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A big project like this Handbook means that you incur debts, and not only to your authors and your publisher. As editors we, along with our colleague Elaine Unterhalter who edited the section on postcolonialism, would like to thank most warmly those authors who delivered on time, and who did not fuss but just got on and did a first-rate job. We would also like to thank all authors who did deliver – which was almost everyone we asked. We know that some of our authors worked in very difficult private circumstances as they were finishing their chapters and we hope the publication of the Volumes will, later, be for them a happy reminder of difficulties and disasters overcome.

The only sad theme is that some very close colleagues, with whom we were working and for whom we had the greatest respect and liking, became very ill (and died) while the volumes were being prepared. We decided to ask for copyright permissions to publish something of theirs. These permissions were graciously given by two major journals and with the agreement also of our publishers Springer, Rolland Paulston and Terry McLaughlin have examples of their writing in this Handbook.

We know it is going to embarrass her and she no doubt will take advantage of working in the same building to reprove Bob Cowen directly, but we wanted especially to note the major contribution to these Volumes of Elaine Unterhalter who combines a genuine independence of mind and spirit with a charming sense of what it is to work in a small team, to soak up pressure and to deliver on time. We are very grateful to her and to her colleague Helen Paulsen who provided us with technically perfect copy, address lists, Notes on Authors, Abstracts, and so on. We had problems enough of our own – it was a treat to deal with another small team that did the job faster, more neatly, and with less fuss.

Our two institutions – the Institute of Education within the University of London and the University of Wisconsin-Madison – provided crucial infrastructures for controlling the project, notably computing services backed by the inestimable assistance of Apple specialist Jem Dowse in the Institute and the last-minute computer skills of Lefteris Klerides which helped keep Bob Cowen calmer than he thought he was going to be.

However, it was not just an infrastructure thing. Both of us were in each other’s universities from time to time and Bob Cowen would like to thank Tom Popkewitz and Mike Apple who made him feel especially welcome in Wisconsin and Andreas
Kazamias would like to thank Jagdish Gundara and Gerald Grace who made him feel especially welcome inside the Institute of Education. Much of the project was actually edited in a small office inside Bob Cowen’s new ‘department’ – Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment – in the Institute of Education which was reorganized internally during the life of this project. He would like to thank colleagues within Curriculum, Pedagogy, and Assessment for welcoming a relative stranger – especially Denis Lawton with whom Bob (and Andreas for much of this project) was privileged to share a room. With the calm wisdom for which Denis is famed, he planned his visits to the Institute with exquisite care for quite some time.

We thank him and all other colleagues in many countries – it is the unexpected extra kindnesses which is so touching – for their help and support. The project finally got completed. We are still not exactly sure how; but it did. Like many other people we also look forward to reading the Volumes. It is difficult to grasp their full scope and complexity. They contain some surprises and a flurry of implications – captured in the writing of our authors – for future work in comparative education.

Robert Cowen and Andreas Kazamias
March 2009
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SECTION 1

THE CREATION AND RE-CREATION OF A FIELD
JOINT EDITORIAL INTRODUCTION

Robert Cowen and Andreas Kazamias

We are doing well…? In some ways, yes. The field of comparative education began to grow again around the millennium.


The journals are also numerous. They include *Comparative Education* (the UK), *Comparative Education Review* (USA), *International Review of Education* (UNESCO/ Hamburg), *Canadian & International Education* (Canada), *Compare* (the UK), and *Prospects* (UNESCO). There are also other journals (e.g. in French and in Spanish) which frequently carry comparative articles or which like *Propuesta Educativa* (Argentina) offer occasional special issues devoted to comparative education, or are
entirely comparative in content, like the Greek *Synkritiki kai Diethnis Ekpaideutiki Epitheorisi* (Athens).

The advanced study of comparative education is widely institutionalised, in graduate schools. For example, in the English-speaking world in the United States, Columbia University, Florida State University, Harvard University, Ohio State University, University of Pittsburgh, University of Maryland, State University of New York at Buffalo and at Albany, University of Illinois, University of Wisconsin, University of California at Los Angeles, University of Southern California, Stanford University, Loyola University, and University of Hawaii are some of the major centres. Australia, Canada, England, New Zealand, and many of the anglophone African countries – notably South Africa – also have graduate school programmes. In continental Europe, there are specialised courses in comparative education in Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Malta, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the Netherlands. Overall, the institutionalisation of comparative education is increasing not merely in Southern and Eastern Europe but also in the older metropolitan university centres, as universities internationalise their programmes and absorb a market of ‘overseas’ students.

Similarly in terms of its international networks and its conferences, comparative education is doing exceptionally well.

But how is it doing intellectually? That is, what kind of concerns and what kind of academic work is being, and has been, done in ‘the field of study’ called comparative education – primarily from a university base? Where are we? And where are we going?

The two volumes of this handbook make an effort to outline the situation. As editors we have used a number of principles.

