

Equalization and Educational Totalitarianism

Shin Joong Sop

Abstract

Although high school equalization in Korea has caused ceaseless debates during the last 30 years, a societal consensus has not yet been reached. Since both stances toward the high school equalization system have their own compelling arguments, it is hard to expect this issue to be resolved through logical-empirical debates. One possible solution would be to make both the equalization system and a system of inequality coexist, rather than select one over the other. By giving up on the goal of having either a complete system of equalization or inequality, we may find that the solution lies in allowing schools to make their own choices. In order to expand the freedom of educational choice, schools should first be independently empowered to make decisions about the establishment of schools, entrance exam management, and curriculum. Government control is only justifiable when it is exercised across a variety of schools and for the purpose of securing student and parental choice, as well as for the expansion of schools themselves. Along these lines, debates on the equalization policy should be developed in more fundamental and practical terms.

Keywords: equalization, educational totalitarianism, educational welfare, educational equality, freedom of education, non-zero-sum game

Shin Joong Sop (Sin, Jung-seop) is Professor of Western Philosophy at Kangwon National University. He has published numerous books and articles, including *Popper-wa hyeondae-ui gwahak cheolhak* (Popper and Modern Philosophy of Science) (1992), *Yeollin sahoe iyagi* (Stories of Open Society) (1997), and *Yeollin gyoyuk-gwa yeollin sahoe* (Open Education and Open Society) (2000). E-mail: joongsop@kangwon.ac.kr.

Introduction

Education has always held a special place in Koreans' dreams, as it has provided an avenue to better living conditions. In particular, graduation from a prestigious school has been seen as a means of moving up the social ladder, gaining a better job, and enjoying a better life. Korean parents, whose hopes have rested on their children having better lives than they had, have been passionate about educating their children. In most cases, these expectations and passions have been well rewarded. In a nutshell, education has been seen as the vehicle for the achievement of Koreans' hopes and dreams.

In addition, education has been seen as a medium for the state to accomplish its own goals. (This was true not only at the individual level, but also at the state level.) The Korean peninsula, a region with very few resources except for its human ones, has been home to people who have long regarded education as a means of overcoming national crises and of building a better country. The recent elevation of the minister of Education and Human Resources Development to the position of deputy prime minister for policy coordination clearly illustrates the nature of the South Korean state's educational vision. However, this educational vision is not a new phenomenon. In fact, following the Gabo Reforms in 1894, the Joseon government announced the introduction of modern education to its people:

Things have changed drastically. Although there is an urgent need to reform the entire system, the education of elite students has become the most important task. For this reason, the government has decided to establish, beginning in Seoul, elementary schools and normal schools. All those of the proper age, whether they are from the high class or the working class, should attend these schools and study day and night. Because these schools aim to educate the human resources who will save our nation and take charge of the administration and diplomacy of the state, this is a good opportunity for our youngsters. In the future, the government also intends to establish universities and colleges. Any person of resolution should not abandon the great will to establish a new era of

prosperity by putting his or her mind and soul into learning (Son 1998, 248-249).

In February 1895, the Joseon government announced the Edict of Educational Reform (*gyoyuk ipguk joseo*), which was intended to establish a strong state through education. One portion of this edict reads as follows:

When one looks at the state of affairs in the world, one finds that in all those nations that maintain their independence through wealth and power and thus have gained ascendancy, the citizens are enlightened in their knowledge. Enlightened knowledge is attained through excellence of education, and so education truly is of fundamental importance in preserving our nation.

On 12 May 1896, the *Dongnip sinmun* (The Independent) also emphasized the importance of education:

It is a task of the utmost importance for the government to educate the public. As such, the government should place public education ahead of all other affairs. Currently, our country is weak and underdeveloped and disdained by other countries. However, Korea will become as strong as other countries when the government educates its people. . . . To educate children is just like planting seeds in spring. Any parents who desire to harvest in autumn should regard the education of their children as the planting of seeds in spring.

