

---

---

## An American Construction of European Education Space

IVETA SILOVA AND WILLIAM C. BREHM

*Lehigh University, Pennsylvania, USA*

**ABSTRACT** The construction of European education space has typically been attributed to European education policymakers, institutions, and networks. Rarely do scholars consider the role of outside, non-European actors in shaping the terrain of European education thought and practice. This article considers the construction of European education space as a borderless project with multidirectional flows of ideas, policies, and academics. While this project has created an intellectual space for the emergence of new theoretical insights and policy instruments within Europe, it has also had inevitable consequences for the study of comparative education outside Europe. This article explores how American scholars have attempted to influence the development of comparative education as a field in the United States by purposefully constructing specific notions of European education during the Cold War (1969-1985). Drawing on content analysis of comparative education scholarship in *Western European Education*—a journal published in the United States—this article discusses the role of journal editors in the construction of European education spaces in order to advance not only a marginalized geographical area of study within the expanding American field of comparative education but also a methodological vision for the future of comparative education, one free of positivist techniques, quantitative methodologies, and modernization ideologies.

The construction of the European education space has been typically attributed to European education policymakers, institutions, and networks, or what Lawn and Lingard (2002) refer to as "a new European class of education system actors" and European "policy elites" (p. 290). While these actors exert tremendous power in constructing and (re)negotiating the boundaries of education inside Europe, their voices are neither uniform nor unambiguous. Language differences alone among the nations of Europe result in multiple definitions and conceptualizations of educational space, allowing the possibility for scholars to retreat "into their national or language-based societies" (Cowen, 1980, p. 103). Furthermore, various "internal intellectual logics and external pressures" (Cowen, 1980, p. 180) among these national and regional actors within Europe contribute to the emergence of multiple European education spaces, which are constantly evolving and shifting. Consequently, (re)negotiating the relationship among the network of regional and language-based groupings in the fields of education throughout Europe means one "European voice" is often uncommon.

Adding to this complexity are the voices of outside, non-European system actors who filter the multiple conceptions of education inside Europe to create (imagined) boundaries of European education space for foreign audiences. The role of these outside

actors is frequently overlooked in the discussions of how European education space is produced, negotiated, and redefined. Highlighting the complex interaction of both the internal and external sorting of the spatial boundaries of education, this article considers the construction of the European education space as a borderless project, which has encouraged a multidirectional flow of ideas, policies, and academics across Europe and the globe. While this borderless project has created an intellectual space for the emergence of new theoretical insights, research agendas, and policy instruments within Europe, it has also had inevitable consequences for what is studied in the field of comparative education, and how it is studied, outside European borders.

Drawing on content analysis of *Western European Education*—a journal published in the United States since 1969 and edited by such leading American academics as Ursula Springer, Raymond E. Wanner, and William W. Brickman—this article examines the role of American scholars (especially journal editors) in the construction of the European education space during the Cold War. Through content analysis of 64 issues of *Western European Education* (published between 1969-1985) and interviews with the former journal editors, the article places the discussion of the American construction of European education space in the larger context of theoretical and methodological debates in the field of comparative education on both sides of the Atlantic. In particular, it examines how journal editors attempted to construct a specific vision of the European education space in order to advance not only a marginalized geographical area of study within the expanding field of comparative education in the United States but also a methodological vision for the future of comparative education. It was, paradoxically, *Western European Education's* geographic focus that gave space for alternative epistemological views in American comparative education. By returning Western Europe as a geographic foci, preserving single country, qualitative analysis, and emphasizing the value of historical scholarship in the field of comparative education, *Western European Education* attempted to construct a European education space, which could be used as a site of intellectual resistance to the positivist techniques, quantitative methodologies, and modernization ideologies dominating comparative education in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s.

### **The Politics of Knowledge Production in Comparative Education**

The study of Western European education, originally the epicenter of comparative education, became increasingly marginalized in the United States during the height of the cold war. This marginalization could be partially attributed to the shift in American scholarly interest towards Soviet and non-aligned country studies in the 1960s (Silova, 2009; Steiner-Khamsi, 2006), which was propelled by the launch of *Sputnik* in 1957 and redirection of federal funding away from Europe.[1] Driven by modernization theories and the belief that education served as the main vehicle towards national development, studies of international education development, combined with a growing emphasis on area studies, became the driving force behind most comparative education research. By the late 1960s, every respectable academic institution had its "Sovietologists," "Sinologists," "Africanists," and "Latin Americanists," making the university's "Europeanist" just one regionalist among many (Campisano, 1988, p. 105). While the shift of comparative and international education scholarship towards the non-aligned and developing countries undoubtedly had contributed to the geographic expansion of the

field, or what Wilson (1994) called “the growth spurt of comparative and international education” (p. 464), it had inadvertently affected the configuration of European education space in comparative education.

The dislocation of Western Europe from the center of comparative education scholarship in the United States coincided with a shift in preferred methodology (Silova & Brehm, 2009). Qualitative, single-country studies came under attack by scholars relying on “new,” primarily quantitative methodologies that claimed to achieve greater scientific reliability and validity in cross-national comparisons. As Kazamias (1970) admitted, “the empirical scientific phase” was indeed “the singly most distinguishing mark” of the 1960s (p. 256). Commenting on the trends that have emerged since two of the major journals in the field (*Comparative Education Review* and *Comparative Education*) published special issues focusing on the state of comparative education in 1977, Kelly and Altbach (1988) arrived at similar conclusions: “much research [...] tended to focus almost exclusively on the quantitative analysis of educational outcomes, assuming that the outcomes—like modern attitudes or academic achievement—could be attributed to whatever schools taught without necessarily studying schools” (p. 15). Furthermore, Altbach and Kelly (1986) explained that the study of “other educational outcomes—social, political, and cognitive—seemingly became devalued” (p. 5).