In the way we have arranged the volumes there are a number of general arguments. These may be summarised as follows:

1. Both volumes argue that what is judged to be ‘good’ comparative education has changed over time. They analyse the shifting academic agendas, the changing perspectives of attention, and the different academic languages used to construct ‘comparative education’. They ask why this happens – why does ‘comparative education’ change its epistemic concerns, its reading of the world, and its aspirations to act upon it? They show the ways in which comparative education responds to the changing politics and economics of real events in the world as well as to the intellectual currents that are strong in particular times and places. The consequence is that several comparative educations can be identified, both at any one particular time and over time, and that comparative education is continuing to change with the new readings of the world which are emerging now.

2. There are some things which the handbook is not, and is not intended to be. It is not an encyclopaedia covering the comparative education world (and scholars within it) alphabetically. It does not offer ‘national case studies of education’ – that stuff was out of date 50 years ago. In particular, the Volumes do not assume that the nation state is the correct unit of analysis in comparative education. Nor does
the handbook embark on a series of case studies of the condition of ‘comparative education’ in Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Denmark, etc., and bewail the fact that comparative education is relatively weak in ‘the south’ or ‘the east’ and insist that the job of the handbook is to correct that imbalance. Constructing a comparative education in ‘the south’, for the south, and of the south is a mite more complex than that, even when the political cliché of The South has been deciphered.

3. Thus the handbook is an account of how a field of study was, is, and is becoming within the politics of its times. It analyses the construction of comparative education in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries particularly in Volume One. Volume Two shows how lively the contemporary field is, within the new politics of our times.

4. The handbook is a major statement of the condition of a field; it is not a fashion statement. Thus the future of comparative education is addressed in the handbook, especially in Volume Two, but it is not addressed with the rash confidence of conviction that the future is about the clash of civilisations; or the future is more globalisation; or that all that is needed is a better understanding of one (identified and specific) intellectual perspective.

5. The handbook is written at a turning point in the history of the field, and thus it leaves the future of the field open while offering a wide range of ways to talk about that future.

The handbook is divided into two volumes with four sections each.

In Volume One, Section 1 shows the construction of comparative education as a discourse, including the construction of comparative education as a university discourse, up to the late 1970s. The section also notes that ‘comparative education’ in its nineteenth- and twentieth-century framing was an ideological project for action on the world – practical policy makers were in the nineteenth century using a comparative perspective to construct a new social technology: mass elementary education and national systems of education. Thus the broadest theme of this section of the handbook is how the field of study sees its past in political context. The narrow way to understand the section is to see it as the identification and analysis of specific epistemological paradigms which, over time, framed comparative education in social context.

Section 2 deals with the world and the world of comparative education after the 1980s: the rethinking of the classical assumptions and approaches whose construction was described and analysed in Section 1.

Section 3 is partly devoted to the theme of ‘comparative action’, that is, those actions upon the world and upon the educational world which are based upon a comparative assessment of it. The strategic themes which the authors were invited to address as they undertook their descriptions and analyses were: (a) what was the political agenda for the activities; (b) what was the view of the international state system which framed the political action and the educational reform; (c) what was the view of the relationship between culture, economies, and education; and (d) what concept of comparative education was made visible?

Section 4 is concerned with the shift from anxiety about the relationships between educational systems and industrial economies in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries
to the relationships of educational systems and emerging knowledge economies in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. This section thus deals with some of the classic patterns of reforming educational systems to make them more ‘relevant’ to industrialisation and to the disputes and resistances – and very different patterns of education – which were a consequence. However, the concerns are not merely historical. The same ‘economic imperative’, which caused so much anxiety in the nineteenth and twentieth century, is taking a contemporary reprieve under the rubric of ‘globalisation’ and ‘knowledge economies’, occasionally informed by views of neo-liberalism. What is the nature of that contemporary debate?

In Volume Two, the emphasis is on how the world changed – and how this affected ways of thinking in a range of comparative educations. Thus Volume Two of the handbook exemplifies some of the important new concerns and visions of comparative education: rapid transitions in societies; the new emphasis on teaching and learning; the search for the recovery, reinvention, and creation of identity and of future identities, including ideas of ‘postcolonialism’; and – again – the current sense of what constitutes ‘globalisation’.

Therefore Volume Two very carefully avoids a conventional treatment of schooling systems and descriptions of educational reform in many ‘nation states’; or the description of educational systems sector by sector – elementary, secondary, teacher education, and so on; and it avoids the ‘comparative’ descriptions of educational trends and processes on a country-by-country basis or regional basis.

Within that general framing, Section 5 in Volume Two of the handbook deals with postcolonialism. This is a growing area in comparative education, at the intersection of political science, literary studies, linguistic theory, and history. The concerns which are central are those of identity and language, the formation and reformation of postcolonial politics and polities, the postcolonial terms of discursive contestation, shifts in the nature of the State, and new theories of rights. This is not only an extremely interesting area for comparative exploration, it is also a difficult area of new theorising and we asked Elaine Unterhalter – whose South African experience and interests in gender, rights-theory, capability-theory, and ‘development’ come together around the theme of postcoloniality – to edit this section of the two volumes.