As part of this new emphasis on education, the Joseon government established public schools, including the Hanseong Normal School, foreign language institutes, and judiciary training institutes in 1895; the Gyeongseong Medical School in 1899; the Hanseong High School in 1900; the Agricultural and Commerce School in 1904; and the Hanseong Girls' High School in 1908.

Nevertheless, a closer look at the history of the development of modern Korean schools reveals that private schools were established

much earlier than public ones. At the end of the Joseon period, many private schools were established by individuals and associations. For example, the very first private school, the Wonsan Academy, was founded in 1883 by influential people from the Deogwon area. By the time the Japanese had annexed Korea in 1910, approximately 3,000 private schools had been established. Therefore, it would be fair to argue that the national passion for education began as a result of the actions of the private sector and not those of the government. In time, this passion for education served as the basis for the modernization of the country. Samuel P. Huntington has pointed out that one of the main reasons why the gap between Ghana and South Korea, two countries that were essentially at the same developmental level at the beginning of the 1960s, had become so large a mere 30 years later, with Korea becoming a developed country while Ghana remained underdeveloped, was Koreans' passion for education (Harrison and Huntington 2000).

As South Korea's national economy has grown, so have the South Korean government's expenditures on education. Moreover, South Korea has also undergone a remarkable improvement in educational conditions, which has been exemplified by decreases in the average size of classes and in the ratio of students per teacher. The average number of high school students per class, which was 59.8 in 1980, dropped to 33.5 by 2002. Moreover, the number of high school students per teacher, which was 33.5 in 1980, dropped to 15.7 by 2002. Also, public education expenditures have increased remarkably (KEDI 2003). Nonetheless, many problems continue to plague the South Korean education system, a phenomenon clearly evidenced by the growing number of complaints lodged by teachers, parents, and students. More concretely, although the government has implemented many educational reforms, including reforms to the university entrance exam system, critics note that private education is growing more rampant, students' academic achievements are declining, the gap between social classes is increasing, and national competitiveness is deteriorating. Education used to be seen by Koreans as the vehicle through which people's hopes and dreams could be achieved,

but it is no longer perceived in this manner.¹ What is the root cause of the current educational problems?

Equalization and Empirical Analysis

As mentioned above, the High School Equalization Policy has been the subject of many debates. When the equalization policy was first put into operation, it had clear policy objectives. However, the core of the debate has changed over time. In order to develop a clear understanding of the core of this debate, we must first clearly spell out the contentious issues that have arisen in conjunction with this policy. These issues include: 1) educational equality; 2) the possible disruption of communal harmony and the creation of a sense of inferiority among students because of the advent of a high school ranking system; 3) the gap between social classes; 4) freedom of educational choice; 5) the autonomy of educational actors; 6) the lowering of students' levels of academic achievements; and 7) excessive private tutoring. Those who believe that education plays a significant role in bringing about social equality argue that South Korea should leave the High School Equalization Policy in place to prevent both the possible disruption of communal harmony and the rise of an inferiority complex among students, to decrease the gap between social classes, and to improve students' achievement levels, all while striving to reduce dependence on private tutoring. Meanwhile, those who favor educational freedom argue that South Korea should abolish the High School Equalization Policy in order to preserve freedom of edu-

1. Choe Jang-jip makes the following point:

I think Korean society has become qualitatively worse since the advent of democracy. The unequal social structure among classes has rapidly become worse. Moreover, opportunities to improve one's standing in society, which in the past could be achieved through education and hard work, have rapidly decreased. Concerns about a reality, in which a high-class culture has developed in the Gangnam area and educational opportunities have been proportionate to one's income levels, have spread (Choe 2002, 5).

cational choice and the autonomy of educational actors, guarantee social autonomy, heighten students' academic achievement levels, and ease both the dependence on private tutoring and the gap between social classes. In essence, the core of the debate over the High School Equalization Policy boils down to the issues of equality and freedom of education.