Importantly, Cowen (1980) observed the difference between America's definition and methodology of comparative education with that of Europe's by arguing “the search for new methodological approaches in the United States and the confidence that American comparative educationists have had in positivists techniques draw from other social sciences has meant that a field of study with a common name has diverged sharply” (p. 108). The diverging direction of comparative education in the United States was contentious among its members, many of whom felt that structural functionalism and positivism “had blinded research to the key educational issues” worldwide (Altbach & Kelly, 1986, p. 6). Yet, the search for “epistemological certainty” (Coulby, 2002, p. 42), which accompanied the professionalization of the Comparative Education Society in 1956 (CES, later to include “international” in its name, CIES),<sup>[2]</sup> and the establishment of the society's journal in 1957, determined the direction of comparative education as a field in the United States. While professional associations are among the “crucial events in the push toward professionalization” of academic fields, Wilensky (1964) cautions that “power struggles and status strivings common to all occupations help to explain deviations from the sequence” (p. 146). In the United States, deviation stemmed from the ambiguous epistemology of comparative education, and was the arena where, in the decades following the founding of the professional association, scholars debated the future of comparative education in America. Meanwhile, with no agreement on how to professionalize European comparative education, multiple comparative *educations* formed in Europe, all with unique conceptions of the field. One noticeable consequence of this diverse thinking in Europe has been the absence of one comparative education journal like *Comparative Education Review* in the United States. <sup>[3]</sup> This absence has partially contributed to outside, non-European actors and institutions defining the space of European education for non-European audiences, especially through scholarly work published in academic journals.

It is within this context—the shifting geographic frontiers and methods of comparative education and the professionalization of the field—that *Western European Education* emerged as a journal for an American audience with an intention to preserve geography and broaden methodological conceptions in the American academe. The content it chose to publish was thus a reaction to the divergence in American comparative education, which promoted the scientific, quantitative approach. In this way, *Western European Education* attempted to create its own education space, which would be used ultimately as an intellectual battleground over theory and method in American comparative education—a space where a different future of comparative education could be imagined—albeit through European authors. Europe to the journal was, as Seddon (2002) argues, a metaphor:

Understandings that acknowledge the historical grounding of social space in society and geography, the ongoing contested processes that have produced social spaces and policed their boundaries, and the multiple agency that struggles to shape alternative futures within the obdurate legacies of the past. (p. 158)

### ***Academic journals as an intellectual battleground***

The types of individuals and institutions normally assumed to hold agency in the construction of education space often overlook academic fields. Yet, higher education institutions (including researchers and journal editors alike) are perhaps among the most powerful actors in the spatial reconfiguration of knowledge production. While most discussion about the role of academic journals, textbooks, and other publications has centered on the construction of "official knowledge" (Apple, 2000), rarely do we credit journal editors as a primary actor defining the boundaries of academic fields. Indeed, academic journals help shape the theoretical and methodological direction of a field (Brickman, 1966a; Epstein, 2008). In reference to *Comparative Education Review*, Brickman (1966a) noted how academic publishing was "the most solid and most impressive contribution [...] to the furtherance of the field" (p. 13). Similarly, Epstein (1968) explains:

The content of the field, more than its methods or objectives, delineates its boundaries and gives it substance. Even more than the Society, the field is identified with the *Comparative Education Review*, because the journal displays the field's content. It is what is contained in the *Review*, therefore, that should govern the nature of the field. (p. 376)

In other words, academic publications, especially scholarly journals, were perceived as the central vehicles of charting "a new course in the development of educational knowledge" in the field of comparative education (Campisano, 1988, p. 40). If journals set "scholarly norms and boundaries as well as standards of quality" (Epstein, 2008, p. 13) for academic fields, then journals also have the power to define geographic space. *Western European Education* attempted to define Europe by publishing, unlike other American journals on education, articles mainly by European authors (87 percent during the time between 1969 and 1985). Although defining European education space seemed obvious for an American journal of translations with "Europe" in its title, its clandestine intention was to counter the newly emerging epistemology of comparative

education. It did so by publishing articles whose authors used original methods in the field, which were more common at the time in the methodologically diverse Europe than the "quantifying" America, and then filtered by an American editor.

