

Modified by NJG 28 August 2015

Remodified in September 2015 in the light of comments by Hartwig and Sybille

Further amended by Norman Graves in view of 1970 article by Brouillette; March 2016

Additions by Rafael de Miguel Gonzales May 2016

**The Commission on Geographical Education of the  
International Geographical Union  
1952-2012**

**Norman Graves, Institute of Education, University College London**

**Joseph P. Stoltman, Western Michigan University**

**First Review August 14, 2015**

**Re-Review by Norman Graves 23/09/15**

**New review by Norman Graves 16/03/16 and 09/05/2016**

## **Introduction**

Organizations are living organisms, but their life emanates from the people who join together to foster the organization's functions, as well as the types of commitments and issues that stimulate the organization to remain viable and continue its work. That description fits the International Geographical Union (IGU) Commission on Geography Education (CGE) and the people who have participated in the programs fostered by the organization over the 60 year period from 1952 to 2012. Those years serve as the bookends for the story of the organization that is presented in the following pages. Little is known about the role of the group of individuals prior to 1952 when they proposed and established the Commission. They were active and must have communicated with the leadership of the IGU, since the formation of the Commission required initial discussion among individuals that eventually resulted in a proposal to formally establish a Commission. Neither of the authors were to become fully engaged in the Commission during the initial 20 years of its service to the IGU. However, the common memory of senior members of the Commission was expressed during symposia and conferences, and the authors were keen listeners. Much of the early history was verbally passed from senior participants in the Commission to newer and younger participants. The authors of this account have recorded that verbal history in these pages. When possible, we have found citations enabling us to confirm and validate the account of the Commission's first 60 years. However, the authors take full responsibility for the pre-1972 account of the Commission. The post 1972 period was validated by citing the archives of the Commission and receiving confirmation of trends and events in the organization from geography educators who were engaged in more recent times.

We set out to write an account of the history and activities of the Commission on Geographical Education of the International Geographical Union (CGE-IGU). The story of the Commission begins with the view that geography was a key scholarly component of international understanding. The basic position was that students who study geography in elementary and secondary school will have greater knowledge of the world and its peoples and, as a result, the international understanding that people display would improve. There would be improved relationships among the world's peoples. That was a

compelling argument for geography education following World War II and during the initial years of the Cold War.

The context for international understanding dates to the early part of the 20<sup>th</sup> century and World War I, but gained considerable momentum with the establishment of the United Nations in 1945. The concept has been invoked often within the educational community with different titles, being called international understanding, global understanding, and intercultural understanding at various times. The post World War II international understanding movement was nurtured in particular by geographical education, which was viewed as a natural bridge connecting people, the environment, and the international relations necessary for economic, social, and political progress among the world's peoples. There were expectations among international education experts that the study of geography would result in people developing a more positive and empathetic understanding of the world and its peoples.

There was an overarching belief among experts that geography education would develop a positive international worldview among learners. At the time, a positive worldview included knowledge about the physical environment, the diversity of cultural groups who inhabited those environments, Over the years, the details of research and writing about international understanding and an informed worldview became more defined, presented greater clarity, and reflected the dynamism of the discipline of geography. Geographers weave ideas from human and physical aspects of the discipline to describe and explain how the world works. Geography education enables people to develop a worldview that incorporates physical and human information, concepts, and skills. Geography Education enables students to critically analyze the world about them. International understanding is an essential product of the study of geography since understanding requires meaningful knowledge. The meaningful knowledge is necessary to make important decisions about the immediate and long human and environmental conditions on Earth.

Developing a worldview laced with generous amount of international understanding among young people **has** been one of the longest standing objectives of geography education. The IGU Commission on Geography Education was founded on the principle to enhance international understanding in a changing world. This paper will have a particular emphasis on the way geography educators have contributed to international understanding and have pursued it as one of the aims of the discipline in the context of education. It will also outline the way the Commission on Geographical Education (CGE) of the International Geographical Union (IGU) has evolved and developed ways to enhance international understanding and cooperation, with its focus on teaching, student learning, and research in geographical education.

We rest on the belief that the study of geography is about people and the environment. Geography strives to attain the right **balance** of society and habitat, both essential components for a dynamic and sustainable Earth. In that regard, international understanding is an essential component and expectation of geography education

### **International Understanding: A Foundational Commitment**

International understanding was an initial consideration relative to the founding and early activities by the Commission on Geographical Education of the IGU. The Czech educator, Jan Amos Comenius (born in 1592) is proclaimed to be the father of modern education, and he experienced the warfare that ravaged Europe during his lifetime. Those experiences led him to the belief that understanding of one another by different groups or nationalities of people was necessary in order to prevent conflicts. However, the work of the Commission on Geographical Education of the International Geographical Union does not extend back to the age of Comenius, and we need to begin the IGU story during the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century. It was the concept of international understanding that persisted and influenced the work of the IGU.

International understanding emerged as a goal for education after World War I (1914-1918). Among the discussions and planning that occurred in the 1920s, there arose an interest not only in disarmament, but also in the use of the human intellect to avoid future conflicts. Interestingly, the idea of international understanding was not championed by geographers in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. A more assertive group took up the themes of the League of Nations and began to promote the idea. The group was made up largely of educators, one of which was the World Federation of Education Associations, with its founder and first president, Augustus O. Thomas (Thomas, 1932). The journal, *Education*, featured the topic International Understanding through Geography as the January 1932 lead article. This is one of the earliest of the modern period references to geography and international understanding.

International understanding as an educational concept proved difficult to promote during the 1930s for economic, ethnic, and political reasons. Economically the great depression led to governments reducing public expenditure, including education; politically and ethnically, this was a long period in which nationalism and colonialism were promoted in direct violation of the principles being espoused by proponents of international understanding. The Nazi party in power in Germany from 1933 onwards, aggressively propagated the so-called racial superiority of the “Aryan Race”. In retrospect it was a challenging period that reflected both a lack of international understanding and gross violations of the rights of colonized people. World War II was, in part, the consequence of the tensions which existed during this period. The League of Nations, though founded to prevent future wars, lacked the means to enforce the peaceful solution of international disputes.

The United Nations was established in October 1945, with a view to remedying the defects of the League of Nations. One of its organs, The United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) was also established in 1945. Although the charter for the UN does not specifically use the term international understanding, the UNESCO constitution stated that the purpose the Organization was, in part, to:

Collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of peoples, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend

such international agreements as may be necessary to promote the free flow of ideas by word and image (UNESCO, 1945).

In 1946, the stated purpose of UNESCO was that of education for peace and security. By 1947 this description was replaced by education for international understanding. The inclusion in the UNESCO constitution of the need to develop mutual understanding between people from different nations did not go unnoticed. The project on “Tension Affecting International Understanding” in 1947 suggested that enquiries be made into:

a)“the ideas which the people of one nation hold concerning their own and other nations” and

b)“modern methods developed in education, political science, philosophy and psychology for changing attitudes, and into the social and political circumstances that favor the employment of particular techniques”

Initially international understanding was intended to indicate that the loyalty of an individual towards their own country should be supplemented by a consideration for the larger human community. Thus the concept of international understanding was to be developed to mean more than simply a good feeling between and among countries. It was also intended, in the 1947 statement, to encourage familiarity with the international institutions that maintain peace and extend respect for the different peoples of the world. For a brief time the term world citizenship was used in UNESCO publications, but it was short lived. Later, but also briefly, education for living in the world community was used. However it implied a highly idealistic approach to a world order. In 1954 the concept of education for international understanding and co-operation was proposed and it remained the UNESCO terminology that has considerable meaning and direct applications for geography education (Graves, Dunlop, & Torney-Purta, 1984).

As a result, research on topics such as the nature and distribution of national stereotypes, the presentation of stereotypes in the mass media, and methods for modifying stereotypes were undertaken. It seemed from these studies that the origin and development of national stereotypes in the minds of children would have implications for international understanding in later life. That was the premise for further research.

While direct evidence is lacking, it seems a bit more than coincidental that Jean Piaget, the eminent development psychologist and epistemologist, began researching the process that children experience as they pass from unconscious egocentricity to various forms of sociocentricity (Piaget & Weil, 1951). His interest began by observing first the concept of nationalism and the changes that occurred in attitudes towards those people similar and those who were different in national identity. It was a relatively short step from the study of nationalism to the study of international understanding. However, Piaget became more

directly concerned with the children's development of the concept of space, with their understanding of the ethnic group to which they belonged, with their ideas about foreign people, and stereotypical thinking. Each of those topics introduced relevance to any research context examining the role of international understanding as an educational goal (Stoltman, 1977). In hindsight, this was fertile ground for research in geography education, which psychologists, cognitive scientists, and educational theorists pursued through the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century (Carnie, 1972).

It is also interesting that Piaget's work, published in the highly regarded *International Social Science Bulletin*, received hardly any attention from geography teachers. Even today it is uncommon to find a reference to Piaget's research, which was one of the landmark studies in spatial thinking concerning spatial inclusion, association, and hierarchy as developmental concepts. The part of the research that applied to international understanding was in the component on nationalism. Piaget raised questions regarding the source and intensity of nationalistic attitudes and values and their effects when viewing people of other nationalities. The studies were clear invitations to future generations of researchers in geography education and the role of international understanding. Those invitations seldom receive attention in the research literature, and most often not from geography education.

### **The International Geographical Union (IGU)**

Geographers, mapmakers and others, including military strategists from a range of countries, found the need to exchange ideas during the 19<sup>th</sup> century, but it was not until 1871 that the first International Geographical Congress was held in Antwerp. Although the main themes of the Congress were concerned with substantive geographical research and scholarship, there was also an interest in geographical education which at that time was limited in scope and largely restricted to primary schools. It was pointed out, during the congress by a French geographer, **Richard Cortambert**, that no progress would occur in geographical education until a body of geography specialists were trained and sent to do their missionary work in secondary schools (Congrès, 1871). In the years which followed, more and more geography teachers began to be trained in universities and geography began to be established in secondary schools in Western Europe.

After World War I, the International Geographical Congresses were to have an official and permanent status with a president and a secretary and thus the International Geographical Union was officially founded in Brussels in 1922 (Kish, 1992). It became an organization where geographers from different parts of the world could exchange ideas and publish their research in the proceedings of the congresses. Since that time the IGU has held congresses every four years except during World War II.

At each congress there has consistently been a number of delegates who were interested in and wanted to consider, the problems of geographical education, usually with respect to primary and secondary education. These delegates eventually formed a Commission of the IGU, at first called the Commission on the Teaching of Geography, and more recently the Commission on Geographical Education. Commissions are composed of groups of

geographers from different countries, whose task is to work on particular problems during their careers, and to report back to the Executive Committee of the IGU. In the post- World War II period the Commission on Geography Education held symposia. Symposia were often held in a different location from the main congress in order to address different aspects of geography teaching and the challenges presented by different locations. For example in 1968 the main congress was held in New Delhi, but the Commission on the Teaching of Geography met in Madras (now Chennai). Although IGU Commissions are appointed for a specific period of time, the issues addressed in geographical education are ongoing. As a result, the Education Commission of IGU has functioned officially since 1952.

### **The Commission on Geographical Education and UNESCO**

Many of the participants in the early years of the IGU symposia on geographical education were lecturers in university departments of education and in training colleges whose prime function was that of preparing students to teach geography. In the post-World War II period, these lecturers were conscious of the need to educate pupils and students to be tolerant towards people of other ethnic groups and in particular towards those who until relatively recently had been enemies of their country. As a result of those empathetic views, UNESCO's focus on international understanding found willing allies among geography educators. UNESCO had published in 1949 *Some Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography* (UNESCO, 1949) since it was felt that geography was a subject in the school curriculum which lent itself to promoting international understanding. It had been drafted by Robert Ficheux a French geographer. In 1950, UNESCO organized their first seminar on the teaching of geography in Montreal. This seminar was chaired by Neville Scarfe (1908-1985), who at that time was Head of the Geography Department at the University of London Institute of Education. The result of this seminar was UNESCO's *A Handbook of Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography* (Unesco, 1951) mainly drafted by Neville Scarfe.

In a personal conversation with Stoltman (Stoltman, 1976a), Neville Scarfe reported his association with L. Dudley Stamp, a British geographer at the London School of Economics. Scarfe, a British geography teacher, became senior lecturer at the London Institute of Education in 1935. He was a professional acquaintance of Stamp's since the London geographers were, in Scarfe's words, a friendly and sociable group. Both were members of the Royal Geographical Society, which was a further reason for contact. It is likely that Stamp and Scarfe collaborated during the 1930s and 1940s when Stamp organized the school children of the United Kingdom to map the land use near their schools. Scarfe had a network of many geography teachers and students who participated in the mapping. Stamp and Scarfe both participated in the first post war IGU conference in Lisbon, Portugal in 1949, where geographical education and international cooperation were topics being addressed with considerable interest. It was during the Lisbon Congress that the IGU appointed a Committee on the Teaching of Geography under the chairmanship of Neville Scarfe. Scarfe's UNESCO and IGU linkages were important to his international work on the teaching of geography. Furthermore, the 1951 *Handbook of Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography* for UNESCO was underway. Finally, the

establishment of a formal IGU Commission on the Teaching of Geography put him at the center of a growing international interest in geography teaching. Neville Scarfe, who accepted a position as Dean of Education at the University of Manitoba in 1951 and **at** the University of British Columbia in 1956, was at the center of the early developments of the Commission on Geography Education.

Scarfe's 1951 publication on the teaching of geography was, in the eyes of UNESCO, very successful and had a very widespread and positive reception. In 1952, the 17<sup>th</sup> International Geographical Union Congress met in Washington, DC, where Scarfe reported on the work of the Committee. Pleased with the report, the IGU Executive approved that the Commission on the Teaching of Geography be established as a component of the Union. Neville Scarfe was appointed the first chairperson during the 17<sup>th</sup> IGU Congress **in Washington DC** (International Geographical Union, 1952). The 1949 conference in Lisbon had been the first international gathering of geographers after the 16<sup>th</sup> Congress in Amsterdam in 1938. However, it was **not** considered a congress, but rather a regional conference (Brouillette, 1970).

Commissions were appointed for periods of four years, in this case from 1952 to 1956. Commissions propose a programme of activities and **report** on progress at the following congress. Thus, at the Rio de Janeiro Congress in 1956, the work undertaken by Scarfe and the Commission was reported upon with success. In 1956 Benoît Brouillette (1904-1979), a French-Canadian Geographer **who had participated in the Montreal meeting,** was appointed chairperson of the Commission and tasked to continue the work begun by the Commission in indicating what the content and which methods of geography teaching should be developed. Brouillette was successful in obtaining funds from UNESCO with a view to undertaking research into the way in which the teaching of geography could be adapted to the mental and physical development of schoolchildren. With the collaboration of the Swiss psychologist, Emile Marmy, René Clozier wrote a report of the Commission's on this topic in 1958 published first in French in the Cahiers de Géographie de Québec (Clozier, 1958) and secondly in English in the Report of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography to the Stockholm IGU Congress (1960).