Section 6 deals with comparative studies of ‘the educated person’ as constructed through schooling, and pedagogical cultures at different times and in different places. Thus this section explores the revision of knowledge traditions and the construction – the making and taking – of pedagogic identity, a theme which has a long history in comparative education, but which through the work of academics such as Basil Bernstein and Tom Popkewitz, feminists and advocates of positional identities (such as American blacks), and some curriculum specialists is being revitalised. As the nature of educational sites alters in late modernity, the issue of educational cultures and pedagogic identity becomes powerfully de-linked from notions of citizenship and more and more powerfully linked to economics or to religion. The framing of the topics of culture, knowledge, and pedagogies is thus changing rapidly and a comparative education of the future must work out new ways to analyse the theme of identity.

Sections 7 and 8 ask about ways forward. They ask, after Sections 1–6: is there anything else to talk about? The answer is, yes. The volumes finish with a range of fresh proposals for new kinds of comparative education.
Max Eckstein and Harold Noah do not know this but I have for years liked both of them very much. At the personal level, I was most touched when they were the first in the comparative education community to warmly welcome me to the USA where, rather to my surprise, I found myself teaching sociology and comparative education in a good university at graduate school level. Professionally, they had also, earlier, solved one of my problems as a student: where is there a history of comparative education? It was there in their classic text (Noah & Eckstein, 1969). Here the origins of the field were set out with exemplary clarity. The footnoting was scholarly and clearly a flurry of research had been done. As someone who was thinking about specialising in comparative education I was most relieved that there was a history – and there was also that marvellous account in Bereday’s book (1964) about scholars in other countries and their universities and departments. Comparative education existed and it had a history as well. There were more jobs in sociology, but clearly comparative education was more fun. I could take up a career. The history legitimated me.

And now – a few decades later? Now that we are all legitimate, in what senses do we exist historically?

The first difficulty is we have a lot of unseen history and not enough labour to make it visible. We have archives in major universities, but not enough obvious reward for young scholars to undertake research on them. We have marvellous bits of private writing on the history of the field – Peter Hackett and Richard Rapacz come to mind – but we have no one who has brought these correspondences (in both senses) together. At least a start has made by Gita Steiner-Khamsi and others on oral history (clearly something which the Comparative Education Society in Europe ought to undertake also as rapidly as possible). But – again – the initial problem is the career difficulty of being labelled as a specialist in the history of comparative education.

The second difficulty is the massive amount of effort required to get one of these serious historical projects going – a point made with great clarity in the Acknowledgements at the beginning of the book Common Interests, Uncommon Goals (Masemann et al., 2007). There are very practical problems in writing histories – in the ways that these must be done if you work seriously on researching history. Miguel Pereyra for example has been working hard and long on analysing Kandel as a scholar in the history of comparative education – but to chase down material on Kandel has meant major travel and expense which can just about be

handled by a scholar in mid-career with major effort – but there are few structural supports for such historical scholarship.

The third difficulty is that, given the invisibility of a large amount of information, we simply do not have the density of information which makes for good history. The amount of material that goes into a first-rate historical account of something is astonishing. Dalrymple’s work on *The Last Mughal* (2007) – so brilliantly contextualised – is dependent upon a complete new bit of the national archive becoming visible. Herman’s work on *The Scottish Enlightenment* (2006) is dependent upon a massive bibliography of earlier specialist and detailed texts. Major histories – whether these are by Norman Davies (1997) or by Tony Judt (2007) – draw on bibliographies which take a chapter-length essay merely to list. An obvious counter-argument may be offered – such work is ‘mainstream’ history (though that is an odd expression given what historians now study) – and, the counter-argument might continue, the comparison is unfair: all we are talking about here are histories of fields of study. But that last proposition, in turn, is not convincing in the face of texts such as Randall Collins’ book on *The Sociology of Philosophies* (1998), Friedrichs’ book (1970) on sociology or even a monograph on a field of study such as Bartholomew (1989) on the formation of science in Japan.

Right now, we simply do not have enough material to move on from the huge amount of work which is already involved in putting together the essays in this section of the handbook. The scholarly apparatus of all of the chapters in the section is impressive and the scholarly apparatus of some of the chapters is amazing. But we are still short of material.

The problem is also worse than that because a history of comparative education ought – sooner or later – to become a comparative history of comparative education.

We are still a little bit away from that – although it is worth remembering that the ‘history’ of comparative education in these volumes is not limited to this first section. Reading the chapters in the other sections of the volumes – Larsen on history, Steiner-Khamsi and her conceptualisation of the development of comparative education, the exploration of comparative education in East Asia outlined by Wang and Dong and Shibata, the concept of voices which Mehta raises, the mappings of Paulston, the analysis of Popkewitz – reminds us of possibilities and thematics in a potential comparative history of comparative education.