### **From Testing Ground to Battleground: Academic Journals and Knowledge Production**

As the Comparative Education Society (CES) was searching for and defining its identity during the first decade of its establishment, "the field was wide open, and anyone who so desired could leap into the vacuum" (Brickman, 1973a, p. 13). Indeed, *Comparative Education Review* originally was a "testing ground in which new ideas and concepts about comparative education were allowed to compete" (Campisano, 1988, p. 43). As Campisano (1988) noted, the readers of *Comparative Education Review* were to witness a "barrage of articles claiming to represent 'the one and only true' method of doing comparative education" (p. 51). Importantly, the first editor of *Comparative Education Review*, George Bereday, was recognized for his efforts of using the journal to provide "an outlet for scholarship of different viewpoints and perspectives" (Altbach, 1984, p. 6) and expanding "the parameters of the field giving room to the breadth of interests, talents, and perspectives" (Campisano, 1988, p. 69). Similarly, Brickman (1973a) acknowledged Bereday's "brilliant editorship," which made the *Review* "the most solid and most impressive contribution by the Society to the furtherance of the field:"

Under nearly nine years of publication [...] the *Review* has indeed covered the significant issues, problems, and developments in the various aspects of education in international perspective. It has stressed historical and socio-political-cultural-economic contexts, as well as scholarly documentation. It has given space to veterans and newcomers, to Americans and foreigners. The book reviews, bibliographies, editorial introductions, news notes, and other features have made the *Review* the indispensable source for all who are concerned with education on an extra-national scale. (p. 17-18)

However, the time of theoretical and methodological openness in the field ended by the mid-1960s with the scientific approach establishing itself as the dominant methodology in comparative education. When Harold Noah took over the editorship of *Comparative Education Review* in 1967,[4] the principles of "scientific rationality" increasingly became more visible in the journal's publications. Based on their analysis of articles from *Comparative Education Review* prior to 1977, Altbach and Kelly (1986) note that the "state of the art" in comparative education at that time reflected "the theoretical dominance of structural functionalism, combined with positivist methodological assumptions" (quoted in Crossley, 1999, p. 250). Furthermore, Kelly and Altbach (1988) argue that the interpretative traditions, critical theory, and conflict studies "scarcely entered the discourse of the field and were not promoted through its major journals and texts" (p. 14). Reflecting on this change, Noah (1968) himself admitted to "the growing attention given in our field to the social sciences," challenging outright the original conception of the field, especially its grounding in educational history and philosophy:

Although historians and philosophers of education are still very much to the fore in our pages, their exclusive dominion over comparative education is now being seriously challenged. As social scientists come marching into comparative education bearing computers on their backs, what will be the reaction of those trained in more humanistic, not to say humane, ways? (p. 125)

Noah foresaw four reactions to his question. First, he postulated there would be 'the Machine-Breakers' who oppose the new methods. At the other extreme would be 'the Ostriches' who will pretend the challenge does not exist. In the middle would be 'the Joiners' who will join the growing methodological shift and 'the Raiders' who will borrow the good results from the social sciences to further their work. This was nothing short of an epistemological coup inside the field of comparative education. Noah threw the gauntlet down to the old cast of comparativists who emphasized humanistic and philosophical foundations, demanding their acceptance of his new genre: "Systematic, controlled, empirical, and (wherever possible) quantitative investigation of explicitly stated hypotheses is the *modus operandi* of best practice in the contemporary social sciences; we must hope that it will soon become the hallmark of those who would call themselves comparative educators, too" (Noah, 1969, p. 251). Scholars who did not heed the warning would be left behind, with blame placed squarely on the shoulders of the individual, not the new scientific method in the field.

The publication of *Toward the Science of Comparative Education* (Noah & Eckstein, 1969) cemented this "scientific turn" of comparative education in the United States. As Kazamias (1974) remarked, "the future historian of comparative education will undoubtedly refer to the 1960s as the decade of empiricism and the quest for quantifiable 'scientific' modes of inquiry" (p. 155). Nevertheless, alternative, soon marginalized, views persisted. While these alternative views were increasingly displaced from the mainstream publications in comparative education (especially the *Comparative Education Review*),<sup>[5]</sup> the establishment of *Western European Education* journal in 1969 provided a new space for the American scholars and their European colleagues to participate in the raging debates over theory and method in comparative education.

### ***Western European Education: The Role of Journal Editors in Constructing European Space***

*Western European Education: A Journal of Translations* (known today as *European Education: Issues and Studies*) was established in 1969 with a dual purpose in mind: expanding the geographic scope of scholarship in comparative education and directly responding to the methodological and theoretical debates in the field. The journal's mission brought together some of the key players in the comparative education field in the late 1960s and 1970s, including Ursula Springer (who served on the CIES board of directors in 1969–71), Raymond E. Wanner, William W. Brickman (who was the first president of CES in 1957–58 and served his second term in 1967), and Susanne Shafer (who became the first female president of CIES in 1976). Common to all of the journal's editors and journal advisory board members was "their commitment to exploring alternative visions in the polarized debate on comparative theory and method in education" (Silova, 2009, p. 18).

One of the visions centered on the expansion of the geographic scope of American comparative education scholarship by bringing back Western European perspectives to the field, which had increasingly been replaced by the study of education in the Soviet Union and nonaligned countries during the cold war. Not only did the editors of the American journal create a new space for publishing scholarship on Western Europe, but they also forcefully promoted original publications by European scholars themselves. Unlike *Comparative Education Review*, which published manuscripts primarily written by American scholars and/or English language speakers, *Western European Education* was established as “the journal of translations” (Springer, 1969a, p. 4), which made original research written in various European languages available to an English-speaking audience. Commenting on the establishment of the journal, Edmund King (1971) noted that the journal performed a "distinguished service in providing indigenous materials for subsequent discussion and analysis by teachers and student of comparative education:"

Reliance on original sources has the advantage of remaining faithful to the context in which educational discussion is taking place. In other words, we peep into each country's domestic scene, with its living concerns and ambiguities. (p. 123)

