

## Travel, Social Science and the Making of Nations in Early 19th Century Comparative Education

Noah W Sobe

Comparative Education's origins in travelers' comparisons of the 18th and 19th centuries are commonly a matter of passing reference in the surveys and methodological writings that describe the field's beginnings.<sup>1</sup> Even up through the present day, however, travel to various places could be argued to be one of the characteristics that most unites the work of contemporary comparative and international education researchers. The movement of educational policies; pedagogies; curricula; and people, be they students, scholars, or immigrants, is much of what comparativists study as researchers and often engage in as practitioners. Recent post-colonial and post-modern work has focused theoretical and empirical attention on positionality, spatiality and subjectivity as critical components for understanding the power and knowledge involved in these travels and transfers, all of which makes attention to movement an important part both of self-reflective practice and of rigorous research. It is only appropriate that travels and mobilities of various sorts are central themes in comparative education, and have historically been present, albeit in different guises, in the dependency and modernization problematics that at various points structured (and continue to inform) inquiry in the field. The traveling researcher interested in a traveling object, however, should be a more carefully examined intellectual concern in the field of comparative and international education. It is a problem at once epistemological and historical, and the inquiry proposed here is a study of the early 19th century appearance of Comparative Education that looks at it as a social science made possible out of an amalgamation of cultural practices, and that considers it in relation to larger epistemological changes.

The French writer and thinker Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris (1775-1848) is considered one of comparative education's 'pioneers'. In a series of publications from 1816 to 1817 Jullien laid out a proposal for comparative education research

---

<sup>1</sup> See William W. Brickman, "A Historical Introduction to Comparative Education," *Comparative Education Review* 3 (1960), pp 6-13; also, for a longer treatment, Franz Hilker, *La Pédagogie Comparée. Introduction à son histoire. sa théorie et sa pratique* (Paris: Institute pédagogique national, 1964).

and has accordingly been treated as the field's "fore-father", "precursor", and "anticipateur cohérent".<sup>2</sup> I will use Jullien's proposal *Esquisse et Vues Préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur L'Éducation Comparée* [Plan and Preliminary Views for a Work on Comparative Education]<sup>3</sup> as my principal entry point into the logic and reasoning that went into this early 19th century appearance of comparative education as a proposed field of study. I am interested in what intersected with Jullien's plan to make his text possible, what made it seem sensible. One of the central arguments of this paper is that Jullien's plan – and Comparative Education generally – emerged out of the studying, categorizing and theorizing that accompanied the practices and discourses of European travel at the end of the 18th and beginning of the 19th centuries.

I approach Jullien's text from a number of angles and one of the theses of the paper is that a sound understanding of this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education will have bearing on how we understand Comparative Education's present. This notion, however, rests on a historiographical scaffolding that warrants some preliminary comment, even though its main outlines will come into view at their clearest over the course of the following analysis and its writing. My interest is in discussing this appearance of Comparative Education as a discourse that derives its legibility/intelligibility through its relations to other formations. Accordingly, the paper will attempt to foreground the reasoning and logic that is built into Jullien's proposal. This work is an intellectual history of a sort, though when it examines relations between ideas it will not be for the purpose of establishing conceptual indebtedness or chains of descent. In these terms, in their conventional sense, Jullien's proposal was

<sup>2</sup> See, as merely the latest examples, Robert F. Arnove & Carlos Alberto Torres, *Comparative Education: The Dialectic of the Global and the Local* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 1999), p. 3; and, R. R. Palmer, *From Jacobin to Liberal: Marc-Antoine Jullien, 1775-1848* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993).

<sup>3</sup> The full title in English is *Plan and Preliminary Views for a Work on Comparative Education Concerned in the first place with the twenty-two cantons of Switzerland and with some parts of Germany and Italy, with the intention of examining successively, according to the same plan, all the states of Europe; And Series of Questions on Education Destined to furnish material for Comparative Observation Tables, for the usage of persons who, wishing to study the present state of education and of public instruction in the different countries of Europe, will be willing to collaborate in the joint undertaking, whose plan and aim is expounded here*. In preparing this paper I have relied on the 1964 English translation, Marc-Antoine Jullien, *Plan and Preliminary Views for a Work on Comparative Education*, trans. Stewart Fraser (New York: Teachers College Bureau of Publications, 1964) and will in the rest of the text refer to the work simply as the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education*.

itself 'lost' to the field of Comparative Education for roughly a century, being famously rediscovered and resuscitated by Isaac Kandel in the early 1940s.<sup>4</sup> Since that time it has enjoyed circulation in a variety of ways, notably as disciplinary *bona fide*, for it gave the field that useful "founding father" (the gender specificity is telling) one could both descend from and revolt against. This paper tries to approach Jullien at deliberate distance from such debates and from conceptions of heritage and influence that trace a development of ideas through later thinkers and their works. According to these latter criteria Jullien's proposal can easily be rated a failure and of little importance: it appears that no sets of responses to the questions he proposed were ever submitted, no international scientific committee sprouted, and for a long stretch of time his ideas were evidently 'forgotten'. One can find a loosely analogous situation in another great 19th century scheme, Jeremy Bentham's plan for redesigning prison buildings. Independent of whether Bentham's proposals were realized in the construction of actual buildings (they didn't, at least immediately), scholars in a wide range of literatures have found insightful and useful the notion of "panopticism" elaborated by Michel Foucault in his now classic analysis.<sup>5</sup> Jullien's proposals are useful for thinking about the comparative and international education scholar as a traveling researcher interested in a traveling object, and for thinking about the field of comparative and international education as a social science caught up in the making of both national and cosmopolitan worlds.

It is an honor to be able to offer this analysis in a volume dedicated to Jürgen Schriewer and his scholarship. His work on internationalization and globalization points to the centrality of these phenomena in the very constitution of comparative education studies conceptually and methodologically. My hope is that this paper complements Schriewer's analysis of the way various relations can accumulate to dynamize a self-sustained world-level discourse<sup>6</sup> by focusing

<sup>4</sup> Isaac Kandel, "International Cooperation in Education: An Early Nineteenth Century Aspiration," in *Educational Forum* 7:1 (1942). This was actually the second 'discovery' of Jullien's text, the first being in 1879 by Franz Kemény, a Hungarian student, who happened on an edition in a Paris booksellers. See, Jean Giraud, "Marc-Antoine Jullien De Paris (1775-1848)," in *Paedagogica Historica* 15 (1975), p. 390. Subsequent to this Jullien's work only enjoyed a limited circulation, and only became identified as 'year one' for Comparative Education in the 1940s.

<sup>5</sup> Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (New York: Vintage Books, 1970).

<sup>6</sup> Jürgen Schriewer, "World System and Interrelationship Networks: The Internationalization of Education and the Role of Comparative Inquiry," *Educational Knowledge: Changing*

on the field of cultural practices through which it becomes possible for education to be moved along world-level and local-level networks. Like Schriewer, I would maintain that Comparative Education has an under examined role in fabricating these networks, and in the historical treatment of Jullien that follows I explore how the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* works to fabricate both bounded, national localisms and global-level cosmopolitanisms. I describe the reasoning and rules through which this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education is articulated, treating the logic and arguments brought into the text as among the many cultural practices that intersected to make Jullien's plan possible.