There is also the shiver of the shock which comes later, as a reading of these volumes is complete, and it is recalled that we have no serious history of comparative education in Brazil or in Argentina in print – and this despite the significance of Sarmiento in Argentina and his political views and his astonishing practical ‘comparative education’ or the significance of Anisio Teixeira and his international connections in Brazilian educational history. (Of course articles in our specialist journals exist on both people with good hints about where a ‘history’ might go, but that is just my point. We have articles and hints; and we do not have histories.)

We have not even brought together seriously the ‘individual’ histories of comparative education in France, Germany, Italy and so on – though again in at least three book chapters or articles by Wolfgang Mitter (one appearing in Volume 1) you can find ways into a fuller comparative history.
So, let us be optimistic like a cheerful and happy child. Let us assume that a major foundation such as the Gulbenkian or Hoover decides that a comparative history of comparative education would be well worth funding. Apart from establishing an Advisory Board with such senior scholars on it as Eckstein, Noah, Kazamias, Mitter and Rust, what would we wish our team of actual researchers to make visible as evidence for this putative history so that our material for writing that history became denser and denser?

Almost certainly it would be necessary to review the history of other fields of study including comparative study (Schriewer, 2006). It would be necessary to make women visible – they are there in history but they (e.g., Ann Dryland, Madame Hattinguais) are not there in our histories. I suspect it will also be necessary to make fuller sense of the meta-epistemic assumptions of a range of comparative educations in a range of countries: for example the effect of structural-functionalism sociology in the USA on American comparative education but the relative lack of effect by the Frankfurt School; the fear of sociology which so characterises the ‘culturalist’ school – though not Lauwerys – in the Institute of Education and Kings College in London in the late 1950s and early 1960s; the sudden lurch in vocabulary which inserts ‘international’ as a qualifier of, or as a juxtaposition to, ‘comparative’; and the reasons for ‘a linguistic turn’ or a ‘post-modern turn’ or even the new vocabulary that implies a ‘geographic’ turn in a number of social sciences, including a hint of it within comparative education.

Also – amazingly – we do not have a really sharp, historian’s sort of account of the life of George Bereday, or Joseph Lauwerys and his work for UNESCO, his links with Piaget, the IBE, with Teixeira and with Hiratsuka in Japan. Both Bereday and Lauwerys linked persons and ideas across cultures and continents and for quite justifiable reasons – including their impact on their own institutions, and on the societies of comparative education and on generations of graduate students as well as their astonishing lecturing skills – Bereday and Lauwerys are well known in the field of study; but they indirectly raise a broader question.

We do not understand our own iconographies. For example, Sir Michael Sadler was clearly a fine public servant and an educational leader and, one suspects, a rather pleasant human being. Fine – but we give him an astounding importance in comparative education even though that famous essay of his (Sadler, 1964) has caused far more confusion than it has ever solved. But he is always in ‘the histories’, which itself becomes a historical problem of the social construction of our iconographies. No doubt a comparative history of comparative education would explore whether such iconographies also have been inserted into the invention of the tradition of comparative education in Japan or Germany or France.

The final paradox of course is that while ‘the evidence’ can be made available, pre-prepared as it were by stabilising and strengthening archives and by making hidden ‘facts’ more visible, the questions cannot.

Somewhere in this first section on the creation and recreation of the field of study, Andreas Kazamias – who is and always has been deeply committed as a historian to doing an immense amount of work on the history of the field of study – has a quotation
from T.S. Eliot. The quotation confirms in a subtle and elegant way one of Andreas’ own convictions – that each generation must rewrite its history.

That almost leaves us with a paradox. The propositions of Eliot and Kazamias create the thought that it is the future which determines the past. Yes, I know neither of them said that. But the possibilities are exciting. The quotation from Eliot reverberates. Our contemporary histories of ourselves need revisiting now and will need revisiting again frequently in the future.
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THE MODERNIST BEGINNINGS OF COMPARATIVE EDUCATION: THE PROTO-SCIENTIFIC AND THE REFORMIST-MELIORIST ADMINISTRATIVE MOTIF

Pella Kaloyannaki and Andreas M. Kazamias

Introduction

The modernist beginnings of comparative education (CE) as a field of study are conventionally traced to the post-Enlightenment period in the early and mid decades of the nineteenth century, specifically to the pioneering work of Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris and to discourses of educational policy-makers, reformers and administrators in Europe and the United States, such as Horace Mann, Calvin Stowe and Henry Barnard in the United States, Victor Cousin in France and the poet–school inspector Matthew Arnold in England. First, this chapter analyses in some detail Jullien’s ideas about CE—its methodology, epistemology and ideology—as reflected mainly in his now famous *Esquisse et vues préliminaires sur un ouvrage sur l’éducation comparée* (Plan and Preliminary Views for a Work on Comparative Education), published in 1817, on the basis of which Jullien has been acclaimed as ‘the father’ of CE. Here Jullien’s conception of CE will be referred to as representing ‘the proto-scientific humanistic and meliorist motif’ in the history of the field. Second, the study examines in lesser detail what may be called ‘the reformist-meliorist motif in comparative education’, which refers to discourses about foreign education as reflected in the relevant texts of nineteenth-century policy-makers, reformers and administrators like Victor Cousin of France, and Horace Mann, Calvin Stowe and Henry Barnard of the United States.