During the first 15 years (volumes 1-15), the journal's table of contents specified exactly where authors came from geographically.[6] In particular, all authors were clearly identified with geographical locations (i.e., the name of the country) in brackets, which appeared after the author's name. This immediately placed each author within a specific context, justifying the journal's role as the authority of defining European education space to an American audience. During the height of the cold war (1969-1985), 87 percent of articles published in the journal (181 out of 207 articles) were written by European scholars, confirming the European nature of the journal. [7] Of 207 articles written during the 15-year period, for example, 35 percent (73 articles) were written by authors from West Germany, 12 percent (25 articles) by Italians, 11 percent (23 articles) by Americans, 9 percent (19 articles) by the French, 7 percent (15 articles) by Swedes, 7 percent (14 articles) by British, and less than 4 percent each by authors from Denmark, Switzerland, Spain, Netherlands, Austria, Finland, Belgium, Scotland, East Germany, Portugal, South Africa, and Greece (see table 1). Of the 24 non-European authors, 23 came from the US higher education institutions.[8] In other words, it was European scholars, not Europeanists, who published in the journal.

While the journal published articles written predominantly by European authors, American scholars edited it. It is through their editorship that the American scholars determined the content of academic research to appear on the pages of the *Western European Education* journal. While academic journals are typically concerned with serving as "gatekeepers for entry and advancement in higher education institutions" by developing high quality articles and screening-out underdeveloped manuscripts (Post and Fedri, 2010, p. 6), *Western European Education* also attempted to make a theoretical and methodological statement in the field of comparative education. In a sense, the editors of the journal functioned as the gatekeepers for how the American English-speaking readership understands and constructs the field of comparative education more generally.

What was included and what was excluded from publication in the journal had thus become a political process where the editors held power.

Table I: The country of origin of authors in the first 15 volumes of *Western European Education* (1969-1985)

Country	Number of Authors	% of Total Authors
Sweden	15	7.25
West Germany	73	35.27
England	14	6.67
France	19	9.18
Italy	25	12.08
USA	23	11.11
Denmark	8	3.86
Austria	3	1.45
Switzerland	8	3.86
Finland	1	0.48
Netherlands	4	1.93
Belgium	1	0.48
Spain	6	2.90
Scotland	1	0.48
East Germany	1	0.48
Portugal	1	0.48
South Africa	1	0.48
Greece	1	0.48
Uncategorized	2	0.97
Total	207	100.00

Through the publication of *Western European Education*, the editors attempted to construct a new education space in order to advance not only a marginalized geographical area of study within the expanding field of comparative education in the United States but also a methodological vision for the future of comparative education, one free of positivist techniques, quantitative methodologies, and modernization ideologies. The founder of *Western European Education*, Ursula Springer, was optimistic of the journal's potential impact on the field to keep a diverse epistemology and geography in the American academy: "It seemed clear to me that I was the new captain of the ship, with full responsibility for the flow of things [...] the future was still open" (personal communication, 29 August, 2008). But as the decades passed, and the editorship moved to William W. Brickman, a more reactionary call to arms became evident as Noah's science became mainstream in American comparative education scholarship. Aiming to keep the debate over theory and method alive in the United States, the journal's editors actively engaged in constructing their own European education spaces—all advocating for the place of historical scholarship and context in comparative analysis, yet each pursuing different paths towards the common goal.



### ***Searching for middle ground: Ursula Springer's vision***

Reluctant to abandon the historical dimensions of the field yet understanding the value of cross-national comparison, Ursula Springer, the founding editor of the journal, attempted to find a middle ground between the "old" and "new" methodological approaches in comparative education by advancing multiple case-study analysis in comparative education research. Her first book (Springer, 1969b), written before the creation of the journal, was a multiple case-study analysis of curriculum in France, West Germany, and Italy. This book was quintessential "Springer" scholarship in comparative education. On the one hand, it explored in depth one topic in education that could then be compared across nations in a larger analysis, while on the other hand concerned a research topic she deemed part of the "heart of education"—that is to say, topics of school functions and pedagogy that require qualitative research "based on values that are rooted in cultural context" (Springer, 1977, p. 361), not quantitative and predictive techniques that dominated the "new" comparative education. Springer's approach to comparative education embodied in her first book was the original intention for *Western European Education*.

Since comparative education was becoming noticeably more focused on Soviet studies and non-aligned countries in the late 1960s, Springer was concerned that the neglect of Western Europe in the political atmosphere of the time would ultimately hinder the development of comparative education as a field for American students interested in education and Europe. She "wanted to open up a vista" for Western European education studies, and allow "future students [to] follow up with these important topics" (personal communication, 29 August, 2008). The idea of the journal, then, was to publish thematic journal issues, which would feature qualitative country case studies tightly embedded in their political, economic, and social contexts, allowing an opportunity for the journal editor to compare educational issues across different contexts and cases (Silova, 2009). The articles were mainly written by European scholars in a verity of languages, translated, and then compared by the editor.

While some editors experimented with the organization of journal issues (particularly Brickman, see below), the overall commitment to embed multiple case-study analysis contextually remained consistent throughout the four decades. Raymond Wanner, for instance, followed Springer's framework almost flawlessly. Since the journal was one of translations, Wanner "saw it basically as a vehicle to make material on Western European education available to others" (personal communication, 10 November 2008). Indeed, of the 30 issues Wanner edited between 1972-79, only seven were single country issues, something Springer never considered publishing during her three year tenure. Additionally, the thematic foci of the 158 journal issues since its founding have focused on—for the most part—"the heart of education," in line with Springer's original intention (Silova & Brehm, 2009).