The following conclusions can be drawn from the above-mentioned seven contentious issues: while the High School Equalization Policy has contributed to growth in educational equality and to a reduction in both the possible disruption of communal harmony and the emergence of a sense of inferiority among students, non-equalization has guaranteed freedom of educational choice and heightened the autonomy of educational actors.

Everyone, regardless of whether or not they support the equalization policy, would agree on the need to heighten students' academic achievement levels, resolve the private tutoring problem, and ease the gap between social classes. However, many studies have concluded that the relationship between equalization and the above-mentioned factors is not only a logical one, but one that can be empirically proven. As a result of these studies, heated discussions have been held on the subject of the relationship between equalization and students' academic achievement levels and on the relationship between equalization and the gap between social classes.

Equalization and Students' Academic Achievement Levels

The relationship between equalization and students' academic achievement levels has led to heated debates between those who support the equalization policy and those who do not. This debate has often taken the following form: if equalization has in fact caused a lowering of students' academic achievement levels, then the equalization policy is no longer justified; on the contrary, if there is no relationship between equalization and the lowering of students' academic achievement levels, then the equalization policy should remain in place. However, this particular argument is problematic in two

regards. First of all, such an argument is based on the assumption that all Koreans would agree that the equalization policy should be maintained or abolished according to whether students' academic achievement levels have risen or fallen. In reality, such an agreement is highly unlikely. Second, the exact relationship between equalization and students' academic achievement levels is very hard to prove.

The difficulty raised above is clearly evidenced by the fact that different studies have reached different conclusions about the relationship between equalization and students' academic achievement levels. Thus, although the Korean Educational Development Institute (KEDI) has maintained that the academic achievement levels of students from equalized areas were higher than those from non-equalized areas, these findings were contradicted by a report published by the Korea Development Institute (KDI), which concluded that equalization has caused a drop in students' academic achievement levels. Therefore, although these two government-funded research institutes based their studies on the same materials—the “national assessment of educational achievement” compiled by the Korea Institute of Curriculum and Evaluation—the results were diametrically opposite each other.

In the study carried out by KEDI, the academic levels of elite students from equalized areas and of those from non-equalized areas were found to be essentially the same. Moreover, the overall academic achievement level of students from equalized areas was found to be comparatively higher than that of students from non-equalized areas—a finding that runs counter to the argument that students' academic achievement levels have been lowered as a result of the introduction of the equalization policy. However, a caveat should be added to this study, as the argument can easily be made that these differences in academic achievement levels have not been caused by equalization or non-equalization. As the great majority of the equalized areas used in the study were in metropolitan centers, and as the non-equalized areas were composed mostly of smaller cities and agricultural regions, the argument could also be made that regional differences have been the decisive factor determining students' academ-

ic achievement levels. Moreover, as parents' academic backgrounds influence students' academic achievement levels, the argument that equalization actually influences students' academic achievement levels is rendered even more tenuous by the fact that parents who reside in equalized areas have comparatively better academic backgrounds than their counterparts in non-equalized ones. Thus, because the educational environment and family background of students from agricultural areas (where the great majority of non-equalized areas are situated) are not as favorable as those enjoyed by students residing in metropolitan areas (home to most of the equalized areas), the cultural gap between urban and rural areas should also be considered in any comprehensive discussion of students' academic achievement levels (Yun 2003, 7).

In order to develop a persuasive analysis of the role that equalization has played in students' academic achievement levels, a researcher should form two experimental groups of identical conditions and have one group operate under an equalized system and the other under a non-equalized one. So that a reasonable comparison on the role of equalization can be arrived at, other variables used in these studies should be identical. However, to date, no study has been carried out that satisfies these conditions. In fact, meeting such conditions is nearly impossible. A more reliable method of identifying the influence of equalization on students' academic achievement levels would involve comparisons of academic results in the same area before and after equalization was implemented. However, the accuracy of this method would also be decreased if variables changed during the experimental period. Therefore, the existence of a relationship between equalization and students' academic achievement levels is very difficult to empirically prove. Even if such a method could be developed, it would be very difficult to abolish the equalization policy on the sole basis of an increase or a decrease in students' academic achievement levels. In addition, people who support the equalization policy typically ground their arguments in the philosophy of educational equality, not in the logic of improvements in students' academic achievement levels.