### 1. Jullien's Plan and Its Questions

The plan for comparative education that Marc-Antoine Jullien de Paris published and disseminated<sup>7</sup> was to consist of a series of questions that surveyors could use to report on the state of education in a given location. The introduction to the initial series of questions explained that reports from different areas were to be collected and compared against each other. To contemporary eyes Jullien's questions are an extremely odd mix and need a good deal of accounting for to see how they could have made 'sense' together in the early 19th century.

Jullien's questions are remarkably wide in their scope and were topically grouped to a certain extent. Two series of questions were published, one on "primary or elementary schools" and the second on "secondary and classical education". The remaining series of questions, which were to be on "higher and scientific schools", "normal schools", "institutions for the education of girls", and "education, as it is related to legislation and social institutions" were apparently never published nor prepared. Possible answers to the questions range from what might today be considered subjective judgments to simple fact

*Relationships between the State, Civil Society, and the Educational Community*, ed. by Thomas S. Popkewitz (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2000), pp. 305-344.

<sup>7</sup> The plan was first published in the Swiss periodical *Bibliothèque Universelle* volumes III (1816) and IV (1817). It was nearly simultaneously printed in the French *Journal d'Education*, appearing in December 1816 and continuing in January and February 1817. Jullien was an accomplished publicist, giving the plan to his friend Tadeusz Kosciuszko the Polish patriot to distribute, and mailing a version to Thomas Jefferson.

reporting. One entry point into the logic of *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* can be the way that it might not 'make sense' today to pose all these questions at the same time and in the same manner.

A brief selection from Jullien's list of questions could include a number of questions that appear to be problems of simple computation or appear to be straightforward matters of reporting. For example, we find him inquiring:

A. 17 In what ratio is the number of instructors to the total population of the town or surroundings?

A. 92 At what age are children usually taught to read, write, count, and what method is considered the easiest?

B. 76 In each course, what are the *classic books* consulted or applied by the teachers or professors and placed in the hands of students? [emphasis in original]<sup>8</sup>

The questionnaire also includes questions that could be read from a present perspective as requiring some sort of exercise of judgment, or additional qualifications so that they could be operationalized, such as:

A. 78 Do mothers exercise a considerable influence on the primary moral education of their children, and how is this influence conducted?

A. 83 What is the internal organization of primary schools? Is discipline mild, benevolent, fatherly, or strict and severe?

A. 109 What are the usual contacts of children with their parents, in the families; with their teachers and their friends, in the public schools?

A great number of the questions are what could be considered 'leading questions', meaning that the standard or desired norm is abundantly clear from the way the question is posed. For example:

A. 89 Has care been taken to avoid competition from degenerating into rivalry full of hatred, and produce in children, on the one hand, the first sentiments of vanity, pride, ambition; on the other hand painful impressions of discouragement, disgust, and envy?

<sup>8</sup> Because Jullien's numbering scheme is generally preserved in modern reprintings of his work, for simplicity's sake I will cite the questions throughout the rest of this paper only by these numbers, without page references.

A. 96 Does one apply generally in the country, or only in a few places, the new method of mutual instruction coming from England, and known under the names of its inventors, Messrs. Bell and Lancaster?

B. 98 Does one exercise early in children the thinking ability and reason applied to the guidance and examination of their behavior, so that, when they reach youth and a mature age, they can easily do without a guide, in whatever concerns them and trust their own judgment?

Taken all together, the questions come across most strongly to many contemporary observers as eclectic, as a strange set and a strange system.<sup>9</sup> What logic connects questions such as A. 106 "Are there annual vacations?" and B. 81 "How does one prevent greed in children?" to make them able to be posed and able to be answered (potentially at least) in the same space? Is there a method or a set of assumptions about such a survey or about the researcher and/or respondent that makes all these questions reasonable?

Jullien's text could be used to make a much more in-depth study of the cultural assumptions surrounding French and European schools and pedagogies in the early 19th century than I will be undertaking here. One could try to explain why Jullien asks specific questions – for example, question A. 49 "During sleep is the head covered or bare, and for what reason is one method preferred over the other?" In such a study, one would have to read the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* in juxtaposition with many more texts and cultural artifacts than is possible with the length constraints of a single book chapter. Presumably the political and philosophical backdrop of Rousseau's *Emile* could enter, also medical discourses on activity and rest, and it seems clear that such a study or studies would fill in a picture of very culturally specific document. In comparison with this, the present analysis of how Jullien's overall plan is possible as a research project is quite circumscribed; yet, seen another way, it is quite broad in that it attempts to describe the 'rules' according to which Jullien's comparative project could occur.

<sup>9</sup> See George Bereday, "Foreword," *Plan for Comparative Education*, Marc-Antoine Jullien; and Michel Debeauvais, "De Marc-Antoine Jullien Aux Indicateurs Comparatifs de L'an 2000" (paper presented at the 19e Congress CESE, Bologne, 2000).

## 2. The Traveling Observer

Jullien's questions point to a tradition of assembling knowledge about a place through exhaustive inventory and, relatedly, they highlight the model of the researcher as a traveler who does that collecting and assembling. In this section I will discuss the observation, validity and certainty trajectories on which Jullien's comparative education project can be based. I begin with the travel and information collecting models his plan relates to, then quickly discuss the ways travel by Europeans informed the development of social science ideas about observation, and finally relate this in detail to the several ways that Jullien's text seems to be laying out the task of the observer, scientist and comparativist.

A number of Jullien's questions are drawn verbatim from a 1789 book by Count Leopold Berchtold titled *Essay to direct and extend the Inquiries of Patriotic Travellers*.<sup>10</sup> In this work Berchtold presented a 400 page questionnaire which followed in the tradition of 'rational travel' developed by 16th century humanists. In his text Jullien indicates with an asterisk the questions he drew from Berchtold (the question about head-covering habits while sleeping is among them), and he refers to the book as an "interesting and instructive work".<sup>11</sup> This connection points to the tradition of scholarly travel that was one of the conditions making Jullien's plan possible.

Lists of questions, frequently known as *interrogatoria*, came into increased use in the 16th and 17th centuries as guidelines that were to structure the travel journals and reports of travelers, among others those on the 'grand tour'. The intellectual historian Eric Leed argues that this convention, shaped by early modern humanists and physicians, came to have a decisive effect on the conventions of social science description. Drawing on the 'reductive-compositive' method of Peter Ramus, the idea of rational travel – notably as something that had and required a *method* – developed where the observing and typically young traveler was to make note of the temperament, mores, customs, diet, and languages of the people whom he (once again, the gender specificity is appropriate) encountered. In Leed's argument, travel became "the primary

<sup>10</sup> The French translation appeared in 1797 as Leopold Berchtold, *Essai pour diriger et étendre les recherches des voyageurs qui se proposent l'utilité de leur patrie*, trans. C.P. de Lasteyrie (Paris: Chez du Pont, 1797).