International Geographical Union Congresses were held in Rio de Janeiro in 1956, Stockholm in 1960, London in 1964, and in New Delhi in 1968. The activities of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography during those congresses has been spelled out in some detail in reports and **in discussions.** Other conferences and meetings were held worldwide but especially in the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America (Bangkok, 1962, Addis Ababa 1965, Accra 1967, Santiago de Chili 1967, Cairo 1968, Caracas 1969, Mexico 1970). These show the intense work Benoit Brouillette undertook to obtain a feedback from local geographers and to disseminate the work of the Commission and in particular, the Source Book once it had been published (Brouillette and Vila Valenti, 1971). However, the pursuit of primary documents and accounts of the activities of the committee remains to be completed to fill **in** early years of the history of the commission. It is clear that, **by 2012,** the Commission on Geography Education's **achievements were** the product of **earlier** enormous effort by Scarfe and Brouillette, but unfortunately **documentary evidence of the early years of the Commission is limited apart**

from an article written by Brouillette in 1970 (Brouillette, 1970). Joseph Stoltman spent considerable time with Neville Scarfe at the 1976 IGU Congress in Leningrad and Moscow, and gained some information in those discussions. However, by the mid 1980s when Stoltman began to pursue the evolution of the committee, both of the founders of the Commission were deceased. Neville Scarf died in 1985 and Brouillette in 1979. The lapse in the early years explains, in part, why from 1972 and thereafter, when both Norman Graves and Joseph Stoltman participated in the commission, the record is more complete.

### **The Commission in the 1960s: A Decade of Cooperation with UNESCO**

UNESCO's collaboration with geographers and especially with the IGU Commission provided an international focus on issues, such as international understanding among the world's school age children. UNESCO's Education Department was keen to progress further along the lines put forth in the 1951 *Handbook* so skillfully managed by Scarfe. Since UNESCO's prime purpose was to propagate international understanding, it preferred to work through international learned societies, rather than through governmental bodies such as ministries of education since the latter tended to emphasize national concerns.

In late 1960, the Commission on the Teaching of Geography of the IGU obtained a contract from UNESCO to draft a *Source Book for Geography Teaching*. It was a perfect scenario for geographic education. First, geography was widely taught in elementary and secondary schools across the world. Second, geography education was politically less controversial than was history, where historical interpretation differed within countries as well as between countries. Thirdly, international understanding was viewed as a topic that the geography curriculum could address, by emphasizing the attitudes and values underlying international understanding.

By 1960 Benoît Brouillette, who taught at the École des Hautes Études Commerciales in Montreal, had been re-appointed chairperson of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography. Since the IGU used both English and French as its working languages it was fortunate that he was bilingual. He gathered a group of geographers from different countries and these met in Paris in December 1960 to outline the structure of the Source Book. By 1961 a first draft of the book was written and sent to geography and education experts in many countries for their comments. Brouillette undertook a globe trotting journey to gather the responses to the first draft of the sourcebook from geographers and educationists in Asia. After modifications by the authors, the English version of the source book was eventually published in 1965.

In the foreword to the *Source Book* (UNESCO, 1965) Brouillette stated that "improvements in teaching geography for better international understanding" were needed. The larger international understanding goals of UNESCO were assisted by geographical education. The *Source Book* was a timely opportunity to both reflect on teaching as well as develop means for teachers to build international understanding among their students. In designing the *Source Book* and its contents, those possibilities

were discussed by the editors and chapter authors. One option was to prepare a book that would show how geography helps to improve relations among people; the second option was to prepare a book that would give practical advice on improving teaching methods. The second option was chosen since it was felt by the authors that improvements in the efficacy of geography teaching was much needed. Thus, the *Source Book* was to serve as a handbook for teachers which, though it incorporated international understanding, was geared to giving advice which had immediate application to teachers of geography, especially in developing regions of the world. The Source Book met with great success internationally.

When the next scheduled IGU Congress was held in London in 1964, the *Source Book* was well on its way to being printed and reference to it was made during the Commission on the Teaching of Geography's symposium, which was held in Goldsmith's College in south-east London. A Korean national, Ryon Kwan Kim (1922-2015), represented UNESCO as a staff member at the symposium. His appointment was with the UNESCO Education Department. Kim completed his undergraduate studies at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo, Michigan. He was a proponent of geography teaching and had become internationalized in his movements from Korea to the U.S. and then to France. Kim was instrumental in keeping geography and the Commission engaged in several UNESCO projects over the next two decades.

Geographers working in education were also extending their attention to geography for the general public as informal education. Informal education included museums, parks, media, and non-academic books for readers interested in discovering geography through reading. During the 1964 London Congress, the Commission was introduced to the work of Henriette Verduin-Muller, a Netherlands geographer, who was researching the design of curriculum materials for geographical education as they pertained to the general public. The Institute for Geographic Information at the University of Utrecht became a center for informing governments, publishers, writers, broadcasters, film-makers, and tourists about the geography of the Netherlands.

### **The UNESCO *Source Book for Geography Teaching***

The *Source Book* (UNESCO, 1965) was authored by a team which took into account the comments made by those who had read the first draft during and following the IGU Congress in London in 1964. The modified text was eventually sent to Longmans, Green & Co which undertook to publish the book on behalf of UNESCO. The book was eventually published in 1965, five years after its initial conception. A first chapter written by two Belgian geographers, J-A Sporck and O Tulippe outlined the importance and educational value of geography. This was followed by a French university geographer, Philippe Pinchemel, who described the nature and spirit of modern geography. For Pinchemel, geography could be seen:

- 1) as a synthetic description of various parts of the world which he illustrated with descriptions of Japan and Peru

- 2) as a study of the spatial relations of phenomena, illustrated by world rainfall distribution and by the distribution of the rural population in the Congo Basin
- 3) as the science of land use, illustrated by the case of the town of Fez in Morocco.

The major part of the book consisted of two chapters written by Norman Graves who had at that time, recently completed ten years of teaching geography in three London secondary schools, and had in 1963 been appointed head of the geography department at the University of London Institute of Education. The first of the two chapters was concerned with the organization of field-work, or direct observation by pupils, and the second with classroom lessons or observation from secondary sources. These chapters were essentially giving teachers practical advice as to how to undertake their work and were illustrated by case studies of particular fieldwork or classroom lessons, which had actually been given in secondary schools. Although the first chapter contained a section on "Geography and the child's mental development" it has to be admitted that in the 1960s the amount of research undertaken in this area with respect to geography was very limited.

The fourth chapter written by André Hanaire, a teacher who taught geography in a Lille secondary school in France, was concerned with outlining the various teaching aids available to teachers. This was followed by a chapter authored by Tom Brown, a member of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography and headteacher of an English school, who wrote about the organization of a geography room. Philippe Pinchemel then suggested ways of organizing a geography syllabus. While the chapter on organizing a syllabus seems antiquated in hindsight, one needs to realize that Pinchemel's proposals preceded the explosion of research on curriculum processes and curriculum theory which was developing in the United States and elsewhere (Biddle & Shortle, 1969; Graves, 1979; Tyler, 1949).

### **The Commission and the Sequel to the UNESCO Source Book**

As the copyright of the *Source Book* was held by UNESCO, there were no financial problems about the book being translated into other languages. Moreover, since the aim was to develop the teaching of geography on a worldwide basis, UNESCO encouraged other language versions to be published. Given the very practical nature of the advice contained in the *Source Book*, it proved popular and eleven other language versions (Arabic, French, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Polish, Portuguese, Slovenian, Spanish and Thai) were published in the years following the publication of the English version in 1965. Thus, the work of the IGU Commission on the Teaching of Geography became well known in education ministries in many countries, including many who were designated as developing countries. In 1965 the Commission was asked by UNESCO to organize a meeting in Addis Ababa with a view to producing a source book that addressed African educational issues. Geography was widely taught in Africa, so there was high demand for a source book custom made for the continent.

Geoffrey Last (1924-2011) who was then working as a curriculum specialist in the Ethiopian Ministry of Education undertook the organization of the conference at which

specialist geographers and educationists from many African countries attended. Apart from Benoit Brouillette, two authors of the 1965 *Source Book* also attended. They were Norman Graves and Tom Brown. A structure for the source book on teaching geography in Africa was designed during the meeting and subsequently authors were commissioned. In 1974, *African Geography for Schools: a Handbook for Teachers* was published (Brouillette, Graves, & Last, 1974). The dates between conceiving a project and its completion with a published product was widely variable with UNESCO. The organizations provided entry to many countries through the educational and scientific programmes on the one hand. On the other hand, project participants became weary with the long delays and, in some cases, the cancellation of projects.

There followed a further series of regional meetings in which the Commission was involved, and financed with the help of UNESCO and national support from ministries of education. The first of these was held in Accra in 1967 which, with guidance from Geoffrey Last, further developed the didactics of geographical education in the African context (Unesco, 1968). This was followed by a meeting held in Santiago de Chili in which geographers from Latin America discussed the needs of schools in the continent to further develop the teaching of geography. In particular the participants asked that a sourcebook angled to Latin America should be produced. Hence the setting up of a working party in Caracas as indicated below. The next meeting was held in Cairo in January 1969. This meeting was specifically concerned with the teaching of geography in those countries where Arabic was the lingua franca. In order to ensure continuity and to profit from the experience of previous activities, Norman Graves and Geoffrey Last were invited to participate in the meetings. The local organizer was Dr Ibrahim Rizkana. As in prior meetings in Africa, simultaneous translation was available. A report on the conclusions of the meeting was produced (UNESCO, 1969).

Benoît Brouillette did not attend the Cairo meeting as he was in the process of preparing the next regional meeting which was held in Caracas in February 1969. He was assisted by Dr J Vila Valenti (1925- ), professor of geography at the University of Barcelona and secretary of the Commission. There was a planning committee comprised of geographers from Latin America. Again the aim was to prepare the production of a sourcebook for the geography of Latin America. The sourcebook was completed and published in 1976 (UNESCO/Teide, 1976). Upon its completion, Mr. Kim arranged for UNESCO to fund a project to translate the Latin American Source Book to English and publish it for a larger market. The source book was translated by a United States geographer, Larry Patrick, who was a faculty member at the University of Texas, Austin, and fluent in Spanish. However, UNESCO decided not to publish the translated manuscript. It was never published in English or any language other than Spanish. It represented the third UNESCO sourcebook prepared by the Commission on the Teaching of Geography. This book had a big influence in developing the teaching of geography in primary and secondary schools and its importance in national curricula in Iberian and Latin American countries in the decades that followed its publication (De Miguel et al. 2016)

When the next IGU Congress was held in Delhi in 1968, the 1965 *Source Book* was evident as a world-wide publication to which reference was made in the Commission's

symposium in Madras (now Chennai). Published in many languages, it was reaching a global audience of geography teachers. Following the Delhi congress, the Commission which had been appointed in 1964 to continue four years, was re-appointed by the Executive Committee of the IGU. Normally, commission chairpersons could not be nominated for longer than eight years. This was a wise policy and prevented commission from being dominated by strong personalities who might channel the commission's work along his or her preferred lines. Thus in 1968, the Executive Committee appointed an Italian, Ferdinando Gribaudi (1902-1971), as chairperson of the Commission, and Benoît Brouillette remained as its secretary. New blood was appointed in that Norman Graves, one of the authors of the *Source Book* became a full member as well as Ms Irrawady, principal of St Mary's University College in Madras, who was the local organizer of the Madras symposium. She had been a student of L. Dudley Stamp, the British geographer who had launched the Land Utilization Survey of the United Kingdom. Dudley Stamp had had a role in encouraging Neville Scarfe to initiate the discussions regarding founding of the initial Committee on the Teaching of Geography of the IGU.

### **International Understanding: The Founding Principle**

Whilst the work of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography was proceeding with increasingly direct attention to teaching in the geography classroom, psychologists were developing their knowledge of children's concept of homeland, nationalism, and their views of other countries and peoples. Those topics had become the focus of international understanding in the 1950s and 60s. The studies were on the very threshold of international understanding within the UNESCO context. One researcher in particular was Gustav Jahoda, a United Kingdom psychologist based in the University of Strathclyde in Glasgow (G. Jahoda, 1963; G. Jahoda, 1964). He replicated Piaget's research from Switzerland and reported similar results in a different national context.

Jahoda had validated Piaget's earlier study with a culturally different group of students. While psychologists were very interested in the spatial perspectives and international understanding of students, geography educators were only marginally engaged in similar studies. Geography educators were focused on the practical problems of teaching the content and less immediately concerned with their pupils' views on peoples of other nationalities. If geography educators had become more engaged with the latter topics in the 1950s and 1960s, then they would have been on a research tradition that would have laid the groundwork for the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. It is likely that a research tradition closely linked to psychology with the rigors of psychological research controls would have become the standard for geographic education research. That did not happen.

Another strikingly geographic study entitled *Children's Views of Foreign Peoples* (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967) provided evidence of the significance for geography education, but it too was completed by non-geographers. The International Union of Psychological Sciences (similar to the IGU) requested their behavioral sciences division to complete the study and UNESCO and the Research Institute for the Study of Man supported the project. The study provided considerable insights into the origin of stereotyping and its influences on the attitudes of children towards other countries and

their peoples. As a community, geographers paid little heed to the results of the research that involved 3000 children in eleven countries and ethnic regions (for example, French Canada, Bantu South Africa). The opportunity for addressing international understanding was gradually moving to content and research in subject other than geography education.

### **The Commission in the 1970s**

The new Chairperson of the Commission, Ferdinando Gribaudi organized a meeting of the Commission in Rome in June 1970, to discuss its future activities. It was a well-attended and well-organized meeting at which fruitful discussions took place. Unfortunately, six months later, in January 1971, Ferdinando Gribaudi died without the opportunity to follow through on his initiatives. The Executive Committee of the IGU prevailed upon Benoît Brouillette to act as interim chairperson, pending the appointment of a new chairperson at the 1972 Congress. It proved difficult, however, given Gribaudi's death, to maintain the momentum necessary to maintain a high profile within the IGU. New leadership was necessary for the continued successes of the Commission. **Norman Graves, of the London Institute of Education, was appointed Chair of the Commission in 1972.**

### **The 1972 Symposium in Quebec City and Congress in Montreal, Canada**

When the IGU Congress met in Canada in 1972, the Commission on Geographical Education held its Symposium at Laval University in Quebec City. There were papers that addressed international understanding in peripheral ways. The paper by Joseph Stoltman had an international understanding component that reported the development process that many children exhibit as they grasp the concept of territorial inclusion. For example, when does a child conceptualize that a state or province unit of territory is also part of a country's territory. His research reported on the results of a replication study of Piaget's spatial stages and views of homeland and nationality. What Stoltman reported and found surprising in 1972, was that geographical educators were not familiar with **nor** recognized the potentials of the studies being completed by psychologists and others were completing at the time. *Children's View of Foreign Peoples* (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967) with its richly reported data had numerous results that could be applied to the teaching of geography for international understanding. However, there was little crossover between the work of the researchers in psychology and those in geography education.