Equalization and the Gap between Social Classes

In January 2004, the Center for Social Sciences at Seoul National University published a report entitled “Changes in the Entrance Exam System: Who Attends Seoul National University?” This report’s findings about the exact nature of the relationship between equalization and the gap between social classes have led to many arguments between those who support the equalization policy and those who oppose it. The main findings of this report can be summarized as follows:

- 1) Parents’ academic backgrounds and income levels have a great influence on students’ scores on the entrance exam.
- 2) The difference in the ratios of students from high- and low-income backgrounds who enter Seoul National University has increased.
- 3) The equalization policy not only has failed to prepare for this tendency, but has actually played a direct role in bringing it about.

While all agree on the veracity of the first two of these findings, much debate has emerged over the third one. Those in favor of abolishing the policy assert that because equalization has preserved the cycle of wealth and has increased the gap between social classes, the solution to these problems is to end the equalization policy. This group maintains that because equalization has resulted in a drop in the quality of the education offered in schools, people have had to depend on private tutoring in order to enter prestigious schools such as Seoul National University. Moreover, equalization is considered to put students from the working class at a distinct disadvantage, while giving students from high-income families, who can afford to make up for the poor quality of the education offered in schools by seeking out private tutoring, an unfair advantage in the competition to enter prestigious schools. Therefore, if equalization were abolished, gifted students from low-income backgrounds could gain access to high-quality education, which in turn would increase their chances of

entering prestigious schools. Therefore, the conclusion made by this group is that the equalization policy puts students from low-income families at a marked disadvantage.

However, this conclusion is widely rejected by those who support the equalization policy (Korea Teachers’ Union 2004). Rather, they argue that the Center for Social Sciences’ report, by showing how students from high-income classes who attend Gangnam’s prestigious school districts have monopolized admissions to Seoul National University, simply proves how deeply ingrained both the cycle of wealth and the gap between social classes have become. Moreover, according to these policy supporters, the report proves that the deep-rooted phenomenon in which one’s social class is determined according to educational background should no longer be ignored. Ever since the Constitutional Court ruled that a law banning extracurricular tutoring was unconstitutional, out-of-control tutoring—not equalization—has created this phenomenon in which educational background determines one’s social class. Therefore, this report should not be used as the basis for any decision either to abolish or to preserve the equalization policy.

It is further argued by supporters of the policy that private tutoring has been caused largely by the difficult nature of the College Scholastic Ability Test (CSAT, or *suhak neungnyeok siheom*), the South Korean scholastic aptitude test for college entrance. Thus, in order to resolve these problems, South Korea should normalize school education by introducing standardized entrance exams, thus doing away with the unreasonably difficult CSAT that spurs the demand for private tutoring in the first place. Additionally, the importance given to the results of the CSAT in the university entrance exam should be reduced so that dependency on private tutoring can be eased. The policy’s supporters ultimately argue that, because the abolition of the equalization policy would not help to normalize school education, the equalization policy should be maintained.

Supporters of the equalization policy argue that independent private high schools and specialized schools, which were set up to

address some of the shortcomings of the equalization policy, have been monopolized by students from high-income backgrounds. In essence, because these schools have deepened the problem wherein educational background determines social class, they cannot be considered countermeasures that compensate for the weak points in the current equalized education system. Furthermore, this group argues that, because students wishing to enter these private and specialized schools must turn to expensive private tutoring from as early as elementary school, the logical outcome of increasing the number of these schools would be both the spread of the entrance exam competition to the elementary school level and, concurrently, a marked increase in private tutoring expenses. Consequently, the abolition of the equalization policy would reduce the opportunities for students from the working class to gain access to higher education, increase the gap between social classes, and eventually destroy the public education system.