<sup>11</sup> The American historian Stewart Frazer notes that additional questions from Berchtold go unacknowledged.

method by which Europeans investigated, observed and compiled a world".<sup>12</sup> The 2,443 questions in Berchtold's essay could direct and extend the inquiries of patriotic travelers because they would help one amass information that would have utility in much the same way that Jullien's plan was to have utility for the national patriots who joined up.

The key methodological device of this scholarly, early modern scientific travel was the observing, detached eye taken from Bacon's philosophy of observation. The popular image of the traveler as teller of fables and tall tales began to fade in the Renaissance to be replaced by a notion of the traveler as the source of authoritative knowledge. In Leed's account, the knowledge of the traveler became necessarily a knowledge of remove and distance, for inherent in the idea of the scientific traveler was "the concept that the traveler's observations are adequate for recognizing and naming things, categorizing species ... but inadequate for plumbing the depths of experience".<sup>13</sup> A host of recent literature on European travel, frequently from post-colonial perspectives, has emphasized the importance of encounters with others as self-consolidating interchanges that served to clarify the autonomous European subject.<sup>14</sup> It is very much in this vein that the subjectivity of the early modern scientific traveler is projected onto the world, rendering up a world knowable as objects that can be described, categorized and named, all from a deliberately external perspective.

The notion that one can see from the outside what might be obscured from within is extremely relevant to the development of social sciences. Schools and education systems, which have historically (and historiographically) been taken as endogenous systems par extraordinaire, can be authentically known, according to the epistemology of scientific travel that I have been describing, when viewed from the outside. Jullien's plan for comparative education relies precisely such a kind of external observer, as he describes in his introduction:

The observer studies and compares, with attention and curiosity, all the possible shades of social institutions, from pure and absolute democracy to the most complicated aristocracy. He endeavors to disentangle the

<sup>12</sup> Eric Leed, *The Mind of the Traveler: From Gilgamesh to Global Tourism* (New York: Basic Books, 1991), p. 188.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 183-4.

<sup>14</sup> See, for example, Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (London & New York: Routledge, 1992); Inderpal Grewal, *Home and Harem: Nation, Gender, Empire, and the Cultures of Travel, Post-Contemporary Interventions* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1996); Caren Kaplan, *Questions of Travel: Postmodern Discourses of Displacement* (Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press, 1996).

variations which the different political organizations have been able to introduce into the systems of the public schools.<sup>15</sup>

Faith in the observer's ability to disentangle reliably an educational system underlies Jullien's plan of questions. It is one of the so-to-speak 'rules', a piece of the architecture on which the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* is articulated. Jullien's educational scientist is an as-if traveler seeing from a privileged outside viewpoint, a viewpoint from which it is possible to observe whether there are annual vacations and how greed is prevented in children.<sup>16</sup>

In addition to this movement – or trajectory – towards the certainty offered by a distant, external eye, there is a concurrent and non-contradictory movement towards the internal, towards assembling knowledge that might exist on the 'inside'. A turn to histories and analyses of travel accounts will once again prove useful.

If the truth of the traveler's account, meaning the certainty and validity of the traveler's observations, are constituted through his or her autonomous subjectivity then it behooves us to pay attention to what was bracketed out of that field of vision. The 17th and 18th century traveler is decidedly not omniscient – the ability to penetrate into matters and describe them from above is reserved to God. In an examination of the representations of Native Americans in French and English colonial literature, Gordon Sayre highlights the method of travel, arguing that for French explorers and trapper-colonists who largely traveled along waterways by canoe, the interiors were the domain of the Indian, knowable only "by extrapolation of what one did see to what one would see

<sup>15</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 44.

<sup>16</sup> I am presenting a model of the observing subject in a somewhat different light than Jonathan Crary does in his outstanding work on the topic (in particular, see Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century* [Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1990]). Crary examines the rupture that occurred in the 19th century with what he calls the "classical" or Renaissance model of vision and the observer. Crary argues that the technique of the *camera obscura* guaranteed a kind of authority, identity and universality to the observer of the classical era. In the first few decades of the 19th century, Crary's argument runs, subjective vision became a key object of study and the incorporeal relations of the *camera obscura* were relocated in the human body. In turning to the traveler's report, as I have done in the preceding analysis, I have proposed that the subjectivity of vision appears, so-to-speak, in the foreground of European scientific thought much earlier. The traveler's gaze, I argued, precisely because the subjectivity of its perspective is so explicitly known, can be granted the authority and universality that Crary maintains came through the *camera obscura*.

behind the curtain of trees if one went there".<sup>17</sup> The veracity of their accounts was established through reliance only on what the eyewitness narrator could see. Sayre identifies a different colonial ethnographic literature, which more often came from the British side, whose farmsteads slowly encroached on the forest, where Native Americans came to be represented through texts that categorized spheres of social life and segregated cultural representations from colonial encounters. When the Native American appeared in these narratives, "he or she is not a single individual communicating with the Europeans in the diegetic timeframe of the [explorer's] narrative, but a plural, unnamed and abstracted *sauvages américains*."<sup>18</sup> The two models work well in concert: one offers the empirical, autonomous observer whose external, alienated eye creates the conditions for knowledge, the second is the categorizing, naming subject who constructs an encyclopedia out of *interrogatoria*, pluralizing and abstracting and thus in effect achieving the *overview* that had previously been bracketed from vision.

Note that I am not suggesting that this is merely yet another way in which the familiar particularist versus generalist debate recurs. I am focusing on the (historically and culturally specific) ways in which knowledge about an object can be assembled, which includes the ways the object can be fixed as seeable and knowable in the first place. I am using the above examples of Europeans representing Native Americans to think through the play of notions of 'inside' and 'outside' in the description of school systems in different places. The external gaze of the early 19th century traveler is inadequate – Jullien thought so, as we will see in a second. However, it does have the ability to establish objects worthy of study, to specify the questions and to see things even if it is only an outline with an unknown interior. As a complement to this, the 'inside' perspective, that gaze which can penetrate, enters the picture – we will see shortly how it enters into Jullien's plan. My argument is that these two components (or trajectories) work in concert, integrally and mutually constituting one another, which suggests that in terms of the reasoning and logic being deployed here a knowledge of the interior elides rather smoothly into an encyclopedic, compiling overview.