Although it is true that the papers at the Symposium in Quebec made little reference to international understanding, a chapter by John Carnie (1972) in Norman Graves' edited book *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of Geography*, did make direct reference to children's attitudes to other nationalities. This was in pursuance of other research carried out by R C Honeybone (1913-2002) (Norman Graves' predecessor at the Institute of Education) on ways to improve children's attitudes towards foreign peoples. In a small scale experimental research Honeybone argued that attitudes to foreign peoples improved if teachers stressed the similarities between human beings rather than their differences.

When the Executive Committee of the IGU met in Montreal, Norman Graves was confirmed as chair of the Commission on Geographical Education. Joseph Stoltman became a close collaborator on the activities and future planning for the Commission.

The main Congress of the IGU was held in Montreal in 1972. It was the initial Congress attendance for both Frances Slater and Joseph Stoltman. In his final comments on the 1972 Congress, Stoltman noted that presenters did not discuss, and may not have been aware of progress on a major initiative that was taking form at UNESCO. Norman Graves and Joseph Stoltman agreed that in keeping with the founding ideas underpinning the Commission, the UNESCO developments may produce opportunities for the Commission to develop its work. One such development was a recommendation to the 1974 UNESCO General Conference to adopt the proposal concerning Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms. The 1974 document (UNESCO, 1974) affirmed that the following objectives should be regarded as major guiding principles of educational policy. The document went specified that education should strive for:

- (a) an international dimension and a global perspective at all levels and in all its forms;
- (b) an understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations;
- (c) an awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations;
- (d) abilities to communicate with others,
- (e) an awareness not only of the rights but also of the duties incumbent upon individuals, social groups and nations towards each other;
- (f) an understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and co-operation;
- (g) a readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving the problems of his community, his country and the world at large.

The UNESCO blue print for education, for all practical purposes, encompassed much that could be applied to the teaching of geography. The 1974 document recommended additional steps be taken by the members of UNESCO who representatives of various countries. Those recommendations broadened considerably the interpretation of the emerging policy.

Each Member State should formulate and apply national policies aimed at increasing the efficacy of education in all its forms and strengthening its contribution to international understanding and co-operation, to the maintenance and development of a just peace, to the establishment of social justice, to respect for and application of human rights and fundamental freedoms, and to the eradication of the prejudices, misconceptions, inequalities and all forms of injustice which hinder the achievement of these aims.

In particular the following were cited specifically or within the text of the recommendations:

- a. Ethical and civic aspects
- b. Cultural aspects
- c. Study of the major problems of mankind
- d. Interdisciplinary, problem-oriented content adapted to the complexity of the issues
- e. International educational activity is granted special attention and resources

The 1974 UNESCO recommendation broadened the concept of international understanding to include international education. The redefining of international education in broader terms was consistent with geography as a discipline, but it also provided an opportunity for the social studies curriculum not previously mentioned, to gain traction as within the UNESCO educational mission. The 1974 definition for international understanding made explicit the new focus that was developing at UNESCO.

The terms international understanding, co-operation and peace are to be considered as an indivisible whole based on the principle of friendly relations between peoples and states having different social and political systems and on the respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. In the text of this recommendation, the different connotations of these terms are sometimes gathered together in a concise expression, "international education."

The increasing attention by UNESCO to international education was also spreading to the United States and became a focus of the United States Office of Education. The third in the series of notable studies was completed as part of that globalization of interest. The research temporally followed Jahoda and Lambert and Klineberg, and was published in 1979. Entitled *Other Nations Other Peoples*, the research examined the responses of 10, 14, and 18 year old students to the world, its peoples, and common issues in the United States (Pike, Barrows, Mahoney, & Jungeblut, 1979). The major shortcoming of this well designed research was that it did not extend to students in other countries or regions of the world. The design, data collection process, and reporting of the research, met a high standard. The research did complement the new international education focus of UNESCO, and provided research stimulus to international education in the U.S. Department of Education. The result was a greater effort by the U.S. in its international education endeavors, especially at the collegiate level. The conceptual proximity to the research completed by the three notable studies to the original plan for an IGU Commission on Teaching Geography was not inconsequential. The Commission **needed** to build a close link to UNESCO if it were to be international in its focus.

### **The Continuing Collaboration between UNESCO and the IGU Commission**

Soon after the 1972 IGU Congress in Montreal, the Commission was asked by UNESCO to organize a regional meeting on the teaching of geography for international understanding in Singapore. Ryon Kwan Kim, the education officer at UNESCO headquarters in Paris who worked closely with the Commission reported that it was the

intent of UNESCO to organize conferences in several regions to promote the teaching of geography in keeping with the organizations educational mission. He cited the success of prior international conferences organized by the Commission and the intention to support future geography focused activities. In his introductory comments at the Singapore conference , he reflected on past and future cooperation by UNESCO

“in close collaboration with the Commission on Geographical Education of the International Geographical Union, of a series of regional meetings of expert geographers (Addis Ababa 1965, Accra 1967, Madras 1968, Cairo 1969, Caracas 1969, Yaoundé 1970, Mexico City 1970, Singapore 1972, Sydney, 1973). During those meetings recent developments in the teaching of geography were reviewed and discussed in relation to the special requirements and objectives of school geography in Africa, Latin America, and Asia” ( Kim, 1973).

The conference in Singapore was to involve the countries of Austral-Asia: Australia, Burma, India, Iran , Japan, Korea, Malaysia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Singapore, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Viet-Nam who sent delegates to the meeting. Norman Graves was in overall charge of the proceedings in collaboration with Kim. Local organization was provided by the Geography Department of the National University of Singapore presided over by Ooi Jin Bee. The meeting took place in September 1972 and produced a report with recommendations which was sent to UNESCO ( Kim, 1972).

UNESCO continued to finance regional meetings of geographers with a view to developing the teaching of geography for international understanding. Following the Singapore meeting in 1972, September 1973 saw the setting up of a conference for Australasia in Sydney, New South Wales sponsored by the Commission on Geographical Education. The local organizer was Dr John Emery of Sydney Teachers' College. This was a very productive meeting whose participants contributed to a publication concerning the teaching of population problems, international understanding and environmental education, which proved useful to teachers (Graves, 1975).

In 1974 a further meeting was held in New Delhi to cover the teaching of geography in South Asia. Thus delegates came from India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal, Iran, Burma and Thailand. Although it had been the intention to produce teaching materials along the same lines as those produced at the Sydney conference. However, in practice it proved difficult to gather the necessary information from the participants. The conference did provide some useful contacts South Asian geographers who proved helpful in other ways.

### **The 1974 Regional IGU Conference in New Zealand**

The IGU held its Regional Conference in Palmerston North, New Zealand in December of 1974. Don Biddle and Joseph Stoltman represented the Commission at the conference. A series of papers addressed geography education issues in the Australia-New Zealand-Oceania region. The island territories, prior to independence, were represented quite well at the conference due to the efforts of the New Zealand organizers to provide funding for their participation. A young, inspiring geography educator from Hong Kong, David

Shortle, gave an exceptionally fine presentation on the conceptual basis for geography in learning. Geography education was strong in New Zealand and Ian Young, Colin Knight, and John Maculley represented the discipline through papers, discussion, and hosting post-conference visits by colleagues to Wellington, Christchurch and the South Island.

In New Zealand the benefits of the UNESCO Source Book were agreed upon. However, the *UNESCO Source Book for Geography Teaching* was approaching 10 years old and much had happened in geography and in education to render it out of date. Most of the chapters had been composed several years prior to its publication in 1965, so Norman Graves suggested to UNESCO that the Source Book should be either revised or an entirely new book produced. It was agreed by UNESCO that the Commission on Geographical Education of the IGU should undertake the task of producing a new book. A proposal to do so was submitted to UNESCO and there started the process of approval at various levels of UNESCO with the help of Ryon Kwan Kim.

### **The 1976 Commission Symposium and IGU Congress in the Soviet Union**

In 1976 the IGU Congress was held in Moscow in what was then the USSR. The Commission symposium was held in Leningrad, now St Petersburg, prior to the main congress. It was organized locally by Prof Oleg Konstantinov, of the Herzen Pedagogical Institute. It was at the symposium that Joseph Stoltman presented his edited volume *International Research in Geographical Education*, (Joseph P. Stoltman, 1976b), which signaled the necessary focus for international research contribution via the IGU. While research was regularly reported at the regional conferences and at IGU Congresses in the Commission on Geography Education Symposia, there had been no coordinated efforts to carry out the same research in several countries. The model used by Stoltman in organizing the edited volume was the Lambert and Kleinberg research (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967), but without the financial support necessary to follow comparable research design. In preparation for the symposium and Congress sessions, the abstracts for each research article were prepared in English, French, and Russian, a forerunner to implement the practice. The Soviet Government embargoed the books, and they were not distributed to IGU participants in either the Symposium or the Congress. However, they were eventually released after the Congress ended and Professor Vladimir Maksakovsky (1924-2015), of Moscow State University, took possession, and used the books in his research seminars at the university. Stoltman and Maksakovsky remained dear friends until the latter's death in 2015.

Although at that time the Government of the USSR was still firmly in the hands of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, there was a vague feeling that a loosening of the control over the press and media was beginning. Perhaps an indication of this was the fact that Norman Graves' edited book *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of Geography* had been translated into Russian and published in Moscow. Indeed by the time the next congress was held in Tokyo in 1980, Vladimir Maksakovsky, who had been appointed to the Commission in 1976, seemed more at ease in discussions. He was even more at ease during the 1988 Congress in Australia, when he would talk openly of perestroika and glasnost. Those were the new international understanding terms of

reference that Maksakovsky openly discussed at commission activities. The Commission represented an opportunity for Maksakovsky to interact with colleagues in other parts of the world, thus extending his vast knowledge of the economic geography of the USSR and its importance in the teaching of geography in every country.

The Commission on Geographical Education was renewed at the 1976 Congress for the term next four-year term with seven members. Norman Graves continued as chairperson, and other members included Paul Claval of France, Robert Geipel of the German Federal Republic, Vladimir Pavlovich Maksakovsky of the USSR, Joseph Paul Stoltman of the USA and Juan Vila-Valenti of Spain.

Following the 1976 IGU Congress, the members of the Commission suggested chapter authors for the new Source Book that had been proposed to UNESCO. A strong field of potential authors with known expertise in the various areas of geography curriculum, research, teaching methodology, and evaluation were selected. These authors were then commissioned to undertake writing various chapters. They were drawn from a variety of countries: Philippe Pinchemel from France, reviewed the aims of geographical education; Michael Naish from the United Kingdom reviewed the relationships between mental development in children and the learning process in geography; Benoit Robert from Quebec in Canada examined teaching strategies; Clyde Kohn from the USA wrote about problem solving in geography; Olatunde Okunrotifa from Nigeria prepared the chapter on gathering and processing of information; Frances Slater from New Zealand (later she immigrated to the UK) and Brian Spicer from Australia provided methods for analyzing maps and photographs; Chandra Pahl Singh from India wrote about the management of educational resources within a school environment; Donald Biddle from Australia authored the chapter on course planning and Norman Graves penned the chapter devoted to evaluation of geographical education.

The preliminary draft was sent to 100 specialists throughout the world and the comments received were considered by a meeting of most authors in Aix en Provence in August 1977 followed by an editorial meeting held in Ibiza, Spain in September 1977. Juan Vila-Valenti hosted this meeting at a seaside hotel. Some of the authors from Europe attended and Joseph Stoltman, who was visiting professor at the University of London Institute of Education in 1977-78 served an editorial assistant and rapporteur during the meeting. At the conclusion of the editorial meeting, Norman Graves returned to the London Institute of Education and during the next six months, with the assistance of Joseph Stoltman, completed the final editorial work on the Source Book. When the next IGU Congress was held in Tokyo in 1980, the work on the new Source Book was editorially completed and the typescript was delivered to UNESCO in Paris. It was in Paris that the second stage of the manuscript preparation began, with the design and style format, referencing, and the inclusion of graphics including maps and photos. The Source Book was published seven years after its inception (Graves, 1982).

The Commission was also involved in other activities. One of the problems facing European geography teachers was the development of curricula for the 16 to 19 age group. The British Sub-Committee of the Commission, the only national organization

representing the Commission, organized a conference in London in 1978 on the theme of students studying geography in the secondary school and Sixth Form Colleges. Sixth Form is generic to the England and Wales and included the final **two years** of secondary school compared to the United States. The academic rigor of the Sixth Form made it possible of universities in the England and Wales at the time to graduate students in three years, rather than four. The Sub-Committee meeting put geography in the UK on the cutting edge for rigorous, engaging geography in the high school, and often employing field studies. The results of the conference was a publication which outlined the ways in which this problem was tackled, often through the setting up of curriculum development projects (Graves, 1979). The book became an international guide for other countries, especially those of the British Commonwealth, in restructuring the upper secondary school experience for students through the study of geography.

### **The 1978 IGU Regional Conference in Nigeria**

The Commission on Geography Education met in Ibadan, Nigeria in 1978, with its symposium held prior to the Regional Conference of the IGU in Lagos. Professor Olatunde (Peter) Okunrotifa was the local host for the symposium on the campus of the University of Ibadan. An informative program of papers involving many African colleagues was presented. A young African academic, Julie Okpala from Nigeria, joined the discussions and became a regular participant in commission activities over the next decade. Nigeria held promise to become a national research orientation in geography education on the African continent. Considerable potential was evident from the Nigerian scholars who participated in the regional conference. However, Okunrotifa was in a state of failing health and died in 1982. At the time of the regional conference in 1978, the University of Ibadan **had** a dynamic geography program with a rich academic focus and the conference participants experienced the vibrancy of the place.

### **The Commission in the 1980s and the Congress in Japan**

The 1980 Commission on Geographical Education held its symposium in Tsukuba with the help of Professor Yasuo Masai an English speaking Japanese professor who had participated in the UNESCO meeting in Singapore in 1972. He did much on the personal level to promote international understanding among geographers present at the meeting. This was particularly important given the fraught history of relations between Japan and the Western Allies during World War II.

