

THE AIM IN TEACHING FOREIGN GEOGRAPHY
HERMAN T. LUKENS, FRANCIS W. PARKER SCHOOL,
CHICAGO

Traveling is likely in the future to become increasingly frequent, as governments will cease to hinder and will begin to recognize that it is to the public interest for more people to meet and mingle with those of other nations. Seeing this, the authorities will begin to aid travelers to remove natural obstacles, instead of putting artificial ones in our way.

The greatest need for all travelers is knowledge of every kind. He who knows the most before he starts will learn the most on the way. Over the door of the Union Station in Washington is this inscription: "He who would obtain the wealth of the Indies must carry it with him to the Indies."

2. The study of foreign peoples should develop the appreciation of the real brotherhood of mankind, our mutual interests, and our true interdependence.

3. The course should make plain and rather dwell upon points in which other peoples excel our own. There should be much comparison of natural resources, climate, and manufactures. Our geographies make the United States too much the center of the world and minimize the relative importance of other countries. It does us good, therefore, to get hold of a British atlas, or to refer to a Japanese chart, or a German guide book, or a French or Dutch colonial publication with a different world view. It is something to stir us out of narrowness to realize that every new day starts in Japan, while Europe and, later still, America are finishing up the preceding day.

4. Differences of religion, custom, and faith should be presented without bias or prejudice, as likewise differences in climate, dress, resources, and manufactures. Somehow or other, most of our pupils get the idea that foreigners are ignorant and stupid, inferior to ourselves in ability and inheritance. Perhaps ninety percent of what we teach about other races involves the assumption that they are inferior to our own, and is more cal-

culated to instill prejudice than to lay the foundation for mutual understanding.

5. All of our ideas of the shapes of countries come from maps and models, and likewise nearly all our ideas of their size. While, however, we learn the shapes correctly, we fail woefully in getting a correct idea of the relative or the actual size of foreign countries or of distances between places. This is due directly to having such a variety of scales to our maps that our resultant memory image has shape only, but no scale by which we can calculate or think size adequately.

To most of us, our Western States are thought of as too small and New England as too large; we think Great Britain as relatively too large and Russia as too small. Europe is too large and Asia is too small in our mental map to enable us to make true comparisons. For illustration, Missouri and Washington are each larger than all of New England, but do they seem to have that size in our thought? The Yellowstone National Park is about the size of Porto Rico and is larger than Rhode Island and Delaware combined. Java has the same area as England, and Ceylon is half as large. Maine is larger than Ireland. New Zealand is considerably larger than the Island of Great Britain, with England, Scotland, and Wales. Formosa is larger than either Maryland or Holland. Borneo is larger than Texas. India stretches as far as from the mouth of the Chesapeake to Panama. Korea is larger than either Idaho, Minnesota, or Utah. From Peking to Canton, China, it is about as far as from Duluth to New Orleans.

How many of us think of these countries in their true size? It is a great deal as tho we used a pair of field glasses in looking at part of the earth's surface and then reversed the glasses and looked thru the other end at other countries. It is thru this sense impression from maps of varying scales that our minds are furnished with memory images that are inconsistent with reality. The scale of the maps in our atlases and on our wall charts is determined chiefly by the convenience of the printer and the cost in making the pages of uniform size and therefore of varying scale. The

price we pay is utter confusion in our source impression of size.

Scales should be standardized into one uniform set of scales, easily transferable from one into another; e.g. 100 miles to an inch, 50 miles to an inch, 20 miles to an inch, 10 miles to an inch, and 1 mile to an inch. It should be possible to get a map of any country in any of the standard scales. This would make possible direct comparison of size by superposition of the maps. Such scales as $6\frac{1}{2}$ miles to an inch and $22\frac{1}{2}$ miles to an inch, simply should not be used, because the distances on such a map will not be translated into miles. Recent publications are moving in this direction, but confusing scales are still very abundant.