Above I wrote that Jullien's observer is as-if a traveler viewing from the outside, but further examination of his *Plan for a Work on Comparative*

<sup>17</sup> Gordon M. Sayre, *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), p. 114.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

*Education* makes it clear that this thesis needs to be modified to take into account the surveyors he proposes to use. Jullien will use what we could call in anachronous language 'native informants'. They are to be "intellectual and active men of sound judgment, of known moral conduct",<sup>19</sup> and in describing the hoped for commencement of his project in Switzerland Jullien writes:

We have ... the justified hope, and in a few cantons the positive assurance, that many inhabitants of Switzerland, entirely devoted to the good of their country, and occupied with tasks related to education, will help us with their experience, their Enlightenment, and knowledge they already have or will acquire about persons, localities, and institutions. The collaborators of our undertaking, whose plan we publish in order to call upon all those who will want to participate in it, will thus have the occasion and advantage of better exercising, developing, and fortifying their three faculties of attention, comparison, reasoning, applied to a determined goal, which is of the greatest interest for all men.<sup>20</sup>

The questions are to be completed by Swiss who will report on the localities they live in and on the institutions they live with. In some measure then, Jullien proposes to rely on knowledge and observation that is 'internal' and 'local'. And, at the same time, he expects the local collaborators to exercise attention, comparison and reasoning. The respondents are to be researchers as well. Their experience, reasoning and knowledge is to adhere to certain guidelines; one could say that in this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education there exists something along the lines of an 'interview protocol', which could be encapsulated as an Enlightenment notion of the universality of reason coupled with specific conventions for thinking about and observing education institutions. The local researcher who establishes whether there are annual vacations and how greed is prevented in children is working in the tradition of the observer who travels through a place viewing it from the exterior, only now the alienated eye is to be turned inward.

To argue, as I have, that there is an overlap in method and an ironic similarity in perspective between the Swiss questionnaire respondent and the external, foreign organizer(s) of the entire project does not mean that these two roles collapse entirely into one another. Distinctions are not obliterated and Jullien

<sup>19</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, pp. 36-7.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 44-5.

throws into the equation the fact of his foreignness, and what effect his role as the ultimate organizer would have on the project, writing:

Allow me here to foresee and do away with an objection which they will not fail to make. 'It is a foreigner', they will say, a Frenchman who undertakes to draw up the table of comparative education in various cantons of Switzerland.<sup>21</sup>

This condition can be skewed as desirable, however, for he continues:

But the quality of being a foreigner is a sort of guarantee of the characteristic of independence and impartiality which becomes the author of a work in which the various cantons of Switzerland must be related and compared in the delicate and important moral and pedagogical respects. Truth will be more easily gathered, more faithfully expressed. All the discretions owed to an estimable and generous nation will be religiously observed, without the truth of facts being altered.<sup>22</sup>

In a way compatible with the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education's* move towards the 'internal', it moves towards the 'external'. Through Jullien's eventual authorship of the compiled work, Switzerland and its cantons will be accurately and validly represented. His foreignness can actually enable the "discretions owed".

The combination of a foreigner who will guarantee "independence and impartiality" and a Swiss observer who will bring the "experience ... they already have" is best made sense of if we think of it in terms of the processes of objectification and subjectification at work in the text. This analytical strategy means that I am precisely not postulating a dialectical relationship between the objective and the subjective. Instead of seeing Jullien's plan in terms of an axis on which subjectivity is opposed to objectivity we can see it as involving observation and compilation that creates certain subjectivities and renders other entities into objects. This tandem movement, which could be expressed in different terms as the creation of a modern scientific and analytical self and a modern scientized and analyzed world, is enacted through both Jullien's foreign author and his Swiss collaborator. It is one of the more solid cultural-epistemological trajectories on which this instance of comparative education can be

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., p. 46.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid.

based, and it is a pervasive feature in the emergence of social science generally, as well as an enduring one.

### 3. The Scientific Society

This early 19th century instance of Comparative Education reveals much about the establishment of social science. Jullien speaks of the study of education as a "science" and many of the treatments of Jullien's plan over the past half century (both those that laud and those that criticize) have focused on it as a proposal for a 'science of education'.<sup>23</sup> Accordingly, it is his research design, usually seen through the eyes of later social scientists, that bears the brunt of the analyses. This paper conducts its analysis of Jullien's science from a different angle – from the perspective of the conditions that made this planned science possible. Above, I began a discussion of the way the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* constructs its objects and subjects, and the rules that this followed. In this section I further specify my analysis of how Jullien's plan 'works' by looking at the networks and worlds these objects and subjects inhabit. 'The Scientific Society', as a subheading, refers to the community of researchers that Jullien's plan seems to be working to implement, and I begin by looking more at the way individuals were to be brought into Comparative Education research, arguing that it was a fellowship oriented around a cosmopolitan identity. I then go on to examine the second sense of the subheading, which relates to the larger idea of the existence of 'society' and the notion that it is something that can be studied and known – and, as we will see, manipulated – scientifically.

The respondents to Jullien's questions, in addition to being researchers, were to be comparativists, comparativists who were all to be joined together into the same cosmopolitan community that was engaged in a global scientific project. When I argued above that the researcher on the 'outside' and the researcher on the 'inside' were one and the same subject, even if some distinctions were maintained, it was on the grounds that the subjectivity that would be brought to and engendered by the study and the objects that would be constituted through it were shared. We should add to this that both the foreign author and the local collaborator were *comparativists* – recall that Jullien claimed that his Swiss

<sup>23</sup> See Harold J. Noah & Max A. Eckstein, *Toward a Science of Comparative Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1968), p. 59.



collaborators would fortify "their three facilities of attention, comparison [and] reasoning." It follows from this that the preparation of the single-country or single-canton response was considered, even in isolation, somehow to involve *comparative* methods or manipulations. (One cannot but fail to notice the correspondence between this and the current day willingness of journals in Comparative Education to consider single-country studies as within the ambit of comparative studies.) In Jullien's case the attribution of 'comparativeness' to the single-canton study can be explained by the method used and the knowledge brought by the collaborator.

An international scientific project of the 18th century whose resemblance to Jullien's is illustrative was the species categorization effort associated with Carl Linnaeus and his taxonomic system. Linnaean trained surveyors charted the globe, categorizing flora and fauna, mailing to each other and to Linnaeus' base in Uppsala species appellations and often specimens as well. Below I will return to the question of how or whether 'centralization' characterized Linnaeus' and Jullien's research projects. Now let us note a similarity in method: just as the same questioning, dividing and characterizing tactics could be employed to identify phyla across the world and/or to identify species variation in one specific locale, Jullien's questions could be used to characterize the education system in a country, in a canton, in any locale however defined. Such an elasticity of scope is tied to the modularity of the method and it works to unite the researchers into a single community.<sup>24</sup> The single study is implicitly intended for comparison – one uses the same questions in Bern as someone else was to in Belgium. In addition, it is intended for comparison because it only makes 'sense' as part of a global research project – implicit in the logic of a system for categorizing regional variations is the idea that this system be mapped across the globe.<sup>25</sup> As would be true for most social scientists, the researcher in the comparative education project was to be cosmopolitan, a citizen of the world. The focus on a specific locale would never be to the exclusion of a perspective on others.

Jullien's collaborator is required to have a cosmopolitan dimension to his identity as the one who knows the international trends in education and can see how they are represented in his locale. It is a commonplace at the beginning of the 21st century to marvel (critically and with enthusiasm) at the pace and quantity with which educational discourses and practices are transferred/

<sup>24</sup> See the discussion in Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, p. 25 and passim.