The second of the Commission's international research project that engaged scholars from several countries in addressing the same research question was presented. The first had been the 1976 research publication (Stoltman, 1976b). The 1980 research report presented at the Symposium was entitled: *Perception and Preference Studies at the International Level* (Slater and Spicer; 1980). In essence, it was a coordinated research on the perceptions and preferences of 15 year old students for the countries they would most like to live in or to holiday. It was carried out in 11 different countries, Australia, Brazil, Canada, England, Germany, Jamaica, New Zealand, Nigeria, Singapore, South Africa

and the United States of America. Apart from the tendency for most students to prefer their own country as a place to live, there were also strong preferences internationally for the USA, Canada, Australia and France, whilst least preferred countries tended to be the then USSR, India and South Africa. Vacation preferences were strong for the USA, Switzerland, and France.

However, the research by Slater and Spencer was completed with a small budget and was not able to delve into further questions that emerged. For example, it seemed that images and stereotypes which are displayed in the mass media may have some impact on the preferences. Did mass media promote or discourage young people to develop views prior to educational experiences that were intended to reduce stereotyping? And, what was the role of growing nationalism on the views of others? The IGU Commission sponsored research nicely complemented the research on views of other people being completed in the United States at the same time, but with out any direct contact (Pike, et al., 1979).

A second research project presented to the symposium in Japan in 1980 was the *Place Vocabulary Research Project* (Saveland, 1980). This was one of the projects discussed in Moscow in 1976 and was initiated, directed and brought to fruition by Robert Saveland of the University of Georgia in the USA. Essentially, the research was designed to determine how familiar 13 year old students from a wide range of nations, were with the names and locations of oceans and seas, countries and cities. They were presented with a world map on which these features were numbered and asked to align the numbers with the appropriate name. The results showed a wide variation between pupils from different countries, from a mean score of 13.7 to one of 33.5 out of a possible total of 50. Whilst the interpretation of the results may not be easy, Saveland argued that the downplaying of the role of memory in education may be responsible for the place name knowledge of students. Pedagogically, he argued that place names are not terms to be memorized, but to be learned in context of place and information about a place that resonates with the student's use of the name. Saveland argued that place names are to geography as the alphabet is to reading or the numerical system is to mathematics. They represent the basic knowledge for developing a perspective on the world.

Norman Graves had completed eight years as chairperson of the Commission by 1980, which was the statutory limit set by the IGU. At the Tokyo Congress the Executive Board of the IGU elected Joseph Stoltman as chair of the Commission. He had been a major collaborator in the Commission and had served as a commission member since 1976.

### **Collaboration with UNESCO in the 1980s**

The 1980s witnessed continued collaboration with UNESCO. The Commission was requested to undertake another regional meeting on geographical education, this time for Central America. The Commission was fortunate in obtaining the cooperation of the Department of Geography of the University of Costa Rica to host the regional meeting. Dr Carolyn Hall, an Oxford University graduate and a United Kingdom national, was on the staff of the University serving in a bi-lingual (English and Spanish) capacity. The meeting took place between 17 and 20 November 1980 with representatives from several

Central American states. Norman Graves represented the Commission at the meeting and read a paper on curriculum planning based on research undertaken for his book, *Curriculum Planning in Geography* (Graves, 1979). The report on the conference was sent to UNESCO soon after its conclusion.

The *New Source Book for Geography Teaching* (Graves, 1982) was published by the UNESCO Press in nineteen eighty two. The intent of the sourcebook was to reflect the changes in the discipline of geography and the significance of new knowledge on cognitive development, curriculum planning, and evaluation in the teaching of geography. The book accomplished those items and addressed many of the issues that were of concern for geography educators in developing countries. However, as with the 1965 Source Book, there was no explicit attention to international understanding, which was a goal of both UNESCO and the Commission on Geographical Education.

As a member of the committee that edited the drafts of the chapters, Joseph Stoltman recalls extended discussions regarding changes in the discipline and what had become referred to as the New Geography. Disciplinary changes had been introduced by the High School Geography Project in the U.S., the German High School Geography Project, and by several Schools Council Projects in the UK, just to name a few from numerous international examples. The decision taken for the Source Book was to focus on new content and pedagogical processes. International understanding was implied as a general aim of geographical education, but not directly addressed in terms of the advice dispensed. It was also inferred through the various suggestions on the teaching of geography, with the incorporation of multi-national data and attention to countries undergoing rapid economic development. However, international understanding was not at the forefront of geography education. The reluctance to fashion the new geography around a strong emphasis on international understanding may have had the effect of moving geography away from the long term focus of UNESCO along the lines initiated by Neville Scarfe. UNESCO was also coming under the direction of a new group of international experts in education. Over the next few years, the impact of the new UNESCO experts would be experienced as a reduced role for geography education.

There was another transition on the horizon regarding in the teaching of geography. The availability of mainframe computers and computing languages that accommodated personal and group instruction began to emerge. It became referred to as computer assisted instruction. Programmed instruction with paper and pencil formats had been used with some success in different subjects, including skill development in geography. Was there a role for geography in the newly emerging computer based instruction using main-frame computers, cathode ray tubes and teletype printers within interactive modes whereby the computer program responded to the student rather than the teacher? The interest in geography education and computers came, in part, from the quantitative revolution that had moved academic geography from a descriptive to an analytic, predictive science using information technology. In response to the growing interest, the British Sub-Committee of the Commission sponsored a conference in April 1983 (Stoltman, 1983) in London on Computer Assisted Learning (CAL) in Geographical Education. Attendees came from and papers were presented, by geography educators

from 35 countries on the use of computers in education. Norman Graves edited the papers and discussion notes and published an extended report of the conference (Graves, 1984a). The papers in the conference made a case for geography in CAL, largely due to the development of very rudimentary graphic representations. The graphics were mainly comprised of the letter x as a symbol typed on paper with a dot-matrix printer. The pattern of the symbols represented a spatial pattern that students could then interpret and analyze. Several different maps of data could be printed and when laid side by side they could be compared and auto-correlations could be suggested. It marked a major leap by geography into the realm of learning using computers.

At this time, the winds of change for geography were beginning to ripple through UNESCO. The international organization had viewed geographical education in a favored way. Considerable help for geography had been provided by Ryon Kwan Kim, Programme Specialist for International Cooperation and Peace at UNESCO. Kim's close working relationship with Norman Graves and the commission was highly regarded. Kim was also friends with Joseph Stoltman, Professor at Western Michigan University. Kim has left South Korea to become an international student at Western Michigan University. After receiving his undergraduate degree at Western, Kim entered graduate school at Harvard University, followed by a UNESCO staff position in Paris. Kim clearly demonstrated the power of having an interested person speaking up for geography education at UNESCO. This has not been the case in more recent decades.

Beginning in the late 1970s and early 1980s, a transition began in UNESCO regarding the focus of its work for International Cooperation and Peace. The social studies curriculum began to be seen as a useful means of fulfilling UNESCO's objectives, thereby extending the organization's reach beyond geography. A meeting was held in Bloomington, Indiana, in the spring of 1980 to discuss the drafting of a UNESCO *Handbook for the Teaching of Social Studies*. This was to be under the editorship of Howard D Mehlinger, then Dean of the School of Education at the University of Indiana. The meeting was attended by Ryon Kwan Kim for UNESCO, with Norman Graves and Joseph Stoltman representing the Commission on Geographical Education of the IGU. A highly regarded social studies education expert, Professor Stanley Wronski of Michigan State University, represented the National Council for the Social Studies, an organization of teachers and higher education faculty members in the United States. .

The *UNESCO Handbook for the Teaching of Social Studies* (Mehlinger, 1981) was published quite soon after the organizational meeting. It represented in some ways the international diffusion of social studies within the curricular structure of newly independent and post colonial countries. The Handbook represented the initial major attention by UNESCO to social studies education as an integrated curriculum that mainly incorporated history, geography, and government/civics. Over the next two decades the transition to social studies as either an integrated curriculum, or an umbrella curriculum that included geography within its purview occurred in many countries.

The reaffirmation of the long term UNESCO agenda regarding international understanding within teacher education occurred in the early 1980s. A UNESCO meeting

was held in Glasgow early in 1981 to discuss the production of a book directly concerned with the teaching of international understanding, peace and human rights in. Present at this meeting were: Ryon Kwan Kim for UNESCO, Norman Graves for the Commission, James Dunlop the local organizer from Jordan Hill College, and Judith Torney-Purta, Professor of Human Development at the University of Maryland and joint author of a National Council for the Social Studies publication entitled *International Human Rights, Society and the Schools* (Branson & Torney-Purta, 1982). The meeting discussed the structure of a handbook and allocated writing tasks to various authors. Eventually the handbook was published by UNESCO in 1984. It was *Teaching for International Understanding, Peace, and Human Rights* (Graves, et al., 1984c). The book was modeled on the topics that represented large, global issues faced people internationally. The chapters provided suggestions regarding how teachers and students might address those issues. The publication intended to energize the issues that UNESCO has identified a decade earlier during the November UNESCO assembly in Paris (UNESCO, 1974) which were outlined on page 13 above. In retrospect, what UNESCO was recommending in 1974 could have been readily added to any geography education teaching methodology book used to prepare future teachers of geography. **The recommendations** seem to be a natural fit for teaching and learning geography across a wide range of countries and social contexts.

**In 1982 a localized conflict arose in the Latin American continent as a result of the Argentine Republic's wish to incorporate the Falkland Islands or Las Malvinas into its territory. The United Kingdom on the other hand considered these islands as belonging to the British Crown. Whilst the Commission as a body took no specific action in relation to this, a member of the Commission wrote an article suggesting ways in which the matter might be discussed in geography lessons in schools (Graves, 1983). It was an initiative that emphasized the advantage of a peaceful resolution to the conflict and was in accordance with UNESCO's recommendations. Regretfully, the conflict was not resolved peacefully.**

### **The Region Conference in Brazil in 1982**

The IGU Regional Conference was held in Brazil in 1982. Professor Olivia Olivera, Professor at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Paraná in Curitiba was the local organizer and host. The university had an active program in the psychology of child development and several of the faculty members, including Professor Olivera, had studied at the **Rousseau** Institute in Switzerland. Several papers at the regional conference were devoted to the work of Jean Piaget and the implications for geography education. **But as has been pointed out in a recent article, the Piagetian view of age related development stages in learning has been called into question (Newcombe and Stief, 2012)** The local environment of Curitiba was **an** educational experience for the geographers in attendance.

### **The Commission Symposium in Freiburg and the Congress in Paris in 1984**

In 1984, the IGU held its Congress in Paris. Prior to the Commission Symposium, a seminar was held in Amsterdam hosted by Dr. Henrietta Verduin-Muller (1921-94), Professor of Geography, University of Utrecht, Netherlands. The seminar was by invitation and intended to introduce geography educators to the work that Verduin-Muller was completing in the use of geography education as a means to international communications. At Utrecht, she had developed a geographical information institute that produce high quality graphics comprised of maps, photographs, and data to represent The Netherlands in publications produced in other countries. From her perspective, it was international understanding being extended from The Netherlands to the rest of the world. The production of camera ready informational materials was highly successful in revealing The Netherlands in an authentic manner.

The Commission on Geography Education was hosted to a pre-congress symposium in Freiburg, Federal Republic of Germany. The local organizer was Hartwig Haubrich, Professor of Geographical Education at the Paedagogische Hochschule/University of Education Freiburg. Hartwig Haubrich had completed research in the field of geographical education and was particularly interested in its international aspects. He had edited for the Freiburg Symposium two volumes of 57 papers, available to the participants (Haubrich, 1984), which contained the results of research into perception geography and the didactics of the use of media. Both aspects touched on issues of international understanding (see Spicer, Stoltman, Williams, Overjoerdet and others). The issue of "perception of people and places" was illustrated by an exhibition with pictures from a variety of national and international publications which showed biased images of people in the world. His participation in the activities of the commission after 1984 complemented the increased attention to international understanding and collaborative international research and writing that Joseph Stoltman, Chair of the Commission, had as objectives for the next four years. There were more than 125 geography educators in attendance, and fifty six participants continued on a field excursion from Freiburg to Paris.

During the Paris Congress, the organization of the Commission was hosted by Lucile Marbeau. Madame Marbeau was active in the continuing professional development of geography teachers in France and had participated widely in European discussions of education in general. The Commission featured a considerable amount of research at the Paris Congress, most of it work that had been planned in Tokyo in 1980 and Brazil in 1982 at meetings of the Commission. Joseph Stoltman was re-elected to remain Chair of the Commission through to 1988.

One item was in the form of a booklet of papers by several different authors addressing Research and Research Methods in Geographical Education (Graves, 1984b). The contributors represented an international body of researchers. However, whilst the papers covered a wide spectrum of research and methods, none was specifically concerned with research into international understanding. There was another publication sponsored by the Commission entitled *Teacher Education Models in Geography: An International Comparison*, edited by William Marsden (1984). The authors of the chapters in the volume revealed the dearth of attention to international understanding in the preparation

of teachers. Teacher education in geography, as reported in 1984, was affected by the social and political contexts in which it finds itself, and in most countries it is expected to make a contribution to that context. In other words the national rather than the international context dominated.

### **The Regional Conference in Barcelona in 1986**

The IGU Regional Conference was held in Barcelona in 1986, with the geography education symposium convening in Sitges, Spain. The symposium paper sessions were focused on the Mediterranean Region, in keeping with the theme of the Conference. The local host for the events in geography education was Agustin Hernando, of the University of Barcelona, who edited the publication of papers for the symposium (Hernando, 1986). The major business of the Commission during the conference and symposium in Spain was to plan for the 1988 Congress and Symposium in Australia. It was also during the business meeting of the Commission that Joseph Stoltman proposed the standardized use of CGE for Commission on Geography Education, when reference was made to the Commission. The standard acronym for the Commission when reference was made to the International Geographical Union was established as IGU-CGE. The IGU-CGE acronym has been used consistently since 1986, becoming the internationally recognized brand for the commission and its work.

The IGU-CGE symposium in Sitges was in a marvelous Mediterranean setting. Juan Vila Valenti, Vice President on the IGU Executive Board participated in several of the sessions despite the main business of the Executive Board being underway in Barcelona at the same time. The symposium was initial introduction of IGU-CGE to a forthcoming wave of changes in education, and in the teaching of geography – the impact of the computer. The 1984 Computer Assisted Learning Conference in London has set the stage, but in 1986 it was apparent that a new type of computer – the desktop computer – was beginning to influence the geography teaching. Prof. Helmut Schrettenburnner, of the University of Nurnberg, was developing geographical simulations in his educational laboratory that were teaching concepts of soil, slope, precipitation, and land use decision making. There were geography educators in New Zealand, Australia, United States, Europe, and Asia engaged in exploring the uses for desk top computers in geography education.

