

Comparative Education and Comparative Social Sciences: Adam Przeworski and Henry Teune. *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York: Wiley - Interscience, 1970. Pp. xiv, 153. \$9.75.

Self-definition is a major problem confronting Comparative Education and Comparative Educationists. The forging of alliances with the established social and behavioural sciences offers a possible resolution of this dilemma. This trend within Comparative Education is exemplified in the interest shown in *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry* by A. Przeworski and H. Teune, in the recent UNESCO Hamburg publication *Relevant Methods in Comparative Education* (1973),¹ it was cited innumerable times. Its influence is also traceable in Holmes' injunction that Comparative Education "replace the names of countries with the names of variables."² The volume was reviewed by R. Edwards in the February 1972 number of *Comparative Education Review*.³ On the basis of an examination of the technical substance of the book, he recommended it highly to Comparative Educationists. Finally, it has made its appearance on Comparative Educational doctoral candidacy examination reading lists.

Within the conventional social sciences community, the book has been the object of considerable attention. Between 1970, when it first appeared, and November 1971, the Przeworski and Teune volume was reviewed at least six times⁴ in journals such as the *American Academy of Political and Social Sciences Annals* and the *American Journal of Sociology*. That it constitutes an important contribution to the debate over comparative method in the social sciences is thus evident. At the very least, it was assured of some attention, because it draws upon the substance of Political Science, Anthropology and Sociology, and addresses itself to the major issues in these established disciplines. However, nowhere do Przeworski and Teune refer to Comparative Education. Comparative Educationists have gone to them, and not vice-versa. In light of this and of the interest shown in the book among Comparative Educationists, it appears worthwhile to consider the possible effects of the text and its approach to comparative study, on the disciplinary baggage of Comparative Education.

Disciplinary segmentation is not a phenomenon which is restricted to the natural sciences. To an extent it also characterizes Comparative Education research. Still, it is possible to identify two orientations which prevail in the field: A desire to understand the role of education in the modernization process, and to contribute to policy-making in education in developing and developed nations. Attention to and concern for specific national cultures and problems seems to pervade these orientations. It may be that this respect for

¹R. Edwards, B. Holmes, J. van de Graff (eds.), *Relevant Methods in Comparative Education* (Hamburg: UNESCO, 1973).

²*Ibid.*, especially Part I, section 2, B. Holmes, "Conceptual Analysis and Empirical Inquiry."

³R. Edwards, Review of *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*, *Comparative Education Review* (February, 1972), pp. 112-113.

⁴Reviews of the Przeworski and Teune book appeared in the following social science journals: *American Political Science Review*, vol. 64 (Dec., 1970); *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 76 (January, 1971); *American Anthropologist*, vol. 73 (April, 1971); *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36 (April, 1971); *American Academy of Social and Political Sciences Annals*, vol. 396 (July, 1971); *Social Studies*, vol. 62 (November, 1971); and *Social Forces*, vol. 52 (June, 1974).

uniqueness is what most clearly distinguishes Comparative Education from comparative efforts in the more established social scientific disciplines.

Recently, the dominant brand of comparative and foreign area social research, (exemplified in comparative sociology) has been subject to cogent criticism (Portes).⁵ In Latin America, India and other areas of Africa and Asia, American social researchers no longer find themselves welcome. Portes attributes this state of affairs to the nature and structure of American sociology. Here, the emphasis is on empirical instances as reflections of general sociological regularities — theory building — as opposed to a concern for nation- and culture-specific descriptions and analysis. In the research process this is reflected in the perception and uses of foreign settings as 'passive laboratories', and the resultant absence of reciprocity on the part of American researchers toward their counterparts in the academic communities of the "target" countries. In the methodological literature this approach is further reflected in an almost exclusive concentration on technical issues, while little if any attention is devoted to the ideological dimensions and implications of comparative research. The consequences of such 'objectivity' are underlined by the Project Camelot scandal.