As can be seen above, the same data has been used to reach totally different conclusions. Which of these arguments should be given more weight is indeed a very difficult question to answer, given the fact that various factors have influenced the gap between social classes. Therefore, it is impossible to determine just how large the role of the equalization policy has been in forming and maintaining this gap. So the arguments presented by the Korean Teachers Union cannot be dismissed out of hand. However, questions can be raised as to whether the prevention of the gap between social classes, which the Korea Teachers' Union regards as its primary objective, should be considered the most important factor when considering ways to reform the education system. In this regard, the objectives of education should be clearly spelled out. If the objective of education is not to decrease the gap between social classes but to allow students to develop their personalities—or their potential abilities—in order to create the human resources required by society, then the goal of easing the gap between social classes through alterations to the entrance exam system is a misguided one.

Because it is difficult to forge a general consensus on the mean-

ing of the results of such studies, it is highly unlikely that the equalization policy will be abolished on the basis of empirical studies that focus on students' academic achievement levels, private tutoring, or the gap between social classes. Moreover, even if such a consensus were reached, some difficulties would remain. For example, a decision regarding whether or not to abolish the equalization policy would be hard to reach if equalization were found not only to have contributed to growth in students' academic achievement levels but also to have both increased the dependence on private tutoring and deepened the gap between social classes. In other words, these three factors can generate various conclusions. Moreover, there are other factors, in addition to the three mentioned above, that could be included in the evaluation of the equalization policy. Given the wide range of conclusions that can be drawn from these results, the decision to maintain or abolish the equalization policy cannot be made on the basis of such empirical studies.

Educational Welfare and Equality

South Korea established the High School Equalization Policy in order to ease the gap between school units by equalizing high school educational conditions, provide students with equal educational opportunities, and achieve educational equality in due time. The core of the equalization policy has been to equalize educational conditions and students' academic achievement levels. In other words, all high schools should have the same educational conditions, and no major variations should appear in terms of the students' academic achievement levels. In this regard, two interpretations of the High School Equalization Policy have emerged: the "rigid" interpretation and the "loose" one. The rigid interpretation holds that the equalization policy should provide the same education for all students. The loose interpretation defines equalization policy as providing all students with an equal opportunity to receive an education.

Viewed in terms of the rigid interpretation, the objective of

equalization is to provide all students with the same education regardless of any differences in students' academic abilities or in the economic resources available to parents. On the other hand, when viewed in terms of the loose interpretation, equalization is understood to mean that each student can receive a different education according to his or her academic ability or economic situation. Thus, in order to meet the objectives allowed for in the loose interpretation, even students unable to cover the necessary educational expenses should have access to an education that is guaranteed by increased government expenditures on public education. Put differently, the rigid interpretation is concerned with educational equality whereas the loose interpretation deals with educational welfare. These are two totally different concepts, as educational equality means that the state provides all students with an identical education free of cost, whereas educational welfare means that the state provides all students with a basic education at no cost. Therefore, at the educational welfare level, policymaking measures should be established to guarantee that students from low-income households are not marginalized. The opportunity to receive an education should be granted to students from educationally marginalized areas, such as regions heavily dependent on farming and fishing, remote island areas, and urban low-income residential areas, with the state guaranteeing every student's right to a basic education.

Thus, if we understand equalization to mean educational welfare, then the state's role is to guarantee that all students have access to a basic education. Under such a scenario, it is not problematic that students from a more privileged economic background are provided better educational conditions. If the focus is on educational welfare, the important thing is the state's task to improve the level of the basic education provided, and it is irrelevant that students from more privileged economic backgrounds would obtain a comparatively better education by bearing all the expenses of such an education.

However, in Korean society, equalization has generally been taken to mean educational equality. People who understand equalization to mean educational equality argue that South Korea's existing

education system, by concentrating excessively on improvements in competitiveness and productivity, has already damaged educational equality and social integration. These people would argue that, under such circumstances, social equality and integration can only be worsened if the equalization policy is abolished.