### **The 1988 Symposium in Brisbane and and Congress in Sydney**

The active participants in the IGU-CGE were encouraged by the Chair, Joseph Stoltman, to plan long term projects of two to four years. It was difficult to prepare a Commission project, either focusing on research or pedagogical practices, in the year or so prior to a regional conference of congress. During the 1986 conference in Barcelona, Hartwig Haubrich and Stoltman discussed a publication that would highlight the 1988 Congress for the Commission. Haubrich agreed to collaborate with other active geography educators and prepare a series of short papers under the overall theme, *International Trends in Geographical Education* (Haubrich, 1987). The papers in the book were to represent views on the way geographical education was evolving in each of the countries

represented at the end of the 1980s. Whilst the editor's preface suggested that geography teachers should be concerned with the problems the world is facing, they should also emphasize future opportunities for learning and becoming engaged in promoting peace and international understanding. Yet, it was rare to find in the individual chapters any overall concern for international understanding. The authors outlined the problems and difficulties faced by teachers in developing and implementing the national geography curriculum or with national assessment expectations. It was clear that teachers were more concerned with practical problems of teaching than with the kind of objectives indicated in the 1974 UNESCO recommendations. Geography education's roles in the big questions of international understanding, peace, global environmental trends were not present in the essays. The publication renewed the concern expressed by Stolzman in 1980 that the large opportunities for geography were being missed while the major concerns were with the content of the new geography at the time. International understanding, one of the founding principles of IGE-CGE was on the back burner of concerns expressed by authors of the short essays.

Similarly, following the 1984 symposium in Freiburg, Josef Birkenhauer and Bill Marsden arranged to edit a series of papers emanating from geographical educators in the Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), concerning the state of geographical education (Birkenhauer & Marsden, 1988). The book was much in keeping with the theme similar to the book edited by Haubrich (1987), but gave little attention to the international focus of geography in the work that was being completed in the school curriculum.

Many participants in the IGU-CGE had been active in the development of the new geography of the 1960s and 70s. Those new geographies were manifest in the curriculum development projects such as High School Geography Projects in the United States, in the Republic of Germany, and in Israel. In the United Kingdom the Geography 16-19 Project, and the Jordan Hill Project were prominent. These projects largely refocused geography from its traditional regional and earth-science focus to more specific nomothetic topics. This seemed to contribute further to the movement away from geography education taking responsibility for international knowledge, understanding, and the major emphasis on globalization that entered the curriculum over the subsequent two decades.

The 1988 pre-congress symposium was organized in Brisbane. Rod Gerber (1945-2007), who had participated in the 1984 IGU activities, and John Lidstone, a former PhD student of Norman Graves. They were faculty members at the Red Hill Campus of the College of Education, which later became affiliated with Queensland University of Technology. Whilst the papers presented at the symposium and later in the main congress (including the Birkenhauer and Marsden book mentioned earlier) covered a wide area of geographical education with a growing emphasis on environmental education, it would be difficult to argue that there was much stress on international understanding (Rod Gerber & Lidstone, 1988).

The IGU-CGE regularly held business meetings at each of the symposia and congresses. The activities of the past several years were reviewed, current activities were reported by members of the commission who were present, and future plans were discussed, evaluated, and decided for the next two and four year periods. There was usually consensus regarding the activities that would occupy the attention of the commission in the near future. The Brisbane business meeting became an exception to the overall discussion, but did result in an open debate that resulted in a strong statement by the commission's continued focus on geography education research and pedagogy. The 1980s were the years of the environmental education movement in many countries. While environmental education did rely on some of the content and skills from geography education, it was much broader in its national and international objectives. It was decided that geography education could contribute to environmental education as a curriculum focus, but geography education should not relinquish its responsibility for research and curriculum development as a discipline. Thus, Commission decided on making geography education the main concern for future work.

The major proposal for the activities of the Commission for the future was made by Stoltman, since he was serving his final appointment as chair. Other educational disciplines, mathematics and science in particular, were forging ahead with the development of standards in their disciplines. Standards were basically a recommendation by the best minds in the discipline and education regarding what students should know and be able to do at various times in the school curriculum. Stoltman believed that geography was virtually a politically neutral discipline that could make an impact on education since it was not loaded with historical interpretation. It was similar to mathematics. In 1984 the two major geography academic and pedagogical organizations in the United States had collaborated in the development of a national set of guidelines (Joint Committee on Geographic Education of the National Council for Geographic Education and the Association of American Geographers, 1984). While not standards, they were an initial step in the process of discussing and proposing standards. Stoltman suggested to his successor, Hartwig Haubrich, that the commission provide the international community with a powerful, persuasive document that presented the rigor and adaptability, as well as the international appeal of geography as a school subject. The project became the International Charter on Geography Education that was developed over the subsequent four years (H. Haubrich, 1992). The view that geography could be seen as a politically neutral discipline was not shared by every geographer.

During the Congress in Sydney there were geographical education sessions. Abstracts were included in the Congress proceedings. Dr Tony Milne of the Department of Geography at the University of New South Wales, was the Sydney host, along with Dr Don Biddle, of Sydney Teacher's College. Both institutions had exemplary geography programs. Milne had become an expert in remote sensing education during his doctoral work at the University of Colorado, Boulder, and had served on the IGU-CGE beginning in 1984. Biddle had been a student of Norman Graves, and was a contributor to many IGU-CGE projects.

Frances Slater, who had participated in the 1972 Symposium of the Commission in Quebec City, contributed substantially to the work of the commission during the period of Stoltman's Chairmanship. A presentation was made at the 1988 Congress regarding the forthcoming *Language and learning in the Teaching of Geography* (F. A. Slater, 1989), a Commission sponsored publication. The publication included a chapter entitled "Language and Learning in Multi-Cultural Education" that resonated well with UNESCO's and Stoltman's views on the international understanding role of the commission derived from its pre 1952 foundational *raison d'etre*.

The point was made that international understanding should have an expressive or emotional component, and in 1989 that component was delivered through the language used during teaching, the discussions undertaken and the media used.

The IGU Executive has formalized the rules of appointment and expected the commissions to abide by the conditions after 1980. The term of office for the Chairman of the Commission was set at eight years under the operational bylaws. Full members of the Commission were permitted to serve eight years as well. The term limits permitted greater national and regional diversity on the commission and by 1988 the terms were being applied with one exception. Joseph Stoltman served as a Full Commission Member from 1976 – 1980, as Chair of the Commission from 1980 – 1988, and as a Full member from 1988 until 2000.

There were no individual membership dues to participate in the work of the Commission. There were three levels of membership. Full Members of the Commission were appointed by the IGU Executive for periods of four years, the same as the Chair's term of office. Corresponding members were appointed by the Chair with the concurrence of the Full Members of the Commission. Their responsibility was to disseminate information about the work of the Commission in their region or country in the day before the World Wide Web and the Internet. There were normally approximately 20 corresponding members who disseminated information at national conferences and in national and regional newsletters published by academic societies and professional geographic organizations. Regular members of IGU-CGE were those geography educators and other who followed the activities of the Commission, participated in conferences and congresses occasionally, and contributed to the work of the Commission by collaborating in projects. The operating procedures for the Commission had been set by 1988 and were applied thereafter, with the single exception of Stoltman's 24 year period of continual appointment by the IGU Executive Board.

At the conclusion of the 1988 IGU Congress, Hartwig Haubrich was appointed Chair of the Commission. Haubrich who had been very active in his work for the Commission after 1980 and was the unanimous choice to lead the commission for the next four year.

### **The Commission in the 1990s**

The next 8 years were to be a fruitful time for the Commission. Under the leadership of Hartwig Haubrich, the Commission developed its activities in a number of new

directions. Notable among these were the production of the International Charter on Geographical Education and the Lucerne Declaration on Geographical Education for Sustainable Development. But Hartwig Haubrich also specified in detail the responsibilities of the members of the Commission. For example the chairperson was to:

- Coordinate the activities of the full members, the regional correspondents, the project teams and the organisers of symposia and field studies.
- Edit and post newsletters
- Send reports of the Commission's activities to the Secretary General of the IGU.
- Administer the Commission's funds .
- Coordinate the Commission's activities with the responsible Vice-President of the IGU.
- Chair the business meetings of the Commission.

Similar specifications were detailed for the Secretary, the full members and corresponding members of the Commission.

### **The 1990 IGU Regional Conference and Symposium in China**

Hong Kong was the venue for the symposium of the Commission in 1990, followed by the Regional Conference in Beijing. The Hong Kong event was hosted by Phillip Stimpson of the University of Hong Kong and Yee Wang Fung of the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Still a British Colony at the time, the symposium featured visits to schools, research sessions with formal papers, and discussion sessions focused on the evolving International Charter on Geographical Education under the guidance of IGU-CGE chair, Hartwig Haubrich. The initial draft of the charter was analyzed, deconstructed, reconstructed and English language massaged until it was not only clearly written, but convincing in its message regarding the importance of geography education for all students in all grades. Between working on the charter and academic paper presentations, field studies to Stanley Harbor, the fenced border with the Peoples Republic of China, Kowloon, Urban Victoria, and the Hong Kong Harbor transport hub were experienced.

Participants in the Symposium then traveled separately to Beijing for the Regional Conference of the IGU. The Commission was hosted by Professor Zhang Lansheng, a Full Member of the Commission. Zhang made certain the Commission participants were provided with opportunities to meet Chinese geography teachers, to learn about the national assessment system from scholars working in the assessment bureau, and to explore Beijing.

### **The 1992 Symposium and Congress in the United States**

The 1992 IGU Congress was held in Washington D C with the pre-congress symposium of the Commission on Geographical Education hosted by the Department of Geography of the University of Colorado at Boulder. David Hill (1933-2014), the local organizer, worked with a small committee of colleagues, including Stoltman and Slater, and was able to publish the papers offered at the symposium (Hill, 1992). The call for symposium papers had requested contributors to consider the following three questions.

- (1) What is being taught or should be taught?
- (2) How is geography being taught or how should it be taught?
- (3) What are the historical and institutional settings in which geographic education is conducted or should be conducted and what should be geography's role in the larger context of education in general?

In one respect, Hill was attempting to build a context in the symposium for the teaching of international understanding as a rigorous component of the geography curriculum. Many of the papers that were submitted for the symposium tended to parallel those received by Hartwig Haubrich in his 1987 book (Hartwig Haubrich, 1987), but there are notable differences. Haubrich's paper for the symposium book, for example, examined the self-images of students in the French, German and Swiss border areas near Basle, and compared these with their views of their neighbors. He then focused on the international understanding that emanated from the data and concluded that in geography education we should try to de-emphasize differences and emphasize similarities among us, which echoes the recommendation from Honeybone in the 1950s, those of Piaget (Piaget & Weil, 1951), and Lambert and Klineberg (Lambert & Klineberg, 1967) .

Other papers in the symposium were also concerned, often in a tangential way, with international understanding. For example, Ashley Kent's paper on "Images of People, Environment, and Life", van der Schee's and Huigen's on " International Understanding and Geography Teaching about Europe. A Dutch Perspective" and Lambert and Slater's "Sharing our Sense of the World" were each aspiring to examine the role of international understanding, suggesting a commitment to the founding philosophy of the original Committee on the Teaching of Geography proposed by Neville Scarfe.

A major international collaborative study reported in Hill's edited book was by Gunter Niemz and Joseph Stoltman. The research was built upon the original work of Niemz in West Germany at the time. Entitled, *InterGeo II: The Development of Field Trials of an International Geography Test*, it provided a validated geography test that had been normalized and tested for reliability of items in more than 12 different countries. To an extent this research extended Saveland's Place Vocabulary research, but on a much more elaborate scale. The test covered 6 aspects of geography with sub-tests for each of: 1) location, 2) physical geography, 3) human geography, 4) geographical skills, 5) regional geography and 6) geography of home country and surroundings. The test was administered to nearly 11, 000 14 year old students in 18 countries. The mean score for all participants for sub-tests 1) to 5) was just under 60%, which was judged as being unacceptably low given that the test items were deemed by experts to represent knowledge that ought to have been known to 14 year old students.

Under Hartwig Haubrich guidance, the Commission on Geographical Education published in 1992 the single most cited document. Rather than a content standards for geography as was suggested by Stoltman, Haubrich reached a consensus with the commission to guide the preparation of a major policy statement of the Commission and the IGU on geography education. It was to become milestone in the work of the IGU-CGE. Entitled, *The International Charter on Geographical Education* (H. Haubrich,

1992), the charter became a manifesto of what geography could achieve in education and the means by which it could be achieved. The charter was written with geography as its disciplinary context, but with direct reference to the UN and UNESCO documents that were concerned with international understanding. The charter states, inter alia, that:

Geographical Education promotes understanding, tolerance, and friendship amongst all nations, racial, and religious groups and furthers the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace by actively encouraging:

- (a) an international dimension and a global perspective in education at all levels and in all its forms;
- (b) understanding and respect for all peoples, their cultures, civilizations, values and ways of life, including domestic ethnic cultures and cultures of other nations;
- (c) awareness of the increasing global interdependence between peoples and nations;
- (d) abilities to communicate with others,
- (e) awareness not only of the rights but also of the duties incumbent upon individuals, social groups and nations towards each other;
- (f) understanding of the necessity for international solidarity and co-operation;
- (g) readiness on the part of the individual to participate in solving the problems of his community, his country and the world at large. (points taken from the 1974 UNESCO recommendation for Education for International Understanding, Co-operation and Peace and Education).

The 1992 Charter thus affirmed the IGU's and Commission's commitment to international understanding. However, with hindsight it there was one imbedded caveat. The heading International Education was used in the Charter rather than International Understanding. But this was consistent with the 1974 UNESCO recommendations that expressed international understanding, cooperation, and peace may be gathered together and expressed concisely as international education. The International Charter was intended to align the Commission activities post 1992 to conform with the purpose of International Education.

### **International Research in Geography and Environmental Education (IRGEE)**

Perhaps one of the significant achievements of the Commission evolved from original discussions between Rod Gerber and Joseph Stoltman in 1988 in Sydney. It was the launch in 1992 of a flagship journal for the commission. Entitled, *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education* (IRGEE), it was designed to be the repository and access periodical for research in geography education. In order to incorporate the persuasive voice of the business meeting of the commission in Brisbane, the title deliberately included Environmental Education. Gerber and his colleague, John Lidstone, guided the journal to its first print number and volume and subsequent issues to 2007. Following the death of Rod Gerber, Stoltman assumed co-editorship with John Lidstone. The lead article in Issue 1, volume 1 in 1992 was *Designing a Geography Syllabus: Researching the Process*, by Joseph Stoltman.

Joseph Stoltman and John Lidstone have served as co-editors of the journal from 2008 through 2015 and continue in that capacity. IRGEE was first published by Channel View Publications and later by Taylor and Francis. IRGEE enabled the research work of the Commission and its associated members to find a permanent outlet in a respected academic journal.