The original intention of *Western European Education* helped define—most likely in a relatively unconscious manner—the borders of European education space for an American audience. Since themes are borderless concepts, the journal determined who was and was not relevant to speak on behalf of an educational topic in a specific country by selecting who could publish. The editor's introduction then pulled together the articles

on one topic across multiple countries. In this sense, Springer was able to define borders of Europe as seen by the American academe through the themes by picking which authors would publish in the journal. As the American field of comparative education shifted towards scientific methodology, the geographic focus of the journal provided the perfect grounds for marginalized methodological approaches in the American field of comparative education. Europe's diversity, although reduced to a limited conception through the journal, also provided flexibility for the journal to take on different foci throughout its existence. When William Brickman became editor, a more conscious effort of creating and using European education space to preserve a fading methodology in comparative education emerged in the pages of the journal.

### ***Preserving historical scholarship: William W. Brickman's legacy***

Best known for being the founding CES president (1957-58) and the only society member to hold the presidency twice (again in 1967-68), William Brickman's contribution to comparative education has been suspiciously neglected in the field as a whole. Professor of Educational History at New York University and later University of Pennsylvania, he was a scholar in the strictest of senses, revering educational historians like Thomas Woody, whose chair at the University of Pennsylvania Brickman held starting in 1962, as "meticulous, thorough, painstaking, and precise" (Brickman, 1974, p. 16). Brickman memorialized Woody's 1200-page "history of women's education in the United States" as being exhaustive and never duplicated. This type of scholarship was sacrosanct to Brickman; Brickman wanted to reach "into the remote as into the recent past and the present to throw light on his subject matter" (Brickman, 1974, p. 13). Brickman wrote often on history and comparative education. For example, one article focused on the pre-history of comparative education to show the field has roots before Marc-Antoine Jullien (Brickman, 1966b). In fact, of the eight articles Brickman published in *Comparative Education Review*, all but one dealt explicitly with education history and the history of comparative education. [9]

Brickman's aim to professionalize the junket-like trips abroad into a scholarly field known as Comparative Education in the mid 1950s was dominated by his idea that, in Kandel's words, "the prolongation of the history of education into the present" (1937, p. 163) is at the heart of any comparative study. His belief in history created space for comparative education to become scholarly by demanding a "rigid adherence to the canons of historical research" (Brickman, 1956, p. 119.) Historical and contemporary examination of any and all documents relevant to the research topic, Brickman believed, was required before any comparative examination could occur.

Brickman's scholarship in comparative education, emphasizing historical and philosophic tenets, influenced all of his students and received sympathy among the founders of CES. Raymond Wanner, a student of Brickman, called him "a tireless worker, multilingual, and committed to scholarship" (personal communication, 10 November, 2008). Another student, Elizabeth Sherman Swing, called his work "substantive" (personal communication, 20 November, 2009). Additionally, although he admitted the founding of CIES was "an act of rashness perpetrated by a relatively younger generation" (Brickman, 1977, p. 398), most of the scholars considered fathers of comparative education—Nicholas Hans, Friedrich Schneider, I.L. Kandel and Robert Ulich—and the two other founders of CES—Robert B. Sutton and Gerald H. Read—

shared Brickman's strong belief in the history of education. Brickman's belief in sound research techniques based on scholarly inquiry, evaluated in the "open market of scholarship," was the only way for educationalists to attain "first-class citizenship in the academic community" (Brickman, 1973b, p. iii). He saw CES, and later his editorship of *Western European Education*, as space for him, and other scholars in comparative education, to show and support proper research.

Regardless of his convictions towards history, comparative education was a diverse field in Brickman's perspective. He used the Latin phrase *Quot homines, tot sententiae* (so many men, so many opinions) to describe the state of the field in the 1960s (Brickman, 1973, p. 125). When the field began to lose its theoretical and methodological diversity, Brickman took on the editorship of *Western European Education* in 1979 as a way to preserve approaches and geographical foci in comparative education, which he thought became relatively absent in America but remained abundant in Europe. The epitome of his attempts at preservation was, in Swing's recollection, at the 1979 CIES conference in Ann Arbor, Michigan where Brickman's personal photo display was almost a desperate attempt to remember his, and by extension the Society's, history in comparative education (personal communication, 20 November, 2009). Nevertheless, Brickman (1985), like Springer, wanted to make sure Western Europe was not lost in the expanding field in comparative education:

As the twentieth century is drawing to a close, it is clear that the western half of the small continent of Europe is still contributing substantially, as it has been doing for many centuries, to the culture and education of most of the globe. This it accomplishes not only through its resources *in situ*, but also through the millions of its inhabitants who have emigrated to each area of the world. Western Europe has drawn upon other cultures, but, for the most part, it has enriched and edified an entire universe. (p. 7)

As editor of *Western European Education* between 1979-1986, Brickman continued Springer's original intention of promoting both a marginalized geography and methodology in comparative education within the journal's pages; however, he emphasized more fully studies of single countries across a multitude of topics in individual issues. This trend, begun under Wanner's editorship (1972-79), was preferred by Brickman whose 14 single country issues counted for half of his total issues published over his seven year tenure (Silova & Brehm, 2009).