<sup>25</sup> Pratt refers to this as the "totalizing embrace" of the Linnaean knowledge-building enterprise. *Ibid.*, p. 30.

borrowed/exported around the world, which makes it a useful corrective to find evidence that much of the same was occurring in the early 19th century. Drawing from Jullien's plan alone we learn that Bell-Lancaster methods were coming out of England (Question A. 96);<sup>26</sup> Pestalozzi's methods were coming out of Switzerland (A. 97);<sup>27</sup> a certain French engineer, Regnier, is noted as having perfected a strength measuring device that would be useful in physical education (B. 66); ideas of a German philosopher, Basedow, were informing moral and religious education (B. 100). The Ecole Polytechnique of Paris had been reproduced successfully in Austria and Russia, Jullien also notes.<sup>28</sup> In his text education is cast as something very much in motion, a traveling object, and it is clear that the task of the Comparative Education researcher is to be on top of all of this, to be a cosmopolitan subject whose local knowledge is, at the end, framed by a global perspective.

In both Jullien's project and Linnaeus' project these cosmopolitan networks were bound together through correspondence. In Jullien's case the travels of letters more than specimens connected all these researches and researchers together; however, both projects drew on the epistolary tradition of early modern European science, where knowledge was advanced through the correspondence between scientific societies and the exchange of the objects that could be used to assemble the scientific curiosity cabinets of British and French gentlemen-scientists.<sup>29</sup> What begins to distinguish Linnaeus' project and Jullien's project from these earlier instances of scientific research was the restriction of subject matter to one single topic and the development of expertise about its study. Specialization – even if the topic still remained somewhat broad: flora and fauna in one case, almost all of education, in the other – represented a narrowing, ultimately though, it was an entire world that was being constituted as the object of study.

<sup>26</sup> As evidence that this the movement of educational discourses and practices was a worldwide phenomenon even in the early 19th century we could mention that Andrew Bell's contributions to the "Bell-Lancaster Method" actually grew out of work that he did in India.

<sup>27</sup> Jullien himself had spent time with Pestalozzi in Yverdon and contributed to the circulation of Pestalozzian ideas in his writings. See the excellent treatment in Jacqueline Gautherin, "Marc-Antoine Jullien ('Jullien de Paris')," in *Prospects* 23:3/4 (1993), pp. 760-62.

<sup>28</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 36.

<sup>29</sup> Michel de Certeau similarly argues that these networks of the curious mark a point of origin for 'disciplines' and the 'institution of knowledge'. Michel de Certeau, *The Writing of History*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), p. 61.



Above in reference to its questions I noted that Jullien's *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* includes a rather broad notion of what could come into the study of education. When the idea of specialization is applied here it needs to refer to the development of expertise for the study of education, seen against the practice of sharing information among general scientific societies.<sup>30</sup> One element that was to make this specialized social science was the international committee that Jullien proposed. It would be a:

*Special Education Commission*, small in number, composed of men in charge of collecting, through their own means and by corresponding associates chosen with care, the materials for a general work on the establishment and methods of education and instruction in the different European states, related and compared under this report. [emphasis in original]<sup>31</sup>

In the 'rediscovery' and promulgation of Jullien's work in the mid-twentieth century, much was made of this specialized commission. It was immediately likened by his new promoters to the existing Geneva-based International Bureau of Education,<sup>32</sup> and seemed to anticipate the post-war growth of international organizations, such as those connected with the United Nations. In terms of how this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education was organized as a science, however, it would be a mistake to overemphasize the 'centralizing' impetus. I have demonstrated how Jullien's researchers were to be comparativists and cosmopolitan minded participants in an international research project. The built-in modularity of Jullien's project, as well as Linnaeus', meant that neither Uppsala nor the Special Education Commission, as centers that would collect reports, were essential. Categorizations and comparisons could be

<sup>30</sup> As an example, it is worth mentioning Jullien's membership in the specialized *Société établie à Paris pour l'amélioration de l'enseignement élémentaire*. Jan Kanty Krzyżanowski, who organized the 1822 Polish translation of Jullien's *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education*, was a founding member of another such society, the Lublin-based *Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk*. See Jan Dobrzanski, *Ze studiów nad szkolnictwem elementarnym Lubelszczyzny w pierwszej połowie XIX wieku* (Wrocław, Warszawa, Krakow: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolinskich Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968), pp. 83-89.

<sup>31</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 36.

<sup>32</sup> Pedro Rosselló, *Les précurseurs du Bureau International d'Éducation; un aspect inédit de l'histoire de l'éducation et des institutions internationales*. (Geneva: Bureau International d'Éducation, 1943). An English version of this text was published in London in 1944.

made 'in the field' so-to-speak; they were the mobile rules of reason that made the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* possible. The notable characteristic of Jullien's cosmopolitan comparativists was that they engaged in specialized study that was a divisible and assemblable social science.

Twentieth century scholars have frequently underscored an apparent parallel between the historical situation in which Jullien's plan was written and that in which it was resuscitated.<sup>33</sup> Jullien proposed his Comparative Education in the wake of the Napoleonic wars; the growth of international organizations in the late 1940s and 1950s, including internationally coordinated education research, came after the destruction caused by World War II and was intended, as many charters will attest, to build a stable and more peaceful world. It is a connection that warrants further interrogation because it reveals important pieces of the logic and trajectories on which social sciences are based.

Jullien's *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* is full of references to "revolutions and wars", "our long upheavals", "troubles and violent commotions" that serve as a foil for his case. They are the alternative to be avoided. The common ideas expressed after both periods of war were that schooling was to be ameliorating vis-à-vis governments and peoples, as well as ever-improving vis-à-vis its own methods. The parallel to point out in particular is that at both times it was the *study* of schooling that was believed necessary for effecting these improvements.

Although the timeframe of his history is different, some observations from the science studies scholar Bruno Latour are strikingly appropriate to this discussion of appearances of Comparative Education. Latour writes:

Most of the social sciences were invented, a century ago, to short-cut political processes after many years of insufferable civil wars and revolutionary strife. If we have a society that is *already composed as one single whole* and which can be used to account for the behavior of actors who do not know what they are doing, but whose unknown structure is visible to the keen eyes of a social scientist, it then becomes possible to embark on the huge task of social engineering in order to produce the common good, without having to go through the painstaking labour of composing this commonality through political means. [emphasis in original]<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See, Stewart E. Fraser, "Commentary," *Plan for Comparative Education*, Marc-Antoine Jullien, pp. 94-5.

<sup>34</sup> Bruno Latour, "When Things Strike Back: A Possible Contribution of 'Science Studies' to

Latour's suggestion that the establishment of social sciences involved a kind of short-cut is made against the backdrop of his research and theorizing about the extensive political constituencies that scientists in the natural sciences need to mobilize in their work, yet it describes some crucial dimensions of Jullien's plan.