### **The 1994 Commission Symposium in Berlin and Regional Conference in Prague**

The reunification of Germany in 1989 and the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 made the regional conference in Prague (**Czechoslovakia**) in 1992 a very special opportunity for the commission. If possible, the influence of the Commission to help reunite geographic education across the divide that had existed since 1945 between East and West Europe. The Chair of the Commission, Hartwig Haubrich was anxious to exert the scholarly role of the Commission in promoting international understanding and arranged for the preconference symposium to be held in Berlin, with field studies in East Berlin. As a capstone, the linking of the Berlin Symposium with the Prague Conference was an overland bus journey through the eastern region of Germany. The opportunity provided an exceptional way to engage geography educators in the 1990s transition of Europe. The venue in Prague was at Charles University, hosted by **its** Geography Department.

The papers from the IGU-CGE symposia and **conference** session in Berlin and Prague were published in a book entitled, *Europe and the World in Geography Education* (Haubrich, 1994). The book and the papers included were timely since it represented geography education the final years of the Cold War and the emergence of the post-Cold War Europe. It also manifested the growing importance of the European Union in the world. International understanding was not presented or discussed as a major goal of geography education in the essays that comprised the book. Rather, the authors of the articles wrote about issues that would perhaps require international understanding, cooperation, and peace in resolving both European and worldwide issues. Another opportunity to highlight the mission of the initial Committee on the Teaching of Geography in 1952, was missed. Geography education and the commission were in the center of a sea change in political, economic, environmental, and social conditions in Europe. The response to those changes would have to wait for several years as the

commission turned its attention to charters on cultural diversity and sustainability of Earth. The commission was gradually encompassing a larger portfolio of concerns referred to as international education, cultural understanding, multicultural education, intercultural education, peace, tolerance and democracy. The linkages to the work of the commission and the language of professional education was intersecting. A new geopolitical era required new terminology and new approaches to reach generations of students in transition. The challenge was to determine geography education's role in the international contributions to the changes that would move international understanding into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **The 1996 Congress in The Hague, Netherlands**

In 1996 the IGU Congress and the Symposium on Geographical Education were held in The Hague, Netherlands. The proceedings for the commission symposium included more than 70 abstracts and short papers (Van Der Schee, Schoenmaker, Trimp, & Van Westrhenen, 1996). A survey by Hartwig Haubrich was reported as the keynote lecture in which he compared the results with his prior survey (Haubrich, 1987). Haubrich made a strong case that education for national identity, on the one hand, drives many of the world's geography curricula. On the other hand, the curricula **do** not provide adequate attention to international and global solidarity, peace, intercultural relationships, or gender education. In spite of the publicity given to the *International Charter on Geographical Education* (H. Haubrich, 1992), now four years old, the overwhelming majority of the papers in the symposium were concerned with knowledge and skills, environmental learning, the use of old and new media, and curriculum development. The first section of the book was entitled International Cooperation and included papers **which were** either directly or tangentially **relevant** to International Education, but not directly to international understanding. Titles of papers suggested **somewhat more than a purely national perspective**, with such titles as "Teaching Europe in the multicultural societies of Europe" and "How to encourage intercultural learning in geography lesson." There were no references to UNESCO or to its recommendations regarding international understanding, cooperation, and peace (UNESCO, 1974).

Within the proceedings, *Innovation in Geographical Education* (Van Der Schee, et al., 1996), Haubrich argued that it was the "unique response to our Commission's call to promote international cooperation in Geographical Education". There is little doubt that the Commission had, through its work, increased the cooperation between geographical educators and international understanding between them. However, how far this became translated into international understanding among the general population the remaining question. The IGU-CGE is with its international focus should be the vehicle for researching and suggesting the possible ways that geographic learning in classrooms around the world includes the importance of international understanding in developing a safe and civil world

The 1996 Hague Congress was notable also for the first International Geography Olympiad. The idea of an international geography competition for 16 to 19 year old students, was launched during a Regional Meeting of the IGU in Prague in 1994 by

delegates from Poland and the Netherlands. The initial trial run of the competition was then planned over the subsequent two years and formally launched in 1996. The competition has expanded over the subsequent years and involves a greater number of participants. Participation in the contest was modest at first, with only five countries involved in 1996. The numbers grew to 24 in the 2008 IGU Congress and to 28 in 2010 competition. The Olympiad is designed in three parts: 1) a written test; 2) a multimedia test; and 3) a field work exercise. It is organized by the IGU Olympiad Task force, a formal division under the IGU Executive. Each team's performance is evaluated by an international team of judges who closely follow scoring guides and procedures. The competition brings together young people from many countries for an educational experience that engages them in physical and cultural geography. The Olympiad is a positive step in the quest for international understanding.

Hartwig Haubrich's term of the chair of the Commission ended in 1996 and Rod Gerber was nominated as chairperson. The IGU Executive approved his appointment and he assumed the chair's position. Gerber had been active in the commission since 1988 following the Brisbane symposium. Originally at the Red Hill Campus of the Queensland University of Technology he moved in 1995 to the Faculty of Education at the University of New England in Armidale, where he remained until 2002. In his role as chair, Gerber was ably assisted by John Lidstone who was appointed secretary to the Commission. **Meanwhile Hatwig Haubrich continued to undertake research in geographical education and in particular on student perceptions of nations other than their own (Haubrich,1997)**

In 1997 the British Sub-Committee to the IGU-CGE sponsored their second London Conference focusing on a theme of interest internationally. The initial conference was devoted to Computer Assisted Instruction (Graves, 1984a). The conference in 1997 was organized around the theme of *Values in Geographical Education* (Naish, 1997) and was convened at the Institute of Education in London. A large number of geographical educators from many countries arrived to participate in the conference. The conference occurred under the assumption that values education that was aspect of geographical education that had declined over the 1990s decade. The papers demonstrated that those participating were clear as to the importance of values in geographical education, but were also conscious of the views of policy makers that values education had no role in the classroom. Further, others not in attendance had espoused that geography should only be taught for its scientifically valid concepts and should not be involved in exposing the values underlying economic development. In particular, textbooks were shown to imply values in their descriptions of other peoples that ran counter to the UNESCO recommendations, and could be categorized as stereotyping or at worst, negative statements. It also became apparent in the conference that values cover a wide swath of education and the content that is offered in elementary and secondary curricular. In most cases, the teacher has the most important role in clarifying and propagating positive values and beliefs through instruction in school. However, the focus of values education in geography ranges from personal values to those of peer groups, families, ethnic groups, and national societies. Values surround people at every moment in their lives, and geography education is in a positive position to help students address environmental and ethnic values through physical and human geography.

## **The 1998 Regional Conference in Oporto and Lisbon**

The IGU-CGE held its symposium in Oporto, Portugal, in 1998 and the Regional Conference of the IGU was in Lisbon. Professors Manuela Ferreira and Fernando Alexandre were the local hosts for the symposium. The theme for the Congress was The Atlantic: Past, Present and Future, and the symposium applied that context to the papers and presentations on didactics, content selection for geographic study, and the increasing use of technology in teaching geography. In this respect it is appropriate to note that the Commission has since set up a website ([www.igu-cge.org](http://www.igu-cge.org)) on which information about the meetings, research and publications of the Commission are listed as well as the newsletters, reports and names of current Commission members.

The Regional Conference in Lisbon had a good representation of geography education and the discussions and papers continued with an emphasis on the Atlantic and its role in geography education in the present, with linkages to the Americas, Northern Europe, and Africa being the focus. In some regards, the presentations begged for attention to international understanding as a major focus of geography education given the topic of the congress and the location. The topic was approached in several different papers, but was a minor component of the discussion.

## **The 2000 Symposium in Gyeongju and Congress in Seoul**

The Symposium in 2000 was held in Gyeongju and the Congress convened in Seoul. Gyeongju was a highly desirable venue for the symposium, being the capital of the Silla Dynasty from 57 BCE to 935 CE. The Dynasty had a significant effect on the development of Korea as a country, and controlled about 70% of the Korean Peninsula at its peak of power. The Congress venue was the newly opened COEX Convention and Visitors Center. It had the most modern electronic devices for presentations and introduced many participants to a 21<sup>st</sup> century view of future conferences. The numbers attending the Congress IGU-CGE was very large, supported by the participation of many South Korean geography educators.

During his period as chair of the IGU-CGE, Rod Gerber devoted considerable attention to international understanding as he interpreted it within the IGU-CGE community. During the 2000 IGU Congress and Symposium in South Korea, Gerber presented his work to the general business meeting of the commission. He entitled it the *International Declaration on Geographical Education for Cultural Diversity* (Rod Gerber, 2000), a document which affirmed that geographical education should develop:

- the ability to be sensitive toward and defend human rights;
- an ability to understand, accept, and appreciate cultural diversity;
- an ability to understand empathies and critique alternative viewpoints about people and their social conditions;
- a willingness to be aware of the impact of their own lifestyles on their local and broader social contexts;

- an appreciation of the urgent need to protect our environment and bring about environmental justice to local communities and regions that have experienced environmental devastation;
- an ability to act as an informed and active member of their own and global society.

The declaration did strike a note that was close to the founding ideas from 1949. The declaration includes the statement:

Geographical research and teaching makes a major contribution to our understanding of the cultural, social and industrial environments of the world.

One could argue that the declaration evokes international understanding through the terminology and phraseology that emphasizes cultural diversity. However, cultural diversity and the acceptance of diversity are a component of international understanding, not the driving idea for international understanding. The declaration made a significant contribution to the philosophical and applied aspects of what geography education should assume in a more responsible manner at the beginning to the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Whilst the declaration is utopian in the light of the reality of present day society, nevertheless it expresses many of the academic qualities and human values that geography teachers ought to espouse and students practice during their lives. It is the humanistic side of the discipline laying out expectations that education has an important role in achieving.

During the 2000 Seoul Congress, Lea Houtsonen, a Finnish geographer from the University of Helsinki, was nominated and appointed by the Executive Committee of the IGU to chair the Commission. She had been active in geography education research in Finland, having directed the study on the reform of geography teaching in Finnish upper secondary schools (Houtsonen, 1988). Houtsonen had contributed to IGU and British Sub-Committee in London (Lappalainen, Godenhjelm, Houtsonen, Malmberg, & Smirnova, 2000). She had a special interest in the use of new technology in geography teaching which was presented clearly in the chapter she wrote for the *International Handbook* (Houtsonen, 2003).

Houtsonen encouraged Rod Gerber to complete the *International Handbook on Geographical Education*, which he had **worked on** for several years when chair of the commission. The concept **underlying** *International Handbook on Geographical Education* (R. Gerber, 2003) was to represent the work of the commission at the turn of the century. Each chapter was written either by a member of the Commission or an associate active in research in geographical education. Gerber's own introductory chapter entitled The Global Scene for Geographical Education is the result of a survey of geographical education in the year 2000. He noted that compared with the 1987 survey (Haubrich, 1987) there was increased attention being given to geographical concepts, thinking skills, environmental and intercultural education. On the other hand he felt that values, development education and international solidarity had declined in importance, which he found worrying. He argued that given the trend to globalization and the growing inequalities between nations, it was important to reawaken the conscience of people to those **conditions** through geography education. It would be difficult to do justice to the scholarly work manifest in the *International Handbook*, suffice it to say that

it is a fitting tribute to the work of the Commission and its collaborators. The former Chair and editor of the Handbook, Rod Gerber, who had done so much for the Commission and for geographical education died in 2007.

### **The 2002 Regional Conference and IGU-CGE Symposium in South Africa**

Richards Bay was the venue for the Symposium of IGU-CGE and Durban was the IGU **Conference** site in 2002. William Mngoma was the host for the symposium. He organized an engaging series of cultural events, field study, and paper sessions in Richards Bay. The commission participants continued to Durban where they participated in the presentations and activities of the Regional Conference.

The commission also organized symposiums in Helsinki (Finland), London, Moscow and Barnaul (Russia) in 2001 - 2003. In Moscow and Barnaul the theme “Society and Environmental Interaction Under Conditions of Global and Regional Changes” led to detailed discussions. Strengthening the “concept of future environmental changes” in the curriculum in geography was agreed upon as an international goal. There was little attention to international understanding in conjunction with the international environmental focus.

Houtsonen was also instrumental in guiding the commission to its participating in the 2004 Congress and Symposium in Glasgow, Scotland. In 2003 a conference on Geography and Citizenship Education: Research Perspectives was co-sponsored in London by the commission. The issue of education’s role in citizenship education was a widely discussed topic for education, with legislative mandates being passed by governments. The question of citizenship education of nationalistic education was on the minds of geography educators, and the conference addressed many of those issues. The importance of the issues to the larger community of geographers was indicated when President of the IGU, Professor Anne Buttmer, was asked and accepted the invitation to present the keynote address on the role of geography in citizenship education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### **The 2004 IGU-CGE Symposium and IGU Congress in Glasgow**

In 2004 the IGU Congress and IGU-CGE Symposium were held in Glasgow. The Commission’s symposium was entitled Expanding Horizons in a Shrinking World and was organized by the British Sub-Committee to IGU-CGE. The session in the congress, was organized by Lea Houtsonen. The symposium papers were gathered in a publication edited by Ashley Kent, Alastair Robinson and Eleanor Rawling (Kent, Robinson, & Rawling, 2004).

The theme of the congress **harmonized** well **with** the topic for the sessions on geographic education. Joseph Stoltman presented the keynote address on Geography Education and Citizenship with an emphasis on civic responsibilities that are inherent in being a member of a civil society. The attention to citizenship provides geography education with access to a component of the curriculum that is growing in many countries, that of civic education. Civic education **concerned** not so much the political aspects of citizenship, such as voting, but rather the informed decision making and civic participation that has

positive effects on the community. It has been referred to as environmental citizenship and global citizenship when reference is made to geography. Geography has a contribution to make to civic responsibility from the local to the global. At the Glasgow Congress, Lex Chambers of the University of Waikato in New Zealand was elected to be chair of the Commission for the next four years.

### **The 2006 IGU-CGE Symposium and Conference in Brisbane**

In 2006 John Lidstone hosted the symposium for the Commission on Geography Education at Queensland University of Technology in Brisbane. Margaret Robertson reported on the progress of her project Geographical Perspectives on Sustainable Development which involved geographers from ten different countries (Robertson, 2007). Participants were able to obtain copies of John Lidstone and Michael Williams' edited book (Lidstone & Williams, 2006) *Geographical Education in a Changing World*. The edited book has chapters by geography educators from different countries who relate the changing role of geography education, sometimes within their country and at other times it is an international focus. The role of international understanding was addressed in the chapter by Hartwig Haubrich (Hartwig Haubrich, 2006). He weaved into the story of geographical education the periods of attention to international understanding as a focus of the work of the commission.

Brisbane was also the site of an Olympiad organized by the Olympiad Task Force and locally managed by Kathryn Berg.

### **The Lucerne Symposium**

In 2007 a symposium was held in Lucerne to discuss, *inter alia*, the growing concern over the overexploitation of the earth's resources. It was at this symposium that Hartwig Haubrich, Sibylle Reinfried and Yvonne Schleicher developed the *Declaration on Teaching Geography for Sustainable Development* (Haubrich, H et al. 2007).

