commitment to share and solve these problems and to increase the availability of global studies in schools and colleges.

AMHERST INTERPRETATIONS

During the course of any gathering such as this, some ideas are discussed which, while quite familiar, are worth re-stating for emphasis. They serve, in a sense, the dual purpose of re-evaluation and verification. Other ideas appear for the first time, and as such, they offer the raw material of new thinking. Still others provide an interpretation of the meeting, and when picked out and spotlighted, they provide for future directions. The MIND staff, using rapporteur notes of plenary and group meetings, developed the following conference interpretations.

Student Guidance

The axis of concern at Amherst was on teaching, which necessarily involves attention to those who are taught. Five students from various institutions involved with global studies participated in the conference. Three areas related to student concerns were apparent:

- opportunities for continuing studies in global education;
- counselling as to institutional and course options;
- prerequisites for a beneficial experience in global education.

Concerning the first, at both school and college levels, students who have been exposed to global education, whether in a module, a semester, or a year want to further their exposure and understanding. They find, however, that the global education unit which they selected is the only course offered by their institution. They have no choice but to select one of the degree-granting disciplines, and try to specialize in some global studies area within it.

This, of course, can and probably will be done in a large number of instances. "Thinking globally," whether one's chosen specialization is in engineering, law, philosophy, accounting, or physics is one route to follow. But if students are primarily interested in the field of global studies, students who one day may be scholars in such studies (and we are beginning to see such potential), then the terminal units are inadequate. Schools and colleges will need to address the question of what one does with "awareness" after the global consciousness is successfully raised.

The second concern, counselling, relates to the first, but is specifically directed to the school-college linkage. While there are schools which offer global education and colleges which offer global education, there is too little knowledge by either institutional level of the other's mutuality of interest. School guidance and college placement counsellors need to become aware of each other's interest and programs in global education. College faculty members involved in global studies programs at their campuses can visit schools

offering complementary programs, and teachers at the latter should develop familiarity with college-level opportunities, establishing extensive and close working relationships. College-level students enrolled in global studies can be encouraged to visit school students with comparable interests, or serve as teaching assistants under appropriate institutional arrangements. Where possible, school students with particular interest and ability may be enrolled in nearby college-entry courses.

There exist multiple ways of building school-college bridges for those interested in pursuing global education. They require special attention, not only on the part of school placement and college admissions specialists, but from the professional educators at both levels as well.

The third student guidance matter is one which is becoming increasingly evident as experience is gained in the teaching of global education. For such a course to move ahead, certain learning skills are assumed. Too often these assumptions are shown to be invalid. Among the most frequently cited are geography (literally where countries are, as well as socio-geographic knowledge), economics, comparative economic and political systems, and a command of statistics. Without these learning tools in hand, it is extremely difficult to achieve a basic understanding of global issues, whether food, energy, trade, technology, population, culture, or conflict. Awareness about the importance of global issues is not too difficult to handle, but for awareness to translate into something educationally deeper than emotional concern, cognitive skills must be employed. Without such depth, students are apt to be left with a feeling of helplessness and hopelessness, overwhelmed by the dimensions of the issues.

Experienced global education teachers, especially at the school level, are pressuring those teaching at the younger levels to provide skills in geography, economics, politics, and statistics. College professionals are anxious to find that entering students are familiar with these same skills. Attention needs to be focused on closer identification of such prerequisites to global education, and ways by which they can be coordinated in and between schools and colleges.

Structural Supports

Formal education is a huge activity in this country, occupying the full time of a quarter of the nation's population. No human activity of this dimension just happens. To function, it rests within and is contained by institutional structures-- policy level, administrative, professional-- designed and intended to serve the purposes for which education is endorsed and supported by society. By and large, they meet their purposes.

All structures, by nature, are cautious instruments of governance, designed with objectives in mind and with orderly procedures to meet those objectives. When any new element appears that challenges either the objectives or the procedures, resistance can be expected in

fairly direct proportion to the degree of challenge. To succeed, the new element will have to confront institutional resistance and resolve it.

Global education is now at the point of experiencing intense institutional challenge. That it has progressed to the point of maximum resistance is in itself a sign of strength. Still, the resistance is present, the challenge is very real, and unless or until they are resolved, global education will suffer for lack of structural supports.

These supports are very familiar. They include budgets and financial viability, professionally recognized staff positions, promotions and other reward incentives, legitimacy of course credits and degrees, recognition of scholarly publication and research. Combined, these supports form the matrix of accepted educational attainment.

There are, of course, many ways to learn, other than through the formal educational structure. Much learning takes place outside of formal education, but even within "the system," groups sharing a mutual interest can form centers, institutes, projects, programs, etc. which are loosely affiliated with and recognized by an institution. Through such devices, many new educational ideas make their first appearances on campuses.