The *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* relies on the notion of 'society' and 'societies' but my analysis here will focus on the way that it posits education entities already composed as single wholes. Similar to the way that Friedrich Tenbruck proposes that the concept of 'society' fits the context-bound conditions in which its study arose in the early 19th century,<sup>35</sup> I argue that the concept of 'public education systems' fits the historically specific requirements of the comparative methods proposed for their study. Jullien proposes to collect information "on the condition of education and public instruction" and speaks about "education systems",<sup>36</sup> which produces something quite similar to the 'short-cut' Latour describes. We know the early 19th century as a time when debates raged about the desirability of mandatory, universal public education and about the desirable kinds of government involvement in setting up education systems. The science of Comparative Education arrives and is able not only to represent and characterize education in a specific place, but to compare it against other places. With the simple device of series of questions and a report, the various, seemingly unconnected, schooling practices of a range of institutions; the hygiene habits people have learned or not learned; the philosophies that village school teachers use to explain their instruction techniques – all can be linked together and considered an 'education system' or 'public education'. Jullien's plan renders it visible and allows his comparativists to begin accounting for people's actions, and to begin the social engineering project that is mass education as it begins in the 19th century.

This said, we should note that the precise object of Jullien's study is left somewhat ambiguous. As Jacqueline Gautherin points out, the scale of the study is not clear, one does not really know whether geographical, ethnic, political or administrative entities are to be compared.<sup>37</sup> Jullien does not, by one measure, 'successfully' schematize the education system as an organization; however, it is precisely this haziness that in fact offers a clue to one of the ways that social sciences work. Just as one can, without end, debate and refine and recast the concept of 'society', the concept of the 'education system' can be endlessly

the Social Sciences," in *British Journal of Sociology* 54:1 (2000), pp. 117-8.

<sup>35</sup> Schriever, "World System," p. 310.

<sup>36</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, pp. 37, 33.

<sup>37</sup> Gautherin, "Marc-Antoine Jullien," p. 765.

reworked, parsed out, or mapped. These elusive things are the very objects we necessarily and constantly circle around as social scientists and comparative educationists – approaching from new angles, arguing that predecessors missed a nuance or a dimension. In modern social science disciplines and fields rest on the presupposition that 'it' is there, already composed and needing the right eyes to be organized and made visible.<sup>38</sup>

Jullien's plan works as social science because the constitution of these global objects (the 'society', the 'education system') was accompanied by the mandate that these were objects that *needed* to be operated on. The cosmopolitan network that encompassed both the *Special Education Commission* and all those who collaborated, and on whose information-exchanging circuits this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education was to rest, was bound together by one additional shared, organizing imperative: the necessity of interventionary action. Comparative Education promised successful social engineering because it could reconstitute the very objects it could point out. Jullien makes this argument very clearly. The *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* maintains that destructive revolutions and wars spring from ignorance and the slackening of "religious, moral and social bonds" (i.e. those connections that make up a society), and proposes that "return to religion and morality" can come through public education "without which the reform of customs and of individual and national character would be impossible." The educational entity, characterized in this instance as 'public education', must be studied and reformed because "it is in short by regenerating human society, little by little ... that one can hope to put an end to the misfortunes of individuals and of countries."<sup>39</sup> The reconstitution of society takes on urgency and obligation in the reasoning Jullien develops. And, it should be noted, it is a problem not just for governments; the Comparative Education studies Jullien proposes are intended to provide information usable by many publics.

The scientific study of social problems with an eye for intervention has antecedents in the cameral and policy sciences of the 17th and 18th centuries; these studies, however, Peter Wagner argues, were designed for the almost exclusive use of an absolute ruler, which is a notable contrast to what emerged after the American and French revolutions.<sup>40</sup> The notion that the post-revo-

<sup>38</sup> Whether perspectives identified as post-modern shift the phenomenon I am describing here is a question I will leave to other scholars.

<sup>39</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 34.

<sup>40</sup> Peter Wagner, *A History and Theory of the Social Sciences* (London: Sage Publications, 2001), p. 40 and passim.

lutionary situation enabled or obliged individuals to create their own rules for social order and action<sup>41</sup> is worked into Jullien's plan on two levels. First, it enters on the level of the education programs and reforms that are to be introduced, as in Question B. 98 cited at the beginning of this paper: "Does one exercise early in children the thinking ability and reason applied to the guidance and examination of their behavior, so that, when they reach youth and a mature age, they can easily do without a guide...." Second, the obligation to self-govern and create rules is worked into Jullien's 'science of education' itself. In his argument, comparison would allow the deduction of "certain principles, determined rules, so that education might become almost nearly a positive science, rather than be abandoned to the narrow and limited views, to the caprices and to arbitration of those who control it." [emphasis added]<sup>42</sup>

Even though the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* discusses the interests of governments in Comparative Education research, it is crucial to note the ways that the text diffuses the capability and responsibility for coming up with rules and implementing educational reforms.<sup>43</sup> It is also important to note that in the above quote the study of education is being proposed in opposition to the "caprices and arbitrariness" of political authorities: social science is being instituted as a domain outside the control of governments and as something capable of marshalling pressure on them. It is in this way that the cosmopolitan community of Comparative Education researchers coheres as a scientific network, out of whose efforts education systems and societies can be fabricated.

#### 4. Switzerland Compared

In the previous section of the paper the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* was likened to Linnaeus' taxonomic project and was fit into the development of social science in general. I only briefly touched on the comparative nature of the undertaking Jullien was proposing when I looked at

<sup>41</sup> See *Ibid.*, p. 39, as well as the arguments developed in Gordon S. Wood, *Radicalism of the American Revolution* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992).

<sup>42</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, pp. 40-1.

<sup>43</sup> In this regard see Ian Hunter's arguments about the 'administrative intellectual' who began to act as the agent of the political and intellectual technologies of governments in the 19th century. Ian Hunter, "Aesthetics and Cultural Studies," *Cultural Studies*, ed. by Lawrence Grossberg et al. (New York: Routledge, 1992), p. 363.

the proposal's comparativist researcher as a cosmopolitan subject whose research in one locale would fit together with the efforts of others who, similarly, were studying education systems and working to intervene in them. In this final section I will discuss the comparative dimension in greater detail and the comparisons that Jullien thought Switzerland would offer, and discuss how both fit into epistemic changes that accompanied the early 19th century emergence of social science.

The early 19th century was a time when numerous other comparative disciplines were founded: among others, Wilhelm von Humboldt proposed comparative anthropology in 1795; Georges De Cuvier proposed comparative anatomy in 1800; comparative law was initiated in 1810 by Anselm von Feuerbach; and Franz Bopp proposed comparative linguistics slightly later. Schriewer proposes that comparative research "was the *non plus ultra* of modernity" at the time,<sup>44</sup> and we would do well to further explore what was to be attained by all this comparing.