His editorship of *Western European Education* coincided with the rise in development studies where history was often dismissed as unimportant. Since the journal was not well known within the field, Brickman found the perfect space to preserve historical scholarship and construct a European space, which dominated the founding of the American field of comparative education and remained present in Europe in the late 1970s. That the journal was devoted to Europe seems to be both a welcomed coincident to a scholar who devoted his career to studies and languages of Europe after serving in World War II and a conscious realization that Europe maintained a similar diversity of thought and knowledge to the original comparative education Brickman remembered. Combined, *Western European Education* gave Brickman a platform to preserve his original ideas of comparative education, which were shared by other "forgotten heroes of American education" (Null & Ravitch, 2006) like I.L. Kandel.

While Brickman was editor, he not only emphasized single country studies but also added bibliographies and glossaries, publications he had called for, and produced, since the founding of CES. At the 6th annual conference on comparative education in 1959, for instance, he said, "also on the periphery of the actual research problem, but of immense service to the worker, are critically annotated bibliographies and glossaries of pedagogical terms. Those who prepare such research aids deserve the gratitude of all who endeavor to produce research studies in comparative education." Bibliographies and glossaries were not unique to Brickman. Beatrice Beach Szekely, the editor of *Soviet Education* (also published by ME Sharpe), commented, "I kept yellow pads (pre-computers) with lists of articles on topics of timely interest ranging from curriculum reforms in schools, to the educational roles of trade unions and the Soviet court system and made up monthly issues from them" (personal communication, 22 August 2009). Still, compiling bibliographies and glossaries was a type of filtration of the larger canon of work within Europe (or the Soviet Union), of which Brickman took responsibility and agency in constructing. Both bibliographies and glossaries of relevant works and terms (at least to Brickman) became a clear way to preserve a space in comparative education that was quickly fading. In fact, Brickman's last co-edited book (Brickman & Zepper, 1992) was a 538-page annotated bibliography of Russian and Soviet Education between 1731-1989.

Brickman used *Western European Education* as a space to preserve a dying breed of comparative education in America. More importantly, the journal's focus, Europe, provided the perfect space for diverse understandings of comparative education to exist. Still, Brickman's time at the journal could be understood as a reaction by the once-famous scholar who, although having started the Comparative Education Society, had to by 1979 remind current society members of his and the society's past. In this light, he not only was preserving both a marginalized methodology and geography but also himself, a scholar whose prominence was overshadowed by men "bearing computers on their backs."

## **Conclusion**

A construction of European education space has been a complex, conflicting, and often contradictory process, which has spanned European borders through a multiplicity of actors, networks, and narratives circulating globally. The European education space is no longer exclusively created in Europe; it is now being actively fabricated in other parts of the globe. Consequently, it is only in global terms that we can fully understand the reconfiguration of European education space (Coulby, 2002). Indeed, European education has historically developed into a borderless project, which has engaged both Europeans and non-Europeans alike in formulating the contours and content of European education spaces. Of the multitude of actors involved globally, this article has focused narrowly on an American construction of European education space during the height of the cold war (1969-1985) by highlighting how journal editors attempted to use an American publication, *Western European Education*, to construct their own vision(s) of European education space and using this newly created space to engage in theoretical and methodological debates in American comparative education.

While focusing on American efforts to construct a European education space within a specific historical timeframe, this article offers an array of broader insights into

the multiple meanings of European education space. It highlights one American construction of European education space as a geopolitical project born in the context of the cold war. While many comparative education scholars in the United States were preoccupied with the study of Soviet and non-aligned countries during the cold war, the editors of the *Western European Education* attempted to use the journal to safeguard Western Europe as a legitimate education space in comparative education scholarship. Devoting the journal to Western European education in 1969 was a major step towards preserving European education space, which was rapidly vanishing from American comparative education scholarship. What was more remarkable, however, was that the journal editors primarily relied on the original scholarship by European academics to shape the European education space through journal publications. Paradoxically, the content and contours of the European education space was thus almost exclusively defined by European scholars, yet ultimately controlled (by filtering articles in the publication process) by American journal editors. It is this dynamic interaction between American and European scholars that highlights the complexity of the geopolitical construction of the European education space.

Although critical to understanding the complexity of spatial reconfiguration processes, education space is not always conceptualized in geopolitical terms (Seddon, 2002). Rather, a broader conceptualization of European education space can occur that involves a social and academic arena within which various theoretical and methodological ideas emerge and co-exist. While geopolitical interests may have initially driven the establishment of the *Western European Education*, it had inevitably become an intellectual space for a debate over theory and method in comparative education. More specifically, it opened a space for articulating and advancing ideas often unpopular in the mainstream comparative education literature in the 1960s and 1970s in the United States. As mainstream thinking began advocating for quantitative, cross-national comparative studies and relying heavily on positivist approaches (often at the expense of other methodological and theoretical perspectives), the editors of the *Western European Education* were insisting on the value of historical, contextualized, and qualitative approaches in comparative education research. Ursula Springer originally intended the journal to blend "science" and "context," but under William Brickman's editorship the goal of the journal was to overcome "the present hiatus between historical and contemporary studies" as he searched for "a judicious blend of historical and contemporary material" (Fraser & Brickman, 1968, p. 1).