The benefits derived from this loosely structured form of semi-institutionalized effort are many. It offers opportunities for experimental teaching and use of subject matter, the testing of new materials, the attraction of multi-disciplinary interest, and a degree of freedom from the rigors of academic evaluation. It is not threatening to senior departments and disciplines, whose professionals may help the center along, or watch with curiosity, or simply ignore it.

Yet, handicaps also exist. Usually such centers remain outside the central budgetary support of the institutions and "soft money" in the form of gifts and grants from the broader society must be sought to make ends meet. Staffs are composed of professionals from recognized departments who devote part of their time to the center, if funds permit. Younger untenured professionals, however much the center interests them and however highly the center values their work, fear that diversion of their professional time from their department and discipline to the center's activities will impede their chances of promotion. Students may find experience at the center stimulating and fascinating, but so apart from the mainstream of degree requirements that their academic careers may be threatened. And, finally, in due course, the administration will require a critical evaluation of the center's work, to judge whether continued recognition is justified.

It is at this point that the work of the center must "grow up" academically, to take its place as a fully accredited, degree-granting discipline with the full range of structural supports. Otherwise, the chances are high that it will fade away.

Are global studies going to make it? Should global studies make it as a discipline, or simply seek to influence the senior disciplines through suggesting more global approaches to whatever subject is taught?

There exist many points of view, and there will not be one right answer for all institutions. The most telling argument that can be put forth in favor of full recognition, within at least some institutions, is the need for scholarship and scholarly leadership in global education. At present, few global experts or authorities exist, because the university structures have prevented potential scholars from pursuing their global studies through undergraduate and graduate degree levels. Such scholars are forced into other departments, such as political science, economics, history, sociology, the natural sciences, etc. They may emerge as very fine political scientists, economists, historians, sociologists, physicists, or chemists, and they may continue their general interest in global issues as these issues involve their disciplines, but they will not be global scholars.

Without a core of scholarly leadership, the entire pyramidal structure of education, down to school levels, is deprived of the research, publication, curriculum development, teaching methodologies and materials, and tested evaluation methods that support each discipline at progressive levels of attainment.

If no university fully legitimizes global studies, where are the global scholars to come from? These structural concerns require attention.

The Teaching Experience

The keystone to education is teaching. It is through teaching that knowledge is transferred. If society did not require the transferal of knowledge, there would be little need for systems of formal education. Children would simply grow up observing and absorbing the world around them, or at best, learning minimal quantitative and verbal skills, as is the case for vast numbers of the world's children.

Teaching, as we know it, is a relatively new societal experience. We tend to forget that in the last century, most children were not thought to need educational exposure much beyond the three R's. It is surprising, therefore, to find that so young a profession has become so highly structured, not just in institutional terms, but in terms of teaching as well. These structures are so familiar that they need only be mentioned: accredited subjects, required courses, sanctioned texts, licensed teachers, accepted examinations and grade scores, approved teacher-student ratios, qualifications for degree levels, etc.

Given these structures, what happens when a new concept comes along that claims itself worthy to be taught? First, teachers instinctively look for familiar structural supports and for the knowledge which they are expected to transmit. When they discover that this

new concept lacks these usual supports, many pull back to more familiar territory.

There are, however, some teachers so persuaded by the concepts involved in a new study area, and so convinced of the need for teaching these concepts, that they discover ways to bend the structural limitations and find, largely within themselves, the knowledge content. Such teachers consciously are assuming professional and career risks; the safer course by far would be to sit back and wait.

It is at this stage, once again, that global education finds itself-- within institutionally weak but individually very strong hands. Strong hands are good, but not good enough. Those who teach in global terms need resources, methods, scholarly knowledge, organized and validated processes, and a contextual framework which can withstand evaluation. On the one hand they have eager, demanding students, and on the other, restricting institutional pressures.

Thus the teaching experience of global education, whether at school or college, is exciting, pioneering, full of experimentation, full of doubts, and enormously frustrating. Each teacher must search for methods and materials, course design, and ways of judging performance. A large part of the search ends up with the teacher's own judgment. Such is the price of introducing something new to formal education.

Perhaps the singularly greatest weakness of this innovative teaching experiment is the lack of communication with other global education experimenters. Within formal education, this pattern of self-isolation exists horizontally between comparable education and grade levels, and vertically between schools and colleges. Geography poses some logistical problems, but even where comparable global teaching efforts are in proximity, the isolated pattern is likely to prevail. The communication lapse is acute, too, between formal educational institutions and the non-formal research and resource centers. Finally, international communication is a third level of cooperation that should be included as an element of teaching global studies, based on the supposition that other teachers in other lands have ideas to offer and experiences to share.