In a knowledge-based society, according to equalization policy supporters, educational inequality is directly connected to socioeconomic inequality, and parents' economic resources more often than not wind up determining the quality of the education that their children receive, as well as the length of their studies. Therefore, this structure of educational inequality significantly worsens when parents are free to choose the school of their liking. Those people who understand *equalization* to mean educational equality maintain that such problems can be overcome if equality, in terms of educational opportunity, is guaranteed.

The Democratic Labor Party (DLP) sees the High School Equalization Policy as a minimal tool with which to achieve educational equality and social integration. The DLP has asserted that if the High School Equalization Policy were abolished, the existing hierarchy of schools would aggravate the entrance exam competition. Moreover, the DLP has contended that if this policy were abolished, expenses for private tutoring would rapidly increase, and the public school curriculum would collapse, thus resulting in serious social problems. In an attempt to improve the equalization policy, the DLP has introduced the following alternatives:

- A policy shift from formal and partial equalization to true equalization; in other words, the introduction of a qualitatively improved equalization policy
- The introduction of the equalization policy into non-equalized areas as soon as possible
- Abolishment of independent private high schools, foreign language schools, specialized schools, and autonomous schools
- In the case of science schools, art and physical education schools, and specialized high schools, South Korea should fund research

aimed at ascertaining the appropriate number of such school units, and educational curriculums accommodating the original objectives of these high schools should be implemented. Finally, these schools should be restructured so that, in the long-term, only small numbers of elite students are accommodated.

The DLP has also demanded that Seoul National University be closed, national and public universities be integrated, and the CSAT be done away with.

What is the ideological background behind the DLP's arguments? Succinctly put, the DLP's objectives are to use equalization to overthrow credentialism and remove the gaps between regions and social classes. The DLP intends to decrease the influence that parents' economic resources have on the education that students receive and to prevent credentialism from determining where students will wind up after graduation. The DLP's educational policy is based on the notion of educational equality. As students' and parents' ability to choose schools is derived largely from parents' economic capabilities, the DLP's approach would block the right to school choice in order to guarantee that all students receive the same educational opportunities. Accordingly, the DLP's policy is to use education as a tool with which to achieve their larger goal of overall socioeconomic equality, a policy that goes well beyond the realms of education.

The equality sought by the DLP cannot possibly be realized outside a totalitarian state. Equalization cannot be used as a means of achieving complete educational equality or equality in terms of academic results. Because human beings have different talents and live in diverse social environments, it is impossible for governmental authority to ensure that similar academic results can be achieved across the board. Regardless of this reality, South Korea continues to use equalization as a means of achieving educational equality. As a result, many problems have emerged.

Education Is Not a Zero-Sum Game

Koreans have traditionally exhibited a tendency to concentrate their economic resources on the education of their children. The decision of where to invest one's fortune belongs to the realm of private judgment and should be understood as a part of economic freedom, which would dictate that no society or state can decide people's consumption priorities. If a state does choose to ignore individual decisions and set people's consumption priorities, then it could be understood to be a totalitarian one. In such a society, because natural differences cannot automatically be evened out, the state has no choice but to intervene.

Many of the problems that the South Korean educational system faces have been caused by the government-led educational system. South Korean education has been controlled by a centralized management system, not by each educational actor's voluntary willingness to cooperate with every other actor. In fact, the High School Equalization Policy could only be implemented in the first place because the centralized government controlled the education sector. In other words, the High School Equalization Policy has been the result of a totalitarian government's educational policy. Because democracy has now been consolidated in South Korea, the abolishment of such a system would appear to be a natural development.

However, in order to ease the impact that the abolition of the equalization policy might have, a gradual abolishment method should be introduced. So that students' and parents' school choice can be strengthened, the number of independent private high schools and specialized high schools, which have now tentatively been in action and whose basic institutional framework has been established, should be increased. Also, private schools should be granted more autonomy in terms of school management. In reality, independent private high schools in tentative operation are tied down by many regulations, so their independence is merely nominal. The government should therefore either deregulate these schools and provide them with autonomous rights or provide regular high schools with

the right to decide whether to implement the equalization policy or not. If we continue to argue that only equalization, or conversely non-equalization, be allowed in the educational sector, then the current educational problems will prove very difficult to resolve. The simple fact of the matter is that there is no need for such a choice to be made, as both systems can easily function alongside one another.