Displaced from the American comparative education space because of their alternative visions for the future development of the field, the journal editors constructed a romanticized notion of the European education space where historical scholarship was still valued and multiplicity of voices remained vibrant in debates over theory and method in comparative education. Interestingly, these alternative visions for the future of comparative education echo the current debates over the meanings of European education space. In particular, Novoa (2002) advocates for "the need for a deeper historical perspective on European debates," referring to "an analysis of the *present* as part of historical practices that produce ways of thinking, acting, and feeling" (p. 151). Similarly, Popkewitz, Franklin and Pereyra (2001) argue that history is not the movement toward some form of reliable representation but rather a part of the present. It is this "intellectual interest in reconciling history and comparison" (Novoa, 2002, p. 151) that brought

together the former editors of *Western European Education* in a common project of constructing their vision of a European education space.

*Western European Education* is but one example of a journal where editors hold agency in creating education space. For the journal's first 15 years, editors used the European education space as a tool to resist popular trends in comparative education, namely the domination of social science methodology and the shift away from European research foci. Responding to both methodological shifts and geopolitical events (and their consequence), the journal's construction of European education space provided a new avenue for American scholars to participate in the debates over theory and method in comparative education. Although the field is contemporarily more intellectually diverse, it is imperative to understand why and how the construction of education spaces has historically included and/or excluded some voices. The challenge is for academics to reflect on their own role of reconfiguring existing education spaces and constructing new intellectual spaces, which remain open to a multiplicity of voices, critical inquiry, and a true dialogue in a spatial politics of knowledge production—whether in Europe or globally.

## Endnotes

1. Announced in 1958, one year after the launch of *Sputnik*, the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) promoted the study of languages and regions deemed critical to U.S. national security.
2. Epstein (2008) noted that CIES, unlike its offshoots in other countries, did not "'nationalize' their title" because it was the first society of comparative education and was inclusive of members from outside the US (p. 17).
3. For example, the constitution of CESE was based on the American counterpart (Cowen, 1980, p. 99), and is but one of many societies throughout Europe.
4. Harold Noah became the associate editor of *Comparative Education Review* in 1965 and took over full responsibility for editing the journal since 1967 (Bereday, 1965).
5. Based on content analysis of three comparative education journals (*Comparative Education Review*, *Comparative Education*, and *International Journal of Educational Development*) during the period of 1956-1995, Rust, Soumare, Pescador, and Shibuya (1999) conclude that the number of articles published in comparative education journals using historical research methodologies reduced significantly between 1960s and 1980s/1990s. In the 1980s and 1990s, only a small number of journals articles (10.5 percent) relied on historiography (p. 99).
6. Eventually these labels disappeared in the journal. Starting with issue 16(1), authors were not identified by country anymore. It was in 1992, under the editorship of Suzanne Shafer, when biographical notes on each author began to appear, although inconsistently. More extensive biographical notes have appeared uniformly under the editorship of Bernhard Streitwieser and Edward Bodine since Spring 2005.
7. We defined an "article" as a piece of writing with a labeled author identified in the index. Although the journal included many government and international reports, we did not include these in our analysis. Most of these reports, it should be noted, came from European governments and were simply translated; there neither were reports from nations outside of Europe nor reports detailing issues outside of Europe.

Additionally, the geographic location of each author was identified in the index. We used these geographic labels provided, using contemporary terms where necessary (e.g., West Germany instead of Federal Republic of Germany).

8. The last non-European who wrote from the journal came from South Africa. Interestingly, the article written by the South African detailed his experience while attending university in West Germany.
9. The eight articles Brickman wrote in *Comparative Education Review* were, "Comparative and International Education Society: An Historical Analysis" (1977); "Works of Historical Interest in Comparative Education" (1964); "Ten Years of the Comparative Education Society" (1966a); "Some Review Data on History of German Education" (1964); "The Objectivity of a Soviet Pedagogue" (1961); "Prehistory of Comparative Education to the End of the Eighteenth Century" (1966b); "A Historical Introduction to Comparative Education" (1960); and "The Meeting of East and West in Educational History» (1961). It is interesting to note Brickman's last publication in *Comparative Education Review* appeared in 1977, two years before he took over the editorship of *Western European Education*. He either chose not to publish in *Comparative Education Review* after 1977 or the editors filtered out his articles. In either case, *Comparative Education Review* pigeonholed Brickman as an historian who could only write on the history of comparative education, which was a declining area of interest by the late 1970s. Brickman's neglect in the field provides evidence for personal reasons to take over—and change drastically with single country studies—*Western European Education*.

## References

- Altbach, P. G. (1984). In memoriam: George Z. F. Bereday - Farewell to a founder. *Comparative Education Review*, 28(1), 5-7.
- Altbach, P. G. and Kelly, G. P. (Eds.). (1986). *New approaches to comparative education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Apple, M. (2000). *Official knowledge: Democratic education in a conservative age*. London: Routledge.
- Bereday, G. Z. F. (1965). Editorial. *Comparative Education Review*, 19(3), 249-254.
- Brickman, W. W. (1956). Theoretical Foundations of Comparative Education. *Journal of Educational Sociology*, 30(3), 116-125.
- Brickman, W.W. (1960). A historical Introduction to Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 3(3), 6-13.
- Brickman, W.W. (1961). The Meeting of East and West in Educational History . *Comparative Education Review*, 5(2), 82-89.
- Brickman, W. W. (1964a). Works of Historical Interest in Comparative Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 7(3), 324-326.
- Brickman, W. W. (1964b). Some Review Data on History of German Education. *Comparative Education Review*, 8(3), 281-284.
- Brickman, W. W. (1966a). Ten years of the comparative education society. *Comparative Education Review*, 19(1), 4-15.

- Brickman, W.W. (1966b). Prehistory of comparative education to the end of the eighteenth century. *Comparative Education Review*, 10(1), 30-47.
- Brickman, W.W. and White, J. (Eds.) (1974). *The Thomas Woody Collection of the Penniman Library of Education University of Pennsylvania*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions.
- Brickman, W.W. (1977). Comparative and International Education Society: An historical analysis. *Comparative Education Review*, 21(2/3), 396-404.
- Brickman, W. W. (1973a). *Comparative education: Concept, research, and application*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions.
- Brickman, W.W. (1973b). *Research in Educational History*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions.
- Brickman, W.W. (1985). *Educational Roots and Routes in Western Europe*. Cherry Hill, NJ.: Emeritus, Inc.
- Brickman, W. W. & Zepper, J. T. (Eds.) (1992). *Russian and Soviet Education, 1731-1989: A multilingual annotated bibliography*. New York: Garland Publishing.
- Campisano, C. J. (1988). *Comparative Education Review: Thirty years of scholarship*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation at Teachers College, Columbia University.
- Crossley, M. (1999). Reconceptualizing comparative and international education. *Compare*, 29(3), 249-267.
- Coulby, D. (2002). Education and the European space of flows. In A. Novoa, A. & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space* (pp. 35-46). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cowen, R. (1980). Education in Europe: A Note. *Comparative Education Review*, 24(1), 98-108.
- Epstein, E. H. (1968). Letter to the editor. *Comparative Education Review*, 12(3), 376-378.
- Epstein, E.H. (2008). Crucial benchmarks in the professionalization of comparative education. In (eds.) C. Wolhuter, N. Popov, M. Manzon, and B. Leutwyler, *Comparative education at universities world wide, 2nd Edition*. Sofia: Bureau for Educational Services.
- Fraser, S. E. and Brickman, W. W. (Eds.). (1968). *A history of international and comparative education: Nineteenth century documents*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Kandel, I.L. (1937). National Backgrounds of Education. *Twenty-Fifth Yearbook*, Society of College Teachers of Education, University of Chicago Press.
- Kazamias, A. M. (1974). Editor's note. *Comparative Education Review*, 18(2), 155-156.
- Kazamias, A. M., in cooperation with K. Schwartz (1970). Wozzels and wizzles in the methodology of comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 13(3), 255-261.
- Kelly, G. P. and Altbach, P. G. (1988). Alternative approaches in comparative education. In T. N. Postlethwaite (Ed.), *The encyclopedia of comparative education and national systems of education* (p. 13-19). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- King, E. J. (1971). Review of *Western European Education: A Quarterly Journal of Translations*. *International Review of Education*, 17(1), 122-123.



- Lawn, M. & Lingard, B. (2002). Constructing a European policy space in education governance: The role of transnational policy actors. *European Educational Research Journal*, 1(2), 290-307.
- Noah, H. (1968). Editorial. *Comparative Education Review*, 12(2), 125.
- Noah, H. (1969) Editorial. *Comparative Education Review*, 13(3), 249-251.
- Noah, H. J., & Eckstein, M. A. (1969). *Towards a science of comparative education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Novoa, A. (2002). Ways of Thinking about Education in Europe. In A. Novoa, A. & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space* (pp. 131-155). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Null, J. W. and Ravitch, D. (Eds). (2006). *Forgotten heroes of American education: The great tradition of teaching teachers*. Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, Inc.
- Popkewitz, T., Franklin, B. & Pereyra, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Cultural history and education: Critical studies on knowledge and schooling*. New York: RoutledgeFalmer.
- Post, D. and Fedri, M. (2010). Comparative and international education English-language scholarship publications. In *International Encyclopedia of Education 3rd Edition*. USA: Elsevier Ltd.
- Rust, V. D., A. Soumare, P. Pescador, & M. Shibuya (1999). Research strategies in comparative education. *Comparative Education Review*, 43(1), 86-109.
- Seddon, T. (2002). Coda: Europe, Social Space and the Politics of Knowledge. In A. Novoa, A. & M. Lawn (Eds.), *Fabricating Europe: The formation of an education space* (pp. 157-161). Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Silova, I. (2009). The changing frontiers of comparative education: a forty-year retrospective on European Education. *European Education: Issues and Studies*, 41(1), 17-31.
- Silova, I. & Brehm, W. C. (2009). Education and geopolitics in a changing Europe: Forty years of scholarship in European Education. *European Education: Issues and Studies*, 41(2), 7-30.
- Springer, U. (1969a). Editor's introduction. *European Education: Journal of Translations*, 1(1), 1-3.
- Springer, U. (1969b). *Recent Curriculum developments in France, West Germany, and Italy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Springer, U. (1977). Education, curriculum, and Pedagogy. *Comparative Education Review*, 21(2/3), 358-369.
- Steiner-Khamsi, G. (2006). The development turn in comparative education. *European Education: Issues and Studies*, 38(3), 19-47.
- Wilensky, H. L. (1964). The Professionalization of Everyone? *The American Journal of Sociology*, 70(2), 137-158.
- Wilson, D. N. (1994). Comparative and international education: fraternal or Siamese twins? A preliminary genealogy of our twin fields. *Comparative Education Review*, 38(4), 449-486.