In innovative teaching, it is necessary to utilize to the fullest, all possible support mechanisms. The professional and institutional resistances are severe enough. The self-imposition of intellectual isolation cannot possibly assist the teacher to help the student.

Summary

This interpretive discussion of the Amherst Workshop has concentrated on three areas of concern. Each is roughly comparable in the progress being made in introducing global education to formal education. There are a growing number of students who select global studies where offered, are excited by such studies, and want to continue. A growing number of institutions are permitting experimental programs in global education and are watching these experiments for signs of

academic maturity. The number of teachers is also growing, becoming experienced, and beginning to build a core of expertness.

On the other hand, problems are clearly evident in many areas concerning student expectations, institutional cautiousness, and teaching frustrations. These are the principal agonies of change, and it remains to be seen whether global education is both valid enough and determined enough to survive the multiple trials.

Each dedicated section can help. The students can help by demanding more opportunities for continuing education in global studies and by selecting those courses and colleges which respond to their demands. Institutional decision-makers can lend the necessary structural supports in recognition of their responsibility to produce scholarly leadership in new knowledge areas. Teachers can help most of all by building a professional communications network that is mutually reinforcing.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

During the pre-workshop planning weeks, each participant was sent a questionnaire, part of which requested citation of the sorts of materials, curricula, literature and sources of information which were found to be most helpful in preparing for and introducing global education. In order to provide focus, under each heading only three references were requested; doubtless many more are used from time to time. These citations are included for the interest of readers of this report.

I. Sources of Information or Assistance at the National/Level

African American Institute
School Services Division
833 U. N. Plaza
New York, New York 10017
(212) 661-0800

American Association for the Advancement of Science
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 467-4400

Associated Schools Project of UNESCO
Room 2201
United Nations Building
New York, New York 10017
(212) 754-1234 ext. 2814

Center for War/Peace Studies
218 East 18th Street
New York, New York 10003
(212) 475-0850

Foreign Area Materials Center
The State Education Department
60 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 972-9877

Institute for World Order
1140 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
(212) 757-0055

Management Institute for National Development
230 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017
(212) 889-5847.

National Project on Ethnic America
165 East 56th Street
New York, New York 10022
(212) PL 1-4000

Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 234-8701

Transnational Institute
Institute for Policy Studies
1901 Q Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 234-9382

United Nations
New York, New York 10017
(212) 754-1234

II. Periodicals, Journals, and Newspapers

Africa Report
833 U.N. Plaza
New York, New York 10017

Development Forum
Center for Economic and Social Information (CESI)
United Nations
Palais des Nations
CH-1211 Geneva 10
Switzerland

Foreign Affairs
58 East 68th Street
New York, New York 10021

Foreign Policy Magazine
345 East 46th Street
New York, New York 10017

Intercom
218 East 18th Street
New York, New York 10003

Journal of Social History
TransAction Consortium
Box 3009
Rutgers University
New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903

00019

Newsweek
Subscriber Service
444 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022

New York Times
229 West 43rd Street
New York, New York 10036

Trend (Resource Section)
c/o Global Survival Program
University of Massachusetts
Amherst, Mass. 01002

III. Films and Games

Tilt
CRN Educational Films
1011 Camino del Mar
Del Mar, California 92014

The Little Island
McGraw-Hill Contemporary Films
Princeton Road
Hightstown, New Jersey 08520

BaFa BaFa
Simule 2
1150 Silverlado
La Jolla, California 92037

IV. Curricula

Focusing on Global Poverty and Development
Overseas Development Council
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Global Development Studies: A Model Curriculum
Management Institute for National Development
230 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10017

Learning Peace
Jane Addams Peace Association
1213 Race Street
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

V. Books

AAAS, Energy and the Future

Charles Beitz and T. Herman, Peace and War

00020

Lester Brown, World Without Borders

Leon Clark, World Population

Arthur Clarks, Profiles on the Future

Barry Commoner, The Closing Circle

Daedalus, The No-Growth Society

Rene Dubos, So Human an Animal

Paul Ehrlich, The Population Bomb

Abne Eisenbery and J. Ilardo, Argument, An Alternative to Violence

David English, Nuclear Energy: Its Physics and Its Social Challenge

Richard Falk, This Endangered Planet

E.M. Forster, A Passage to India

Addo Leopold, A Sand County Almanac

John McHale, World Facts and Trends

Meadows, et. al., The Limits to Growth

National Academy of Sciences, Resources and Man

William Rich, Smaller Families Through Social and Economic Progress

Dane Rudhyar, The Planeterization of Consciousness

Herbert York, Race to Oblivion: A Participants View of the Arms Race