On an epistemological level comparison promised a kind of certainty and totality to knowledge. Michel Foucault, in *The Order of Things*, argues that a Renaissance ordering system that was based on resemblance was replaced in the Enlightenment, in Foucault's terms the "classical age", with a way of reasoning based on comparison. At the center of this episteme was the table, which provided a means for conceiving of the relations between things in terms of order and measurement. Any kind of analysis was a matter of establishing the identity of a thing and fixing it in relation to its differences from other things, and certain knowledge resulted.<sup>45</sup> As we saw in the previous section, Jullien was interested in deducing "certain principles" and "determined rules". This would be possible if one had "collections of facts and observations arranged in analytical charts",<sup>46</sup> which is to say in a table. Jullien's science of education seems to be pursuing through comparison a totality of certain knowledge about education in a way that fits Foucault's description of the Enlightenment episteme. How relations of difference were to be established and the rules according to which this could be articulated warrants further attention.

As we learned from several of the earlier passages quoted, Jullien proposed to begin Comparative Education research in Switzerland and then proceed on to the other nations of Europe. Switzerland was a choice that would have made

<sup>44</sup> Schriewer, "World System," p. 308.

<sup>45</sup> Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1971), pp. 54-5 and *passim*.

<sup>46</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 40.

sense to his contemporaries; in the late 18th and early 19th centuries Switzerland was known to Europe as a place of diverse governments with a wide variety of local democratic assemblies. As such, it made an ideal location for Edward Gibbon's studies of government in 1755. After 1798, when it was turned into a French protectorate under Napoleon, Switzerland's local assemblies became sites of pilgrimage for European visitors who found there, according to one historian, a "transcendental value, a theoretical antidote to the follies and excesses of the French Revolution."<sup>47</sup> Switzerland offered a kind of laboratory where a variety of different cases, or environments, would supply certain conditions of difference for a comparative study. As Jullien puts it:

A great variety of climate, languages, religions, political organizations, and governments in the twenty-two cantons of the Helvetian confederation permits finding there institutions and systems of education of unlimited variety, which reproduce all possible known forms of education, whether ancient or modern, or composed of a mixture from former times and changes introduced in our day, whether directed by secular or religious corporations, whether lastly subordinated to government or independent of its action.<sup>48</sup>

This rationale for a study of Switzerland shows comparison being used to construct a totality of knowledge about education in its "all possible known forms" and it also shows how the differences between these forms were organized. Jullien has introduced what Gautherin has described in reference to the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* as a "sense of the specific";<sup>49</sup> and, he has introduced as a noteworthy part of that specificity a significant temporal aspect.

If we continue to apply Foucault's arguments from the *Order of Things* Jullien begins to appear as something of a transitional figure between epistemes, a writer at that point in the late 18th and early 19th century where the figure of 'man' begins to intercede onto the 'table' and man's own 'finitude' provide the foundations of knowledge. For Foucault, the functionalism of Georges de Cuvier represents a decisive break where the continuous identities that could be fitted into a table (Enlightenment episteme) were replaced by organic structures

<sup>47</sup> Paul P. Bernard, *Rush to the Alps: The Evolution of Vacationing in Switzerland* (Boulder: East European Quarterly Press, 1978), pp. 23-4 and passim.

<sup>48</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 43.

<sup>49</sup> Gautherin, "Marc-Antoine Jullien," p. 764.

related by analogies of function (modern episteme). Even though the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* makes reference to Cuvier's work in comparative anatomy as a model for Comparative Education,<sup>50</sup> Jullien does not wholly, as Gautherin points out,<sup>51</sup> map out the elements of his educational comparisons as functional pieces. Jullien does, however, have a sense of the historicity of the human subject that matches Foucault's description of what appeared after the shift that occurred around 1800. Jullien expects the cantons of Switzerland to be places in time, showing both "ancient" and "modern" forms of education, and in his description of what Switzerland offered the comparativist there is the anticipation that one would also find "a mixture" of times that would reflect "changes introduced in our day" – the interventions of people acting on their societies and education systems. This early 19th century instance of Comparative Education seems very close to Foucault's idea that in the 'human sciences' of the 19th century there emerges a sense of 'man' as a conditioned subject who constitutes his representations on the basis of those conditions.<sup>52</sup> The idea of self-reference (public instruction creates peoples; peoples create their education systems) has a close relation to what I described above as a post-revolutionary situation wherein individuals were obliged to create their own rules. The uncertainty that arises out of this is what haunts a fundamental contrast in social science, the difference, as Schriewer puts it, "between purported 'laws' of human nature and man's 'indispensable liberty'."<sup>53</sup> It would be a mistake to seize on Jullien's ambition to find "certain principles" and "determined rules" and determine that such a tension is absent from his project. Jullien's comparisons were aimed at finding certain knowledge about education; yet, they had at the same time a sense of historicity and the uncertainty of the unknown futures that would come of the "changes introduced in our day", the interventions of those who would seek to 'update' the ancient to the modern.

Temporal succession is present as a condition of difference in Jullien's plan, one of the ways in which relations can be established – this is to say that it is one of the ways his comparisons are made possible. Connected to this is a 'sense of the specific' that also enters into the fixing of differences. Jullien introduces "climate, languages, religions, political organizations, and governments" as elements that specify difference. He is, in contemporary language, using a

<sup>50</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 41.

<sup>51</sup> Gautherin argues that instead Jullien's plan is based on the concept of 'value'. See Gautherin, "Marc-Antoine Jullien," p. 765.

<sup>52</sup> Foucault, *The Order of Things*, p. 352 and passim.

<sup>53</sup> Schriewer, "World System," p. 309.

notion of 'context'. The *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* uses the particular as something that has expressive, explanatory power. Differences in education systems are attributable to differences in climate, languages, religions, political organizations and governments – notable about this list is that it combines something that would be taken to be 'natural', climate, with formations such as political organizations that are, at least in some part (if only the "changes introduced in our day") the work of 'man'. Context, as the particularity of a place located in a time and articulated as expressive and explanatory, is precisely the glue that can fasten education to the nation, that can link *Sprachgeist* and *Volkgeist* to the self-conscious efforts of people to form their own institutions.

Jullien writes that with comparative tables "one could judge with ease those [European countries] which are advancing; those which are falling back; those which remain stationary."<sup>54</sup> We shouldn't read into this system of distinctions the same notion of 'ranking' that is familiar to us today from the IEA studies of recent decades. The central thrust of the comparison in Jullien's plan was to establish an explanatory device that would elucidate relations of difference. This extends my argument from the previous section that Jullien's social science was positing educational entities which were already composed and which explained and accounted for human actions, to include the idea that these were *explainable* educational entities and that comparison could make clear relations of difference. It could establish explanatory schema for educational institutions/systems that tied them to a local specificity that came both from 'nature' and from 'man' and was articulated as a locale in a particular time.