Presently, as the central government continues to thoroughly control the educational sector, various forms of education based on autonomy, creativity, and reform cannot be developed at the level of the individual school. All schools nationwide have been managed according to a standardized school management system, administrative structure, and educational curriculum. Under such circumstances, educational diversity can hardly be expected, nor can educational actors be expected to display their autonomy or a sense of responsibility.

All South Korean elementary, middle, and high school students have been educated with the same textbooks. This means that parents who have exercised school choice by relocating to other areas have in reality seen no actual differences in the quality of the education their children have received. Schools have been managed in the same way that administrative offices and police stations have been—according to a standardized system.

To increase educational freedom, schools should be granted the right to make their own decisions when it comes to their establishment and management, as well as to matters related to their entrance exams and educational curriculum. Even if we assume that the government, in order to cultivate a national identity, should provide all students with some compulsory education, this policy should be minimized. Only when various kinds of school units are allowed to exist can we speak of students and parents having any real school choice. Giving people the option to choose between schools that are practically the same does not represent much of a choice at all. Government control can be justified only when it is used to guarantee or even increase school diversity, as well as parents' and students' school choice. Therefore, debates over the High School Equalization

Policy should be carried out at a more fundamental level in consideration of the basic objectives of education.

In order to improve the quality of education offered in schools, South Koreans must provide parents and students with information about various schools, diversify schools, provide more autonomy to private schools, deregulate the educational curriculum, and improve the university entrance exam system. However, giving autonomy and school choice to educational actors should be seen as a precursor to the taking of any of the above-mentioned steps. If autonomy and educational equality are values that cannot simultaneously be pursued, then a political decision must be made as to which of these values should be given priority.

Although a strong governmental role is required in the pursuit of educational equality, no such strong governmental role is required in the pursuit of autonomy. This is the main reason why the pursuit of autonomy should be considered morally superior to the pursuit of equality. Any policymaker who claims that it is possible to establish a policy that can resolve all educational problems and bring about educational autonomy and equality is either a god or a charlatan. The time has come for the South Korean government to resist trying to hit two birds with one stone, even if it attempts to do so with good intentions.

Just as one's sickness cannot be attributed to another's good health, the fact that someone has gained knowledge and received a high quality education does not mean that others must be educationally disadvantaged. In this way, health and education is not a zero-sum game. If some students receive a higher quality education, their achievements will profit them and benefit all of society. If some of these students who have benefited from a quality education go on to become scientists, their knowledge will help others as well. If some of these students became artists, their work could enlighten the world. The time has come for the government to stop preventing these possibilities from occurring in the name of educational equality.

REFERENCES

- Choe, Jang-jip. 2002. *Minjuhwa ihu-ui minjuuui* (Democracy after Democratization). Seoul: Humanitas.
- Harrison, Lawrence E., and Samuel P. Huntington, eds. 2000. *Culture Matters: How Values Shape Human Progress*. New York: Basic Books.
- Korea Teachers' Union. 2004. "Pyeongjunhwa-ga dongne buk-inga" (Has Equalization Become a Whipping Boy?). Statement issued on January 27.
- Korean Educational Development Institute. 2003. "2002 Hanguk-ui gyoyuk injeok jawon jipyo" (Korean Educational and Human Resources Indicators). Seoul: KEDI.
- Son, In-su. 1998. "Sin-gyoyuk-ui baldal-gwa geundae hakgyo-ui seongnip" (The Development of New Education and the Establishment of Modern Schools). *Yeonse uisihak* (Yonsei Medical Journal) 2.2: 248-249.
- Yun, Jong-hyeok. 2003. "Gogyo pyeongjunhwa-ui jeokhapseong yeongu" (On the Relevancy of the High School Equalization Policy) I. Working paper, Korean Educational Development Institute, Seoul.