The Proto-Scientific Humanistic and Meliorist Motif: Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris

The Man, His Work and His Times

Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris was born in Paris in 1775, from highly educated parents in the humanities (philosophy, language, literature and the classics). At a young age and for a short period he served as a journalist for the Jacobins and the French National Convention, and was a diplomat and legionnaire in the service of Napoleon Bonaparte. He travelled widely in Europe, visited England and Scotland and also went to Egypt as a war commissioner in Bonaparte’s expedition there. Throughout most of his life
until his death in 1848 he devoted his time to the study of education and pedagogy on which he wrote books, monographs, essays, reports and memoranda. During the years 1819–1830, Jullien founded and directed the journal *Revue encyclopédique ou Analyse raisonnée de productions les plus remarquables dans la littérature, les sciences et les arts* (*Encyclopedic Review or Reasoned Analysis of the Most Remarkable Productions in Literature, Sciences and the Arts*) for which he wrote, among other things, on public education in Switzerland, Belgium and Spain.

Jullien’s interest in education began quite early in his life, during the period of the French Revolution, and continued thereafter until his death. According to his biographer R. R. Palmer, Jullien started writing books on the subject in 1805 while he was serving in the French army. As a theorist of education he was especially attracted to the pedagogical ideas of the famous Swiss educators J. H. Pestalozzi and P. E. Fellenberg whose schools he had visited at Yverdun and Hofwyl, respectively, in Switzerland (Palmer, 1993). According to Fraser, in his authoritative edition and translation of Jullien’s *Plan:*

> Until his death … Jullien was engaged constantly in scientific and cultural affairs. He founded the Societé Française de l’union des nations, and invited international scholars to his home for monthly dinners. He traveled continually, attending international congresses, devoting his time to learned societies, and corresponding with statesmen and educators whose cosmopolitanism sought to evade the confines of nationalism as it consolidated itself in Europe (Fraser, 1964:12).

In Jullien’s life and works, one can distinguish certain elements which, in combination with each other, had an effect on Jullien’s pioneering ideas in the promotion of the *episteme* (‘science’) of comparative education. Jullien was also nurtured in the ideas and spirit of the Enlightenment ‘paradigm of modernity’ with its emphasis on reason/rationalism, empiricism, science (including social science), universalism, secularism, progress and the nation state. Not unsurprisingly, he became interested in the scientific study of education.

*Comparative Education as ‘Almost Nearly a Positive Science’*

Jullien envisaged ‘education’ and a fortiori comparative education, to be a ‘nearly positive science’ (*science positivie*) analogous to comparative anatomy. In the *Plan* he explained:

> Education, as all other sciences and all the arts, is composed of facts and observations. It, therefore, seems necessary to form, for this science as one has done for other branches of knowledge, collections of facts and observations, arranged in analytical charts, which permit them to be related and compared, to deduct from them certain principles, determined rules, so that education might become almost nearly a positive science. … Researches on *comparative anatomy* have advanced the science of anatomy. In the same way the researches on *comparative education* must furnish new means of perfecting the science of education (Fraser, 1964:40–41).
To make comparative education a ‘nearly positive science’ Jullien developed the aforementioned Plan (Esquisse). The Plan consisted of two major parts: (a) an introductory statement on Jullien’s critical assessment of the state of education in the different countries of Europe, and his own ideas as to how the ‘incomplete’ and ‘defective’ European education could be improved; and (b) a series of questions which were intended to collect ‘facts and observations’ and ‘destined to furnish material for Comparative Observation Tables’ (Fraser, 1964:31).

Why a Science of Comparative Education?

Like his contemporary French scientific positivist philosopher-sociologist Auguste Comte (1798–1857), Jullien believed that the scientific method could be applied to human and social affairs. As a positive science, therefore, comparative education should focus on objectively determinable and systematically collected facts and observations. A ‘nearly positive science’ of CE, according to Jullien, which in the collection and tabulation of ‘facts and observations’ employed similar methods and techniques/instruments as the positive sciences and the ‘mechanical arts’, would be useful in the reform and improvement of contemporary education throughout Europe. In the introduction to the Plan, Jullien averred that both public and private education in the different countries of Europe were ‘incomplete, defective, without coordination … without harmony with itself in the different physical, moral, and intellectual spheres in which the students ought to be guided’. He attributed the social, political and moral ills of European countries, the corruption and ‘degradation of minds and hearts, which have produced revolutions and wars’, the disorder and the general deterioration of European societies to incomplete and defective education. Consequently, education needed to be reformed and improved. In his own words:

The reform and improvement of education, the true basis of the social edifice, primary source of habits and opinions, which exercise a powerful influence on the entire life, are a need generally felt, as if by instinct, through Europe. It is a matter of indicating the means of satisfying the need in the surest, most efficient, and prompt manner (Fraser, 1964:35).