### **The 2008 IGU-CGE Symposium and Congress in Tunis**

Tunis was the venue for the North African Regional Congress in 2008. It was an introduction to both the history and geography of the region. Carthage was a short distance from the conference site and easily accessible by tram. The Medina, a UNESCO World Heritage Centre was visited by many of the participants. The city and surrounding region provided numerous opportunities for field observation.

As mentioned above, for several years the commission had been discussing the rapid developing interest in sustainability. Geographers were participating in the research and writing regarding sustainability, and it was the position of the Commission members that IGU-CGE should have a formal statement. After considerable discussion and the review of principles that would comprise such a document, the Chair of the Commission Lex Chalmers introduced it for final adoption at the Commission meeting in Tunis.

Entitled the *Lucerne Declaration on Geography Education for Sustainable Development* (Haubrich et al, 2007), the declaration represents the third major international statement by the commission. The prior statements were the International Charter (H. Haubrich, 1992) and the declaration on Cultural Diversity (Rod Gerber, 2000). The background to the declaration was the growing realization among scientists that the resources of the planet earth are not inexhaustible. Human activity is resulting in global climate change with the inevitable consequence of sea level rise and desertification of additional expanses of Earth's surface. The Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit (United Nations Earth Summit, 1992) had affirmed the need for development to be sustainable. Despite the confirmation ten years later of its importance at the Johannesburg Summit (Nations, 2002), relatively little had transpired in the education of future generations of citizens about sustainability, and little had been done to promote such development. To address that concern the United Nations General Assembly declared a Decade of Education for Sustainable Development (2005-2014) and designated UNESCO as the lead agency for promoting the Decade (UNESCO, 2005). In 2007 UNESCO published a report of progress (UNESCO, 2007) two years into the decade for education for sustainable development.

In effect, the *Lucerne Declaration* is a statement of how geography education at all levels has potential to contribute to sustainable development. It does not specify particular objectives to be included in the curriculum, since it argues that these must depend to some extent on local and regional conditions. **However it does suggest criteria for selecting geographical themes** in harmony with sustainable development which is future oriented, is a concept of peace between humans and nature, and a concept of justice between generations, different nations, cultures and regions of the world. **It also recognizes that other disciplines and competencies will contribute to education for sustainable development.** The *Lucerne Declaration* reintroduced the concept of international understanding in the quest for sustainable development through geography education.

**Sibylle Reinfried presented the Lucerne Declaration at the Plenary Assembly of the IGU Congress in 2008 in Tunis (Reinfried, 2009)** It was also at the Tunis Congress that the IGU president conferred on Hartwig Haubrich the award of "Laureat d'Honneur" for his scholarly contribution to geographical education. This was a recognition on the part of the IGU Executive of the value of his work and of that of the Commission.

### **The 2010 IGU Symposium in Istanbul and Conference in Tel Aviv**

**During the Tunis Congress a decision was taken that IGU meetings should be held every year between congresses rather than just once. Hence the setting up of a Commission meeting in Istanbul and the following year in Santiago de Chile**  
The symposium of the Commission in 2010 took place in Istanbul. It was hosted by Professor Ali Demirci at the Fatih University, which had modern facilities for the participants. **The theme for the symposium was Building Bridges Between Cultures, in effect taking up the theme developed by Rod Gerber in the Declaration on Geographical**

**Education for Cultural Diversity** (IGU-CGE Editors, Demirci, Chalmers, Yılmaz, & Lidstone, 2010). The Regional Conference was held in Tel-Aviv, Israel and the IGU-CGE had a full complement of papers during the sessions. The theme for the Tel Aviv conference was Teaching and Learning in Geography. Papers presented in the conference address the following topics: 1) good practice in any area of teaching and learning geography (cartography, cultural studies, physical geography, fieldwork, GIS), 2) working with gifted and talented learners, 3) assessment practices, and 4) teaching digital futures in geography.

### **The 2011 IGU Conference in Santiago**

This meeting was held in the Escuela Militar del Libertador Bernardo O'Higgins which had facilities for enabling the translation of papers between Spanish and English. The seminars and workshops concentrated on the activities of the Commission, the status of geography teaching in Latin America and the possibilities of developing practical issues of teaching through digital communications. A presentation was made to Josefina Ostuni in recognition of her work in the field of geographical education in Latin America.

### **The 2012 Symposium in Freiburg and Congress in Köln**

The 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary symposium of the Commission on Geographical Education was held in Freiburg, hosted by the faculty of the Pädagogische Hochschule Freiburg (Freiburg University of Education). Emeritus Prof. Dr. Hartwig Haubrich; Dr. Sibylle Reinfried; Dr. Yvonne Schleicher; Dr. Gregor C. Falk (Chair) and Mr Michael Muller served on the planning committee for the symposium. The title of the Symposium was Experience Based Geography Learning, which attracted a wide range of papers and poster devoted to aspect of the topic.

Professor Daniela Schmeinck was our host for the IGU Congress held at the University of Köln. The theme for the Congress was Down to Earth, and the commission papers were focused, in part, on the main theme. The geographical education sessions were held during one day of the Congress. Additional sessions on geographical education were presented by professional organizations in Europe, international projects, and the opportunities for international collaboration. The congress in 2012 was evidence that the Commission has succeeded in attracting paper presentations from an ever wider range of countries, as Lex Chalmers stated in his editorial (Chalmers, 2012). That widening participation by geography educators may be viewed as evidence of a greater interest in, and need for, the knowledge, content and skills that geography provides for life in a complex world.

Certainly the international understanding of peoples within, between, and among countries remains a prominent goal of the IGU-CGE and was demonstrated by the friendly interaction among the participants.

### **Cooperation with the Committee on the Teaching of Science of ICSU**

An important chapter in the history of the IGU-CGE was the close cooperation with the Committee on the Teaching of Science. Few geographers are aware of the collaborative

efforts since **the status of** geography as a science, and especially in geography education, was not fully agreed upon either within the geography profession or among other scientific disciplines. The linkages to the teaching of science **present** an interesting series of circumstances. In the 1970s, the IGU became active in the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU), encouraged by geographers such as Gilbert F. White and Chauncey Harris, each of whom was deeply engaged in international collaborative research. ICSU sponsored the Committee on the Teaching of Science, but there was no representative of geography on the committee. Professor Michael Wise, who was president of the IGU from 1976 to 1980, suggested that Norman Graves be the IGU representative, and he accepted the assignment. The Committee on the Teaching of Science was much concerned with the use of education in promoting development particularly in countries where the general level of incomes was low. After much preliminary work in the early 1980s, ICSU arranged a large conference in Bangalore on "Science and Technology Education and Future Human Needs." The conference was held in August 1985 with the stated purpose to examine the contribution that scientific education could make to development in the fields of: Health; Food and Agriculture; Energy; Land, Water and Mineral Resources; Industry and Technology; the Environment; and Information transfer. Norman Graves was asked to chair the group of participants who were working on Land, Water and Mineral Resources. In effect the Bangalore conference was mainly in the form of workshops in which participants prepared teaching units as examples of what could be done to foster long term development in **harmony** with available resources. While sustainable development was not part of the educational vernacular at the time, the intent was to engage students in thinking about the future and the humans' role in sustainable development decisions. **The** larger topic under the editorship of Norman Graves on Land, Water and Mineral Resources was divided into three working groups. Joseph Stoltman undertook to steer the Land-Use group, Hans van Aalst the Water Resources group, and Eileen Barrett undertook managing the Mineral Resources group. The output of the workshops was published for ICSU by the Pergamon Press ( Graves, 1987).

Norman Graves filled the role of IGU-CGE representative until 1990 when he retired from the Institute of Education. Joseph Stoltman became the IGU representative to the Committee on the Teaching of Science and served from 1990 to 2002 when the ICSU restructured their educational focus. Stoltman became Secretary to the Committee, a quite important position within ICSU Committee's since the secretaries of the various committees were engaged in the planning of activities. David Waddington, Professor of Chemistry at York University, UK, was Chair of the Committee. Stoltman and Waddington made a strong working team and the role of geography within ICSU **Committee on the** Teaching of Science was enhanced over the decade. Geography had a major role in publications and conferences and workshop in Harare, Zimbabwe, The Netherlands, Santiago, Chile, in conjunction with the International Geosphere Biosphere Program (IGBP) and the production of student materials in the 1990s on Global Change Education.

## **Conclusion**

In the sixty years that have elapsed between 1952 and 2012 much has happened on the world stage and inevitably the International Geographical Union and its Commissions have been influenced by the events that have unfolded during that time. The events may be classed as political in the sense of major decisions taken by both national and international institutions, and intellectual in the sense that human understanding of both natural and social phenomena has changed. The decisions of national ministries of education or of UNESCO are examples of the political events, while scientific discoveries and paradigm changes in geography are examples of intellectual changes.

Focusing on the Commission on Geographical Education, it is possible to see that UNESCO's concern to prevent armed conflict in the Post World War II period affected the Commission's work by financing projects in geography that it hoped would help to develop international understanding among young people, such as the *UNESCO Source Book on Geography Teaching*. Intellectually, however, those concerned with the implementation of the projects were aware of the need to improve the nature of geographical education in schools to move it away from a sterile assimilation of facts to a means of developing observational and spatial thinking skills. Hence much of the work of the Commission under the aegis of UNESCO in the thirty years from 1952 to 1982 whether in Europe, Africa, the Arabic speaking nations, Latin America or Austral-Asia, was concerned with the improvement of the didactics of geography and only marginally with international understanding. This is also true of most of the papers delivered at the Commission's symposia during the four yearly congresses. Here international considerations became evident in the growth of environmental education within geography curricula, and in concerns over population growth. In particular this was manifest in the publication emanating from the Sydney meeting of 1973. National decision-making impacted on the work of the Commission in the sense that members were often involved in national curriculum development projects. They brought to the Commission's work insights acquired from the experimental curricula developed in their own countries. Examples are the High School Geography Project in the USA, directed by Nicholas Helburn, the Schools Council Geography Projects in the UK, one of which was guided by Michael Naish, and the German

Geography Project, directed by Robert Geipel. It is in the work of those projects that the influence of paradigm changes in geography is evident, and is reflected in the Commissions' *New UNESCO Source Book on Geography Teaching* of 1982.

In the twenty years to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> and in the opening years of the 21<sup>st</sup> century the Commission continued to explore the problems of learning geography. These problems were compounded by the development of new technology; so there was an emphasis on computer-assisted learning and of the use of Geographical Information Systems (GIS). There occurred, towards the closing years of that period, a growing realization that the values inherent in the ideas taught in geography, would affect students' attitudes to other nations or ethnic groups. Hence the studies on the language used in geography as well as specific studies of pupils' perceptions and attitudes to other nations. This eventually led to the publication of the *International Charter on Geographical Education* in 1992, which proved a seminal document stressing the international education function of geography. It was to be complemented by the *International Declaration on Geographical Education for Cultural Diversity* in 2000 and by the *Declaration on Geography Education for Sustainable Development* in 2008 thereby making clear the Commission's role in international education.

Inevitably the Commission has had to juggle between the need to bring geography at the school level in line with the development of the discipline at the research frontier and the need to explore learning process in relation to geographical concepts and the interaction between them. This might be called the instrumental functions of the Commission. But as an international body, it has had the social function of helping to foster the use of geography to develop international understanding. In so far as the Commission has promoted international collaboration in the field of geographical education, it has succeeded, manifestly in its sponsorship of IRGEE. The much greater task of promoting genuine worldwide mutual understanding and cooperation is one to which it can contribute but cannot achieve on its own.

## **Commission Members 1952-2012**

### **1952-56**

Neville Scarfe, United Kingdom (Chair)

Tom Batron, USA (Secretary)

### **1956-60**

Benoît Brouillette, Canada (Chair)

René Clozier, France

J Barbag, Poland

Tom Brown, United Kingdom

J Gonzales, Uruguay

### **1960-64**

Benoît Brouillette, Canada (Chair)

René Clozier, France

J Barbag, Poland

Tom Brown, United Kingdom

Hisano Aono, Japan

S P Chatterjee, India

### **1964-68**

Benoît Brouillette, Canada (Chair)

S Birukawa, Japan

Nafis Ahmad, East Pakistan (now Bangladesh) Shokei Birukawa, Japan  
Tom Brown, United Kingdom  
S. V. Kalesnik, USSR  
Henry Warman, USA

### **1968-72**

Ferdinando Gribaudi, Italy (Chair 1968-71) Benoît Brouillette, Canada  
(1971-72)  
Benoît Brouillette, Canada (secretary)  
Norman Graves, United Kingdom  
Ms Irrawady, India  
K Ivanicka, Czechoslovakia

### **1972-76**

Norman Graves, United Kingdom (Chair)  
Benoît Brouillette, Canada  
K Ivanicka, Czechoslovakia  
Clyde Kohn, USA  
Seo E Teo, Singapore  
Juan Vila Valenti, Spain

### **1976-80**

Norman Graves, United Kingdom (Chair)  
Paul Claval, France  
Robert Geipel, German Federal Republic  
Vladimir Maksakovsky, USSR  
Joseph Stoltman, USA  
Juan Vila Valenti, Spain

### **1980-84**

Joseph Stoltman, USA (Chair)  
Norman Graves, United Kingdom  
Kola Ole, Ghana  
Livia Oliveira, Brazil  
Olatunde Okunrotifa, Nigeria

### **1984-88**

Joseph Stoltman, USA (Chair)  
Suresh Garsole, India  
Hartwig Haubrich, Federal Republic of Germany  
Vladimir Maksakovsky, USSR

Lucile Marbeau, France  
Tony Milne, Australia  
Michael Naish, United Kingdom  
Joseph Ouma, Uganda  
Henriette Verdun-Muller, Netherlands

**1988-92**

Hartwig Haubrich, Federal Republic of Germany (Chair)  
Sureh Garsole, India  
Rod Gerber, Australia  
Patricia Green-Milberg, Canada  
Erisa Kyagulanyi, Uganda  
Vladimir Maksakovsky, USSR  
Michael Morrisey, Jamaica  
Michael Naish, United Kingdom  
Julie Okpala, Nigeria  
Savita Sinha, India  
Joseph Stoltman, USA  
Lan-sheng Zhand, People's Republic of China.