Jullien is very clear in the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* what the temporal successions, these changes over time, were heading for. He writes,

The bringing together and comparison of cantons in these respects will give birth to the idea of borrowing from one another what they have which is good and useful in their institutions. The *cantonal mind*, narrow and exclusive, will be succeeded by a national *Helvetian* mind, and in this manner, the political unity of Switzerland will be better established and consolidated. (The same thought can be applied to the larger European family.)<sup>55</sup>

## 5. Conclusion: The Cosmopolitan and the National – Fabricating Nation and World

In this early 19th century instance of Comparative Education the specification of difference and the specification of the local is joined to a social scientific project to engineer education systems and their societies out of it. Of course it may not be axiomatic that the specification of difference lead to its erasure and my purpose here is not to engage with Derrida et al. in the theorization of this. Establishing differences, Jullien considered, would allow the "Helvetian mind" to succeed the "cantonal mind" (this is certainly not the last time social science would be marshaled for nation building). The *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* would make clear or bring into focus national systems of education; Comparative Education study would also help consolidate these systems, thus consolidating the nation. Jullien's parenthetical comment, that "the same thought can be applied to the larger European family" suggests that the effects of Comparative Education might not stop at the nation, but that they could assist the substitution of a "European mind" for the "Helvetian mind". We see here that the nation, as one of the more fundamental forces in organizing the work and workers of social science, and as it is being instituted in the early 19th century, exists in relation to the cosmopolitan – the sense that there is a politics and an ethics above the national. In Jullien's plan there is clearly a reliance on the national; he would compare the education systems of the *nations* of Europe, after all. Yet, at the same time, Jullien's plan discusses education reforms as "universal tendencies" and "impressed on the human spirit"<sup>56</sup> and instills Comparative Education research with strong cosmopolitan commitments.

This paper arose out of a research interest in thinking historically about 'national education systems' and the ways they were established as objects of research. A strong body of literature looks at schooling and education in the 19th century as central components in nation-building projects;<sup>57</sup> this work hopes to add to that conversation by devoting attention to the role that *comparison* of education systems could play in this. It is useful, I proposed and now hope to have demonstrated, to analyze Marc-Antoine Jullien's proposal as an instance in the establishment of social science. The traveling observer whose movements and eyes consolidate a subject position and organize objects for analysis is made

<sup>54</sup> Jullien, *Plan for Comparative Education*, p. 37.

<sup>55</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 46.

<sup>56</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 36.

<sup>57</sup> In particular I am thinking the work of John Meyer, Francisco Ramirez, Dominique Julia and Roger Chartier.

possible out of cultural practices that have an enduring presence in reasoning about education systems. Even as observation was parceled out and 'local knowledge' entered this early 19th century research design, it was an expertise that worked through a cosmopolitan orbit. The scientific society – as group of scholars – was one of the ways the national project was brought into this orbit. And, it is essential to note, it is one of the ways such cosmopolitanism is created. The national education system was not articulated against a preexisting cosmopolitanism; rather, each helps constitute the other. The scientific society – as a social, political, cultural, etc. unit – is, like the education system and Jullien's techniques for studying it, assemblable and divisible. Comparing education systems becomes a way to intervene in national societies, or in a world society:

Jullien's ideas for the study of Comparative Education were not realized, as I pointed out in the introduction. They did not birth a discipline, or a continuous conversation. However, rather than be ignored or glossed in histories of the field the *Plan for a Work on Comparative Education* does, when treated in depth as an 'instance' of Comparative Education, reveal much about reasonings that were fixed to the comparative educational project in the early 19th century. These are 'rules' that of course are open to redefinition and of course have been refined over the past two centuries. They point, however, to the ways that Comparative Education as we know it today bears semblance to the social science institution of modernities that began in the early 19th century. Seen in this light, Marc-Antoine Jullien can in fact be examined as a 'foundational' figure for the discipline, with his plan still casting a shadow. It is a shadow that ties Comparative Education to the social science making of nations and of a cosmopolitan world, and it lingers over comparativists as they pursue mobilities their own travels.

## INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

<i>Marcelo Caruso &amp; Heinz-Elmar Tenorth</i> "Internationalisierung" vs. "Globalisierung": Ein Versuch der Historisierung. Zur Einführung in den Band	13
--	----

### THEORETISCHE ANNÄHERUNGEN

<i>Bernd Zymek</i> Die Internationalisierung pädagogischen Wissens als dialektischer Prozess. Zur Aktualität der Wissenssoziologie Karl Mannheims und Norbert Elias' für die Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft	35
--	----

<i>Gita Steiner-Khamsi</i> Re-Framing Educational Borrowing as a Policy Strategy	57
---	----

<i>Francisco O. Ramirez &amp; John W. Meyer</i> National Curricula: World Models and National Historical Legacies	91
--	----

<i>Florian Waldow</i> The Neo-Institutionalist Account of the Emergence of Mass Schooling: Some Remarks on the Swedish Case	109
---	-----

<i>Erwin H. Epstein &amp; Timothy J. Martin</i> Studying Religion and Politics in Disparate Educational Settings: Converging Methods and Divergent Ontologies	125
---	-----

### GESCHICHTLICHE KONTEXTE

<i>Noah W. Sobe</i> Travel, Social Science and the Making of Nations in Early 19 <sup>th</sup> Century Comparative Education	141
--	-----

<i>Christophe Charle</i> Pour une histoire sociale comparée des débats intellectuels internationaux. L'exemple de la crise fin de siècle	167
--	-----

<i>Peter Drewek</i> Die bilaterale Rezeption von Bildung und Erziehung am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts im deutsch-amerikanischen Vergleich	185
---	-----

<i>António Nóvoa, Luís Miguel Carvalho, António Carlos Correia, Ana Isabel Madeira &amp; Jorge Ramos do Ó</i> Flows of Educational Knowledge. The Space-Time of Portuguese-Speaking Countries	211
---	-----

<i>Hartmut Kaelble</i> Zu einer europäischen Sozialgeschichte der Bildung	249
--	-----

### AKTUELLE ENTWICKLUNGEN

<i>Robert Cowen</i> Sketches of a Future: Renegotiating the Unit Ideas of Comparative Education	271
---	-----

<i>Anthony Welch</i> The Intricate Dialectic. Internationalisation and Globalisation in the Contemporary Re-Structuring of Education	285
--	-----

<i>Eric Plaisance</i> Approches comparatives et production d'indicateurs. Le cas de l'éducation "spéciale"	305
--	-----

<i>Edwin Keiner</i> Organisation – Wissen – Macht. Netzwerke als neue Form wissenschaftlicher Kommunikation?	317
--	-----

<i>Klaus Harney</i> Gleichgewicht in der Berufsausbildung	333
--	-----

<b>AUTORENSPIEGEL</b>	353
-----------------------	-----



# Internationalisierung Internationalisation

Semantik und Bildungssystem  
in vergleichender Perspektive

Comparing Educational Systems  
and Semantics

Herausgegeben von Marcelo Caruso  
und Heinz-Elmar Tenorth

Edited by Marcelo Caruso  
and Heinz-Elmar Tenorth

Sonderdruck  
Offprint

2002



PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien