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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. 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 comparatists study as researchers and often engage in as practitioners. Recent post-colonial and post-modern work has focused theoretical and empirical attention on postmodernity, 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-reflexive 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 Julien de Paris (1785-1848) is considered one of comparative education’s ‘pioneers.’ In a series of publications from 1816 to 1817 Julien laid out a proposal for comparative education research

and has accordingly been treated as the field's "forefather," "precursor," and "anticipateur cohérent."

2 I will use Jullien's proposal "Exquise et Vues Préliminaires d'un ouvrage sur L'éducation Comparée [Plan and Preliminary Views for a Work on Comparative Education]" 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 independence or chains of descent. In these terms, in their conventional sense, Jullien's proposal was 3


3 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. Decreed in Jerusale 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.
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itself "lost" to the field of Comparative Education for roughly a century, being famously rediscovered and reconceptualized by Isaac Kantel in the early 1940s.

4 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 revile 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 sought from any 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 idea of "panopticism" elaborated by Michel Foucault in his now classic analysis. 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 Schirerw and his scholarship. His work on internationalization and globalization pointers to the centrality of these phenomena in the very construction of comparative education studies conceptually and methodologically. My hope is that this paper complements Schirerw's analysis of the way various relations can accumulate to dynamize a self-sustained world-level discourse by focusing
on the field of cultural practices through which it becomes possible for educa-
tion to be moved along world-level and local-level networks. Like Schiller, I
would maintain that Comparative Education has an under examined role in fabricating these networks, and in the historical treatment of Julien that follows
I explore how the Plan for a Work on Comparative Education works to fabricate
both bounded, national localizations 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
Julien’s plan possible.

1. Julien’s Plan and Its Questions

The plan for comparative education that Marc-Antoine Julien de Paris
published and disseminated was to consist of a series of questions
survivors 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
temporary eyes, Julien’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. Julien’s questions are remarkably wide in their scope and
were typically 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 or 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

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’Éducation, appearing in December 1816 and continuing in January and February 1817.
Julien was an accomplished publicist, giving the plan to his friend Tadeusz Kosciuszko
the Polish patriot to disseminate, and mailing a version to Thomas Jefferson.
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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 Julien’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 towns 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]

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

A 78 Do mothers exercise a considerable influence on the primary
oral 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?

Because Julien’s numbering scheme is generally preserved in modern reprints 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.
2. The Traveling Observer

Jullien’s questions point to a tradition of assembling knowledge about a place through exhaustive inventory and, relatively, 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 chart collecting models his plan relates to, then quickly discuss the ways the 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 comparative.

A number of Jullien’s questions are drawn verbatim from a 1799 book by Count Leopold Berthold titled Essai pour diriger et ordonner les Inquiétudes des Patriotes Travailleurs.10 In this work Berthold presented a 400 page questionnaire which followed in the tradition of national travel developed by 16th century humanists. In his text Jullien indicates with an asterisk the questions he drew from Berthold (the question about head-covering habits while sleeping is among them), and he refers to the book as an “interesting and instructive work.”11 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 interrogators, 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 Rama, he provides an example: 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

---

10 The French translation appeared in 1797 as Leopold Berthold, Essai pour diriger et ordonner les Inquiétudes des Travailleurs (Paris: Chez du Pont, 1797).
11 The American historian Stewart Frazer notes that additional questions from Berthold go unacknowledged.
method by which Europeans investigated, observed and compiled a world.12 The 2,443 questions in Berchid's essay could direct and extend the inquiries of patriotic travelers because they would help one amassed information that would have utility in much the same way that Julier'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 Leech's account, the knowledge of the traveler became necessarily a knowledge of remove and distance, for in earlier 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."13 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 homogenous European subject.14 It is very much in this sense 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 historically) been taken as endogenous systems par excellence, can be authentically known, according to the epistemology of scientific travel that I have been describing, when viewed from the outside. Julier'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

---

13 Ibid., p. 10.

Faith in the observer’s ability to disentangle reliably an educational system underlies Julier’s plan of questions. It is one of the so-called ‘rules’, a piece of the architecture on which the Plan for a Work on Comparative Education is articulated. Julier’s educational scientist is an awe-struck observer 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. In addition to this movement – or trajectory – towards the certainty offered by a distant, external eye, there is a concurrent and non-constrictive 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 historical subjectivity then it behoves 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 trader-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 etc."

15 Julier, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 44.
16 I am presenting a model of the observing subject in a somewhat different light than Jonathan H. Crary does in his outstanding work on the topic (in particular, see Jonathan H. Crary, Techniques of the Observer: On Vision and Modernity in the Nineteenth Century (Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992). Crary examines the rapport 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 objectivity, identity and universality to the observer of the classical era, in the first few lines of study and the incorporative 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 to be refigured in the figuration of European scientific thought much earlier. The traveler’s gaze, I argued, precisely because the subjectivity of his 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\textsuperscript{17}. 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 etched on the forest, where Native Americans came to be represented in oral 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 savages anachronism.\textsuperscript{17,18}" The two models work well in concert: one offers the empirical, autonomous observer whose external, alienated eye captures the conditions for knowledge, the second is the categorizing, naming subject who constructs an encyclopedia out of interrogatorius, fetishizing 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, paragoughian versus generalist debate returns. 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 sensible 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 — Julien 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, enter the picture — we will see shortly how it enters into Julien'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 exterior eludes rather smoothly into an encyclopedic, compiling overview.

Above I wrote that Julien's observer is at-ifs a traveler viewing from the outside, but further examination of his Plan for a Work on Comparative Education makes it clear that this system needs to be modified to take into account the surveyors' self-proposals to use. Julien will use what we could call in anachronistic language 'native informants'. They are to be 'intellectual and active men of sound judgment, of known moral conduct',\textsuperscript{19} and in describing the hoped for commencement of his project in Switzerland Julien writes:

'We have ... the justified hope, and in a few centuries 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 question, comparison, reasoning, applied to a determined goal, which is of the greatest interest for all men.\textsuperscript{20}

The questioner are to be compiled by Swiss who report on the localities they live in and on the institutions they live with. In some measure then, Julien 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 geared is prevented in children by 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 Julien...
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threws 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 foreclose 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.21

This condition can be skewered 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 discretion owed to an estimable and generous nation will be religiously observed, without the taint of facts being altered.22

In a way compatible with the Plan for a Work on Comparative Education's move towards the 'internal', it moves towards the 'external'. 'though 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
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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 tenets of Jullien's plan over the past half century (both those that lead and those that criticize) have focused on it as a proposal for a 'science of education'.23 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 roles 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 researchers on the 'inside' and the researcher on the 'outside' 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

21 Ibid., p. 46.
22 Ibid.
collaborators would fortify "the three faculties 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 surveys 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.24 The single study is implicitly intended for comparison – one was the same questions in Bern as someone else was in Belgrade. 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.25 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.

24 See the discussion in Pratt, Imperial Eyes, p. 25 and passim.
25 Pratt refers to this in the "totalizing embrace" of the Linnaean knowledge-building enterprise. Ibid., p. 30.

Noah W. Sobe

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 (Quotation A. 96).26 Pestalozzi's methods were coming out of Switzerland (A. 97).27 It is certain French engineer, Regnier, is noted as having perfected a strengthening device that would be useful in physical education (B. 66); ideal of a German philosopher, Bausewein, were informing moral and religious education (B. 100). The Ecole Polytechnique of Paris had been reproduced successfully in Austria and Russia, Jullien also notes,28 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 epistolarly 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.29 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.

26 As evidence that this the movement of educational discourses and practices was a world 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.
28 Jullien, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 36.
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 relativism was that they engaged in specialized study that was a divisible and assembleable 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. 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 unshaven", "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 school should beameliorating vis-a-vis governments and peoples, as well as ever-improving vis-a-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 eye 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]

30 As an example, it is worth mentioning Jullien's membership in the specialized Société éducative à Paris for the promotion of the éducation elementaire. Jan Kaspro-Krez zanowski, who organized the 1882 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 Dobrzański, "Z dziejów i szkolnictwem ewolucyjnym. Lubiński w pierwszej половине XIX wieku" (Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków: Zakład Narodowy Imienia Ossolińskich Wydawnictwa Polskiej Akademii Nauk, 1968), pp. 83-89.
31 Jullien, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 36.
32 Pédro Roselli, Les précurseurs du Bureau International d'Éducation: un aspect inédit de l'histoire de l'éducation et des institutions internationales (Genève: Bureau International d'Éducation, 1943). An English version of this text was published in London in 1944.
33 See, Stuart E. Fraser, "Commentary," Plan for Comparative Education, Marc-Antoine Jullien, pp. 94-5.
34 Bruno Latour, "When Things Strike Back: A Possible Contribution of 'Science Studies' to
Latom'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 Tertneck proposed that the concept of 'society' fits the context-bound conditions in which its study arose in the early 19th century, 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", which produces something quite similar to the 'short-cut' Latom 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 comparative 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. 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. As just one case, without end, debate and refine and recast the concept of 'society', the concept of the 'education system' can be endlessly 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 previous attempts missed a nuance or a dimension. In modern social science disciplines and fields, rest on the presupposition that 'it is there, already constituted and needing the right eyes to be organized and made visible'.

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'. 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. 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 canonical 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. The notion that the post-revo-

35 Whether perspectives identified as post-modern shift the phenomenon I am describing here in a question I will leave to other scholars.
36 Jullien, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 34.
the proposal’s comparatist 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 epistemonic 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 anthropo-logy 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. Schriever proposes that comparative research “was the man plus ulta of modernity” at the time, 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, i.e. Foucault’s term 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. As we saw in the previous section, Jullien was interested in deducing “certain principles” and “determined roles”. This would be possible if one had “collections of facts and observations arranged in analytic chart”, 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 warrant 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

45 In this regard see Ian Hunter’s arguments about the “administrative intellectual” who began to act as the agent of the political and intellectual technocracies 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.
48 Jullien, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 49.
sence 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 visitor who found there, according to one historian, a "transcendental value, a theoretical antidote to the follies and excesses of the French Revolution." 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 Julienn puts it:

A great variety of climate, languages, religions, political organizations, and governments in the twenty-two cantons of the Helvetic 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 together times and changes introduced in our day, whether directed by secular or religious corporations, whether justified subordinated to government or independent of its action.48

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. Julienn has introduced what Gaither has described in reference to the Plan for a Work on Comparative Education as a "sense of the specific" 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 Julienn begins to appear as something of a transitional figure between epistememes, 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 'Trinité' 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 epimeme) were replaced by organic structures.


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, Julienn does not wholly, at Gaither points out, map out the elements of his educational comparison as functional pieces. Julienn does, however, have a sense of the historicity of the human subject that matches Foucault's description of what appeared when the shift that occurred around 1800. Julienn 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 he 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 these conditions.50 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 Schilewer puts it, "between purporting 'laws' of human nature and man's 'indispensable liberty'."51 It would be a mistake to seize on Julienn's ambition to find "certain principles" and "determined rules" and determine that such a tension is absent from his project. Julienn'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 Julienn'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. Julienn introduces "climate, languages, religions, political organizations, and governments" as elements that specify difference. He is, in contemporary language, using a

50 Julienn, Plan for Comparative Education, p. 41.
52 Foucault, The Order of Things, p. 352 and passim.
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.)  

55 Ibid., p. 46.

56 In particular I am thinking of the work of John Meyer, Francisco Ramirez, Dominique Julia and Roger Chartier.

Noah W. Sohe

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 then exhibits 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, Julien considered, would allow the "Helvetian mind" to succeed the "cantonal mind" (this is certainly not the last time social sciences 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. Julien’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 nation. In Julien’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, Julien’s plan discusses education reforms as "universal tendencies" and "impressed on the human spirit" and insistently 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; 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 sciences. The traveling observer whose movements and eyes consolidate a subject position and organize objects for analysis is made
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