According to Jullien, the methodological approach by which the defects and weaknesses of education, and generally ‘the condition of education and public instruction in all the countries of Europe’ could be ascertained, would be the drawing up of ‘analytical summaries of information’, collected through a ‘series of questions’—a questionnaire—tabulated in ‘comparative tables of observations’ and classified under ‘uniform headings’ for purposes of ‘comparative analysis’. The responsibility for the collection of such educational facts and observations, for evaluative judgements and for the search of solutions to educational problems ‘would be given to intellectual and active men of sound judgment, (and) of known moral conduct’ (Fraser, 1964:36–37; Kaloyiannaki, 2002:42–43). Jullien articulated this reformative-melioristic value of his ‘nearly positivist’ scientific conception of comparative education as follows:
These analytical summaries of information, on the condition of education and public instruction in all the countries of Europe, would supply successively comparative tables of the present state of European nations in regard to this important aspect. One could judge with ease those which are advancing; those which are falling back, those which remain stationary; what are in each country the deficient and ailing sections; what are the causes of internal defects ... or what are the obstacles to the ascendancy of religion, ethics, and social advancement and how these obstacles can be overcome; finally, which parts offer improvement capable of being transported from one country to another, with modifications and changes which circumstances and localities would determine suitable (Fraser, 1964:37).

A ‘nearly positivist’ scientific perspective in comparative education, as envisaged by Jullien, would also be valuable in other respects. In one respect, it would ‘furnish new means of perfecting the science of education’ (Fraser, 1964:41). In another, it would release comparative study from political influence, the omnipotence of religion, prejudice and despotism (Kaloyiannaki, 2002). And, in still another, it would help in ‘nation-building’, as he argues in the case of a comparative study of education in the 22 cantons of Switzerland. Indeed, according to Jullien, the comparative study of education in the cantons of Switzerland would serve a double purpose: in the first place, it ‘will give birth to the idea of borrowing from one another what they may have which is good and useful in their institutions’; and in the second, it will establish and consolidate ‘the political unity of Switzerland’ by developing ‘a national Helvetian mind’ (Fraser, 1964:45–46).

**Jullien’s Methodology: The ‘Questionnaire’ and the Indicators of Comparison**

Jullien’s comparative methodology could be described as ‘empirico-deductive’ and perhaps ‘qualitative quasi-ethnographic’. It sought to gather data, in Jullien’s words ‘facts and observations’, on education and related questions by means of a questionnaire which consisted of a ‘series of questions’ on six educational areas, namely: (a) primary and common education; (b) secondary and classical education; (c) higher and scientific education; (d) normal education; (e) education of girls; and (f) education, as it related to legislation and social institutions. The collected facts and observations would then be ‘arranged in analytical charts’ or ‘comparative tables of observations’ which would allow for comparative analysis and the deduction of ‘certain principles, determined rules, so that education might become almost nearly a positive science’ (Fraser, 1964:40).

In the Plan Jullien identified the educational themes/topics for all six areas for which a series of questions would be posed. However, what he was able to complete was questions for the first two areas, namely, primary and common education and instruction, and secondary and classical education. In each area the questions posed were a set that covered a variety of educational issues, topics and questions. Some of the questions were relatively short, seeking to elicit quantitative data or yes or no answers, while others were relatively long and involved seeking to elicit qualitative
judgements and interpretations. Briefly and selectively, the questions for the first two areas were of the following kind:

1. The first area ‘primary and common education and instruction’ included questions on: (a) ‘Primary or Elementary Schools’, e.g. number, organisation, maintenance and administration, ‘differences among the schools destined for children of different religious faiths’, whether they are free or not; (b) students, e.g. number, age of admission, enrollment ratios; (c) directors and primary teachers, e.g. number, preparation, salaries, possibilities for advancement or retirement; (d) physical education and gymnastics, e.g. ‘suckling of children, nourishment, clothing, sleep, beds, games, exercises, walks, hygienic care and diet, sicknesses, vaccination, and death rate’; (e) moral and religious education, e.g. ‘first development of moral sentiments, repression of vicious tendencies, influence of mothers of families, religious instruction whether dry and dogmatic or interesting and appropriate to make a profound impression on the soul, regulations and discipline of primary schools, punishments … emulation—is it used or not as a necessary motivation?’; (f) intellectual education, e.g. ‘development of the faculties of the mind, instruction or acquisition of knowledge, first education of the senses and organs, aims and ways of teaching, memory exercises, three principal faculties: attention, comparison, reasoning’; (g) domestic and private education, e.g. ‘up to what point is the education begun and continued by parents, in the bosom of the family, in harmony or in opposition with the education and instruction given in primary and public schools?’; (h) primary and common education—as it is related to secondary education, or to the second stage and with the intentions of children’, e.g. ‘Is the present organization of primary and common education resting on a basis sufficiently large, solid, and complete to supply children of poor and working classes with all the elementary knowledge indispensable to them to exercise and develop all their faculties?’; and (i) general considerations, e.g. ‘Is the present manner of bringing up children, up to their seventh or ninth year, the same as in former times? Or rather, in what does the difference consist, between the new and old ways of education?’ (Fraser, 1964:53–67).