**1992-96**

Hartwig Haubrich , Germany (Chair)  
John Lidstone, Australia (Secretary)  
Maryse Clary, France  
Rod Gerber, Australia  
Shuichi Nakayama, Japan  
Michael Naish, United Kingdom  
Julie Okpala, Nigeria  
David Marcio Santos Rodriguez, Brazil  
Joseph Stoltman, USA  
Maria Wilczynska-Woloszyn, Poland  
Lan-sheng Zhang, China

**1996-2000**

Rod Gerber, Australia (Chair)  
John Lidstone, Australia (Secretary)  
Manuela Ferreira, Portugal  
Alexander Kondakov, Russia  
Michael Naish, United Kingdom  
Shuichi Nakayama, Japan  
Julie Okpala, Nigeria  
Josefina Ostuni, Argentina

Mike Smit, Republic of South Africa  
Joseph Stoltman, USA  
Lan-Sheng Zhang, China

**2000-2004**

Lea Houtsonen, Finland (Chair),

John Lidstone, Australia (Vice-Chair),

Margaret Robertson, Australia (Executive Secretary),

Sarah Bednarz, USA

Manuela Ferreira, Portugal

Vladimir Gorbanyov, Russia

Ashley Kent, United Kingdom

Tammy Kwan, China Hong Kong

Christine Kim-Eng Lee, Singapore

William Mngoma, Republic of South Africa

Yasuyuki Nishiwaki, Japan

Josefina Ostuni, Argentina

Honorary Members: Joseph Stoltman and Hartwig Haubrich.

**2004-2008**

Lex Chalmers, New Zealand (Chair)

Manuela Ferreira, Portugal,

Vladimir Gorbanyov, Russia.

Ashley Kent, United Kingdom

Tammy Kwan, China Hong Kong,

Christine Lee, Singapore,

Lea Houtsonen, Finland,

Sibylle Reinfried, Switzerland

Yoshiyasu Ida, Japan,

Wang Min, China,

Joop van der Schee, Netherlands (Chair, Olympiad Committee)

Honorary Members: Joseph Stoltman and Hartwig Haubrich.

**2008-12**

Lex Chalmers, New Zealand (Chair)

Sibylle Reinfried, Switzerland

Ivy Tan, Singapore

Fernando Alexandre, Portugal

Sirpa Tani, Finland

Yoshiyasu, Ida, Japan

Simon Catling, United Kingdom

Michael Solem, USA

Wang Min, China

Oswaldo Muniz-Solari, USA

Joop van der Schee, Netherlands

**2012-16**

Joop van der Schee, Netherlands (Co-chair)

John Lidstone, Australia (Co-chair)

Clare Brooks, United Kingdom (Secretary)

Michael Solem, USA (Treasurer)

Daniela Smeick, Germany

Ali Demerci, Turkey

Fernando Alexandre, Portugal

Oswaldo Muniz Solari, USA

Ivy Tan, Singapore

Sirpa Tani, Finland

Eje Kim, South Korea

Advisory members: Sarah Bednarz, Simon Catling, Joseph Stoltman, Lex Chalmers, Sibylle Reinfried,

## Publications by the Commission

### References

- Biddle, D. S., & Shortle, D. (1969). *Programme Planning in Geography*. West Como: The Martindale Press.
- Birkenhauer, J., & Marsden, W. (Eds.). (1988). *German Didactics of Geography in the Seventies and Eighties. A review of Trends and Endeavours*. Munich: Lehrstuhl für die Didaktik der Geographie.
- Branson, M. S., & Torney-Purta, J. (Eds.). (1982). *International Human Rights, Society and the Schools (NCSS Bulletin No. 68)*. Washington, DC: National Council for the Social Studies.
- Brouillette, B (1960) *Report of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography, XIX International Geographical Congress, Stockholm: Denoyer-Geppert Co*
- Brouillette, B. (Ed. 1965) *Source book for Geography Teaching, London: Unesco/Longmans*
- Brouillette, B (1970) *La Commission de L'union Géographique Internationale (1952-1968), Cahiers de Géographie de Québec IV No 31 avril 1970*
- Brouillette, B., Graves, N. J., & Last, G. (Eds.). (1974). *African Geography for Schools: A Handbook for Teachers* London: Longman/UNESCO.
- Brouillette, B & Vila Valenti, J (1981) *Las Comisiones "La Enseñanza de la Geografía y La Geografía en la Educación de la Unión Geográfica Internacional" , Revista e Geografía 5, 85-107*
- Carnie, J. (1972). Children's Attitudes to other Nationalities. In N. J. Graves (Ed.), *New Movements in the Study and Teaching of Geography*. London: Temple-Smith.
- Chalmers, L. (2012). Congresses, Commissions and Change. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education, 21(3)*, 183-185.
- Clozier, R (1959) *L'enseignement de la géographie et l'adaptation des programmes au niveau mental des élèves, Cahiers de Géographie de Québec V No 9*
- Congrès des Sciences Géographiques, Cosmographiques et Commerciales, (1871)Reports and Proceedings, Antwerp*

- De Miguel, R., Claudino, S. & Souto, X (2016) *La Utopia de la Educacion Geografica en las Declaraciones Internacionales de la U G I, Geocritica XIV Conference, Barcelona, Universidad de Barcelona*
- Demirce, A., Chalmers, L., Yilmaz A, and Lidstone, J. (2010) *Building Bridges between Cultures*, Istanbul: IGU-CGE
- Gerber, R. (2000). International Declaration on Geographical Education for Cultural Diversity Retrieved August 12, 2015, from [http://www.igu-cge.org/charters\\_2.htm](http://www.igu-cge.org/charters_2.htm)
- Gerber, R., & Lidstone, J. (Eds.). (1988). *Developing Skills in Geographical Education*. Brisbane: IGU and Jacaranda Press.
- Gerber, R. (2000) *International Declaration on Geographical Education for Cultural Diversity* from [http://www.igu-cge.org/charters\\_2.htm](http://www.igu-cge.org/charters_2.htm)
- Gerber, R. (Ed.). (2003). *International Handbook on Geographical Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Graves, N. J. (Ed.). (1975). *Teaching Materials on Population, International Understanding and Environmental Education*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Graves, N. J. (1979). *Curriculum Planning in Geography*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.
- Graves, Norman J (Ed. 1979) *Geographical Education: Curriculum Problems in Certain European Countries with special reference to the 16-19 Age Group*, London: University of London Institute of Education
- Graves, N. J. (Ed.). (1982). *New UNESCO Source Book for Geography Teaching*. Paris: Unesco.
- Graves, Norman (1883) *The Falklands or Las Malvinas: an Issue in Political Geography, Journal of Geography, Vol. 82, 3*
- Graves, N. J. (Ed.). (1984a). *Computer Assisted Learning in Geographical Education*. London: University of London Institute of Education.
- Graves, N. J. (Ed.). (1984b). *Research and Research Methods in Geographical Education*. London: University of London Institute of Education.
- Graves, N. J., Dunlop, O. J., & Torney-Purta, J. V. (Eds.). (1984c). *Teaching for International Understanding, Peace and Human Rights*. Paris: UNESCO.
- Graves, N. J. (Ed.). (1987). *Land, Water and Mineral Resources in Science Education*. Oxford: ICSU/Pergamon Press.
- Haubrich, H. (Ed.) (1982) *International Focus on Geographical Education*, Braunschweig: Westermann
- Haubrich, H. (1984) *Perceptions of People and Places through Media*, Freiburg: Paedagogische Hochschule Freiburg
- Haubrich, H. (Ed.). (1987). *International Trends in Geographical Education*. Freiburg: Hochschule Freiburg.
- Haubrich, H. (1992). *International Charter on Geographical Education*. Freiburg, Germany: Paedagogische Hochschule Freiburg
- Haubrich, H. (Ed.). (1994). *Europe and the World in Geography Education: Papers from the International Geographical Union Commission on Geographical Education*

- in Berlin and Prague. Nürnberg: Hochschulverband für Geographie und ihre Didaktik.
- Haubrich, H. (1997) Europawahrnehmung Jugendlicher Eine Befragung Studierender In 21 europäischen Ländern mit geographiedidaktischen Konsequenzen, *Geographiedidaktische Forschungen*, Bd 29 Neurnburg, 192, Seiten
- Haubrich, H. (2006). Changing Philosophies in Geographical Education from the 1970s to 2005: An International Perspective. In J. Lidstone & M. Williams (Eds.), *Geographic Education in a Changing World: Past Experience, Current Trends and Future Challenges* (pp. 39-53). Sydney: Springer
- Haubrich, H. Reifried, S. & Schleicher, Y. (2007) *Lucerne Declaration on Teaching Geography for Sustainable Development* in Reinfried, S., Schleicher, Y., & Rempfler, A. (2007). Geographical Views on Education for Sustainable Development: Proceedings of the Lucerne Symposium, Switzerland, July 29-31 *Geographiedidaktische Forschungen*, 42, 243-250.
- Hernando, A. (1986) *Geographical Education and Society*, Barcelona: Universidate de Barcelona
- Hill, A. D. (Ed.). (1992). *International Perspectives on Geographic Education*. Boulder, CO: Center for Geographic Education, Department of Geography.
- Houtsonen, L. (1988). The Reform of Geography Teaching in the Finnish Upper Secondary School and its Reflection in the Matriculation Examinations of 1976-1985. *Fennia*, 166(2), 413-570.
- Houtsonen, L. (2003). Maximizing the use of communications technologies in geographical education. In R. E. Gerber (Ed.), *Interntional Handbook on Geographical Education*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- IGU-CGE Editors, Demirci, A., Chalmers, L., Yilmaz, A., & Lidstone, J. (2010). *Building Bridges Between Cultures*. Paper presented at the International Geographical Union Commission on Geography Education July 8-20, 2015, Istanbul.
- International Geographical Union. (1952). Report of the Commission on the Teaching of Geography. Washington, DC: 17th International Geographical Congress.
- Jahoda, G. (1963). The development of children's ideas about country and nationality. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 33, 47-60.
- Jahoda, G. (1964). Children's concept of nationality: A critical study of Piaget's stages. *Child Development*, 35, 1081-1095.
- Joint Committee on Geographic Education of the National Council for Geographic Education and the Association of American Geographers. (1984). *Guidelines for Geographic Education*. Washington, DC: Association of American Geographers.
- Kent, A., Robinson, A., & Rawling, E. (Eds.). (2004). *Expanding Horizons in a Shrinking World*. Glasgow: IGUCDE/Scottish Association of Geography Teachers.
- Kim, R. K. (1972). Report by RK Kim to Assistant Director-General for Education UNESCO, Mission to Singapore 18-24 September 1972. Paris: UNESCO.
- Kim, R. K. (1973). Extract of speech by Ryon Kwan Kim at the Sydney meeting.
- Kish, G. (1992). International Geographical Union: A Brief History. *GeoJournal*, 26(2), 224-228.
- Lambert, W. E., & Klineberg, O. (1967). *Children's Views of Foreign People*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts

- Lappalainen, A., Godenhjelm, M., Houtsonen, L., Malmberg, H., & Smirnova, L. (2000). Finnish-NW Russian Environmental Education in St Petersburg: the Starting Phase of an Action-Research Project. In S. Jackson (Ed.), *Geography and Environmental Education: International Perspectives*. London: Institute of Education.
- Lidstone, J., & Williams, M. (Eds.). (2006). *Geographical Education in a Changing World: Past Experience, Current Trends and Future Challenges*. Dordrecht, NL: Springer.
- Marsden, W. E. (Ed.). (1984). *Teacher Education Models in Geography: An International Comparison*. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Press.
- Mehlinger, H. D. (Ed.). (1981). *UNESCO Handbook for the Teaching of Social Studies*. London: Croom Helm.
- Naish, M. (Ed.). (1997). *Values in Geography Education*. London: Institute of Education.
- Newcombe, N. S. and Stieff, M. (2012) Six Myths about Spatial Thinking, *International Journal of Science Education* Vol. 34 No 6
- Piaget, J., & Weil, A. (1951). The Development in Children of the Idea of Homeland and of Relations with Other Countries. *International Social Science Journal*, 3(3), 561.
- Pike, L., W. , Barrows, T. S., Mahoney, M. H., & Jungeblut, A. (1979). *Other Nations, Other Peoples: a survey of student interests, knowledge, attitudes, and perceptions*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, for Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education.
- Reinfried, S. (2009). Education for sustainable development and the Lucerne Declaration. Guest Editorial. *International Research in Geographical and Environmental Education*, 18(4), 229-232.
- Robertson, M. E. (2007). *Sustainable Futures*. Melbourne: Acer Press
- Saveland, R. (1980). *Place Vocabulary Research Project*. Geography Curriculum Project, University of Georgia. Athens, GA.
- Slater, F., & Spicer, B. (Eds.). (1980). *Perception and Preference Studies at the International Level*. Monash: A.I.P. Publication.
- Slater, F. A. (1989). *Language and Learning in the Teaching of Geography*. London: Routledge.
- Stoltman, J. P. (1976a, August 20 ). [A conversation with Neville Scarfe].
- Stoltman, J P (Ed. 1976b) *International Research in Geographical Education*, Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University Department of Geography
- Stoltman, J. P. (1977). Children's conceptions of space and territorial relationships. *Social Education*, 41(2), 142-145.
- Stoltman, J. P. (1983). Conference on Computer-Assisted Learning in Geography. *Journal of Geography*, 82(6), 280-281.
- Thomas, A. (1932). International Understanding Through the Teaching of Geography. *Education*, 52(5).
- Tyler, R. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- UNESCO Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (1945).

- UNESCO (1949) *Some Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography, Towards World Understanding VII* Paris:Unesco
- UNESCO. (1951). *A Handbook of Suggestions on the Teaching of Geography*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO (Ed.). (1965). *Unesco Source Book for Geography Teaching*. London: Longmans/UNESCO.
- UNESCO (1968)*Réunion d'Experts Géographes de Pays Africains*, Accra: Unesco /CS/112/6
- UNESCO, U. (1969). Meeting of Arab Expert Geographers on the Teaching of Geography in the Arab World: Final Report and Recommendations. Cairo: Arab Record Press.
- UNESCO. (1974). *Recommendation concerning Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms*. Paris: UNESCO.
- UNESCO/Teide. (1976). *Geografia de America Latina: Metodos y Temas Monograficos*. Coleccion: UNESCO
- UNESCO. (2005). United Nations Decade of Educational for Sustainable Development Retrieved October 24, 2012, from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0014/001416/141629e.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2007). The UN Decade of Education for Sustainable Development: 2005-2014 (The First Two Years) Retrieved August 15, 2015
- .United Nations Earth Summit. (1992). UN Conference On Environment and Development Retrieved August 14, 2015, from <http://www.un.org/geninfo/bp/enviro.html>
- United Nations, (2002). Johannesburg Summit 2002 Retrieved August 14, 2015, from [http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/basic\\_info/basicinfo.html](http://www.johannesburgsummit.org/html/basic_info/basicinfo.html)
- Van Der Schee, J., Schoenmaker, G., Trimp, H., & Van Westrhenen, H. (Eds.). (1996). *Innovation in Geographical Education*. Utrechr/Amsterdam: Centrum voor Educatieve Geografie Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.