2. The questions in the second area ‘Secondary and Classical Education’ were similar to those in the first. They asked for information about (a) secondary schools (colleges, gymnasia, private institutions and boarding schools), namely, ‘number, nature, origin and foundation, organization … fees’; (b) students, namely, number, age, ‘their division into classes’, etc.; (c) physical education and gymnastics; (d) moral and religious education, for example, ‘Knowledge of God, daily prayers, feeling of benevolence, courage, patience’; (e) intellectual education, for example, ‘development of the faculties, acquisition of knowledge or instruction … teaching aims/methods … classical books … exercises to develop the memory, judgment or reason, imagination … vacations … letter writing style … study of laws’; (f) domestic and family education—in its relationship with public education; and (g) ‘general considerations and various questions’ (Fraser, 1964:67–82).
Jullien’s Conception of Comparative Education: A Positive or a Human Science?

Viewed from the vantage point of a positivist empirical-scientific methodology, it could be said, as indeed it has been said, that Jullien’s questionnaire is too complex, too long and ‘biased’ in the sense that ‘Jullien’s assumptions about the proper goals of education colored the questions he asked’ (Noah and Eckstein, 1969:29). Likewise, from the same positivist methodological perspective one might also add that in several parts, the questions in the Plan are convoluted and ‘leading questions’ seeking less to record ‘objectively determinable’ and systematically collected ‘facts and observations’, and more to instruct and promote Jullien’s own ideas and theories about education. Such evaluative comments would indeed be quite in order, especially on the question of ‘biased’ and convoluted ‘leading questions’ which appear quite frequently under the thematic categories of ‘moral and religious education’ and ‘intellectual education’. Here are some selected pertinent examples of such types of questions (Fraser 1964).

Under ‘Moral and Religious Education’

- ‘Does one restrict religious instruction to teaching and explanation of the catechism, precepts, dogmas, ceremonies, exterior forms? Or does one attempt to penetrate children’s souls, give solid internal foundation to their religious belief, to form conscience, to develop and fortify by the double strength of habits and examples, the moral character, true devotion, disposition to benevolence, tolerance, Christian charity?’

- ‘Does one apply oneself (according to the wise advice of the German philosopher, Basedow) to making children well acquainted with virtue in its beautiful side and with vice in its bad side, so that they may become truly good men and not hypocrites, that is to say, that they not only have their own interests in view, when they do good?’

Under ‘Intellectual Education’

- ‘What are the aims of education which the children usually receive in primary school? (Does one limit oneself in the majority of schools to reading, writing and arithmetic? Or does one also give a few elementary ideas of grammar, singing, geometrical drawing, geometry, and land surveying, applied mechanics, geography and history of the country, anatomy of the human body, practical hygiene, natural history applied to the study of land products most useful to men? All the elements of these sciences, as essentials to each individual in all conditions and circumstances of life, would seem to have to form a part of a complete system of primary and common education, perfectly appropriate to the true needs of man in our present state of civilization.)’

- ‘Does one apply the elementary teaching method of arithmetic, practiced with success by M. Pestalozzi in his educational institute; or of any other methods of the same kind, whether in arithmetic, or for other branches of instruction?’

- ‘How does one seek to develop and exercise in children, in a progressive and imperceptible manner, first, the power of attention, the foremost faculty and
generator of all others; then, the faculty of comparing or the simile; finally, reasoning (which are the three essential and fundamental faculties of human understanding, according to the distinction established by M. Laromiguierе, in his Lessons of Philosophy)?

If, however, one were to place Jullien’s conception of a ‘science of education’ in the post-Enlightenment broader ‘scientific’ intellectual historical context, and, further, if one bore in mind (a) Jullien’s humanistic cultural background, and (b) as noted above, that Jullien was nurtured in the ideas, spirit and culture of the Enlightenment ‘paradigm of modernity’, one could perhaps understand his conception of comparative education as ‘an almost nearly positive science’, i.e. as not a positive science in the strict meaning of the term, as this is shown by the nature of the questionnaire and the indicators of comparison in the Plan. Positivism, stric
to sensu, affirms that ‘all knowledge regarding matters of fact is based on the “positive” data of experience’, and its all-important imperative is ‘strict adherence to the testimony of observation and experience’. As a philosophical ideology, further, positivism is ‘worldly, secular, anti-theological, and anti-metaphysical’ (http://www.brittanica.com/eb/article9108682/Positivism). Additionally, according to the Wikipedia encyclopedia, as it developed in the second half of the twentieth century, positivism (a) focuses ‘on science as a product, a linguistic or numerical set of statements’; (b) insists that at least some of the statements made are ‘testable, that is amenable to being verified, confirmed, or falsified by the empirical observation of reality’; and (c) is based on the belief that ‘science rests on specific results that are dissociated from the personality and social position of the investigator’ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Positivism).

Bearing in mind the above, Jullien’s conception of a ‘science of comparative education’ cannot be said to be consonant with the positivistic scientific conceptions of comparative education that developed in the second half of the twentieth century, e.g. that of Harold Noah and Max Eckstein (Noah & Eckstein, 1969). Nor can it be said that it was consonant with other scientific conceptions of the same twentieth-century period, e.g. those of Brian Holmes (Holmes, 1965), George Bereday (Bereday, 1964), the University of Chicago Functionalist School (Anderson, 1961; Foster, 1960), or indeed the Stanford World Systems School of later years (Arnove, 1982). It can, however, still be said that Jullien’s conception of a science of comparative education was consonant with what the French and other Europeans, e.g. the Greeks and the Germans, refer to as ‘human sciences’, which in certain respects are differentiated, in terms of methodology and subject matter, from the positive and the other empirical-statistical sciences. Two years after the appearance of the Plan for comparative education, Jullien published a Sketch for an Essay on the philosophy of the sciences where, according to Palmer, ‘science was taken to mean mental activity of all kinds, including, applied technology, political and economic treatises, imaginative literature, and the fine arts’. In a ‘Synoptic Table of Human Knowledge According to a New Method of Classification’ in the same Sketch, Jullien classified ‘human knowledge’ under ‘first order’ and ‘second order’ sciences. Under ‘first order’ sciences he included the physical sciences and practical sciences such as ‘agriculture, mining, engineering and healing’, and under ‘second order’, he included ‘metaphysical, moral and intellectual sciences, relative to
the mind’, history, psychology, natural theology, liberal arts, fine arts, practical morality and education (Palmer, 1993:176–178).

Ideologically, as explained below, Jullien could be characterised as an Enlightenment liberal and an international cosmopolitan humanist educational reformer. The purpose of investigating, in a scientific/epistemic way, what he considered to be a defective, morally and intellectually, and an ‘incomplete’ European education, was to ameliorate/improve it by reforming it along what he considered to be the desirable moral, intellectual and physical educational principles. As quoted above, the Enlightenment liberal humanist Jullien considered education to be ‘the true basis of the social edifice, primary source of habits and opinions, which exercise a powerful influence on the entire life’ (Fraser, 1964:35). He believed that education can exert a decisive influence on the moral and intellectual ‘renaissance’ of man, on national welfare and on nation-building (Kaloyiannaki, 2002). His comparative method—the use of the type of questionnaire analysed above—sought to do more than merely collect ‘facts and observations’. As Noah and Eckstein have pointed out, Jullien ‘was ultimately concerned with problems of diffusing knowledge of education, particularly knowledge of educational innovation’. The same authors have added: ‘Influenced as he was by the ideas of Rousseau and Pestalozzi, he wished to encourage a practical, child-centered educational methodology that emphasized, among other things, education of the senses and preparation for life in society, all with a humanitarian emphasis’ (Noah & Eckstein, 1969:16). Actually, Jullien wished to encourage a multi-prismatic humanistic education, as indicated by his emphasis in the questionnaire on the moral, the religious, the physical and the intellectual education of ‘man’, who, according to him, is ‘the subject on which education acts’. Man, Jullien avers, ‘is composed of three elements: body, heart, and mind, whose culture and development constitute for him the true means of happiness’ (Fraser, 1964:48). It would be relevant to add here that Jullien’s Plan and the questions asked reflected also the humanitarian influence of the German Count Leopold Berchold, a renowned ‘traveler and humanist’, and of the Frenchman M. Laromiguiere to whom he refers in the questionnaire in connection with an education that cultivates the ‘faculties of the soul’ (Fraser, 1964:41, 91, 133–147; Kaloyiannaki, 2002). And, further, that some researchers (Gautherin,1993; Leclercque, 1999) consider that Jullien’s work constructs a polyphonic human world; for in the Plan Jullien goes beyond Europe and refers to ‘mankind as a whole’ (humanité), to ‘all people’, to the ‘amelioration of the human being’ and to the ‘love for mankind’, thus giving a universal and humanitarian character to his comparative approach and the propositions for reform (Kaloyiannaki, 2002).

A French Enlightenment Liberal: Liberté, Raison, Education

In the preface to his study on Jullien, titled From Jacobin to Liberal (1993), R. R. Palmer wrote:

Born in the year when armed rebellion against Britain began in America, he (Jullien) witnessed the fall of the Bastille as a schoolboy in Paris, joined the Jacobin club, took part in the Reign of Terror, advocated democracy, put his