The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry is an extremely intricate philosophical and methodological essay — which illustrates the very orientation which has led to the situation described by Portes. For Przeworski and Teune the major advantage of the comparative method lies in its theory-building potential. As they state in their Introduction:

. . . emphasis on theory and the de-emphasis on gathering and analyzing unstructured data is, we think, the important issue for the social sciences in the 1970's (p. xi).

Their volume is oblivious to the ideological implications of their approach. Ideological considerations do not lend themselves to compartmentalization within the research process. They infuse all stages and aspects of it. Acceptance of the paramount importance of theory-building implies among other things a perception of the foreign research settings as a 'lab', and a concomitant indifference to local needs and their solution, as well as a conservative, industrialized perception of the nature of knowledge, scholarship and even social change.

Although the culture and solution specific orientations of Comparative Education at this time are not *a priori* indicative of an awareness of the ideological context of research within the discipline, the option of developing or protecting a methodology cognizant with such considerations is inherent in this nation and culture-specific tendency. If Comparative Educationists become overly enamoured of the Przeworski and Teune approach, they may find themselves also unknowingly operating on the 'imperialist' and conservative assumptions implicit in their idea of a comparative social science. The understated practical element in Comparative Education may then disappear, and with it also their welcome in foreign areas and the value of their findings for the solution to the problems of non-Western nations.

⁵Alejandro Portes, "Perception of the U.S. Sociologist and Its Impact on Cross-National Research" in M. Armer and A. D. Grimshaw (eds.), *Comparative Social Research: Methodological Problems and Strategies* (New York: Wiley-Interscience, 1973), pp. 149-169.

This is not to say that theory-building does not have its rightful place in social science. The question theory-building — yes or no, is an inappropriate question. A more relevant question might be: What kind and level of theory is most appropriate to the needs of Comparative Education at its present stage of development? In this regard, Labovitz⁶ makes this telling point when discussing the utility of the book for political science:

By playing more loose and relaxed, and basing measurement and data interpretation on modest theories or rationales, by developing theories consistent with the data and by dialectic interaction between theory and data, a discipline seems to have a more realistic chance of growing (p. 332).

Avoidance of 'abstract empiricism' seems important if Comparative Education is to continue growing in relevant directions.

This is only the negative side of the coin. The positive side includes confronting important questions related to the normative and procedural place of ideological reality in Comparative Education research. A detailed discussion of the ideological dimensions of Comparative Education research is beyond the scope of this review. Two brief examples will be presented, in order to illustrate potential directions for such an inquiry.

Some sociologists⁷ have employed a modified Marxian approach to their discipline to ask the question "Sociology for whom?" Analogously, Comparative Educationists might ask: What role has Comparative Education played in the maintenance of 'the peace', in the propagation of the myths and conditions which allow the ruling classes to rule without challenge? This type of question seems particularly relevant to the Comparative Education endeavour, being as it is, involved in research in foreign areas where political situations are highly susceptible to various ideological visions. For example, in the late 1950's and in the 1960's, India became an important focus for Comparative Education research. An Indian literature developed. What political values and positions are implicit in this work? How has the research been used? How and why did this concentration on India come about? Answers to such questions might be of value in setting an effective course for Comparative Education.

A further direction is pointed up by the recent work of Martin Carnoy, and the earlier comparative work of Barrington Moore, Jr.⁸ Both works have been the objects of considerable critical attention,⁹ primarily, I suspect, because they have employed non-conservative perspectives on their material. Their procedures throw into relief the usual byproducts of accepted methodological applications. The question which their work poses to the bulk Comparative Education research is: To what extent do Comparative Educationists employ

⁶Sandor Labovitz, Review of *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry and The Methodology of Comparative Research*, *American Sociological Review*, vol. 36 (April, 1971), 332.

⁷These include: C. Wright Mills, *The Sociological Imagination* (London: Oxford University Press, 1959); A. Gouldner, *The Coming Crisis of Western Sociology* (New York: Basic Books, 1970); and Martin Nicholaus, "The Professional Organization of Sociology: A View from Below," in R. Blackburn (ed.), *Ideology in Social Science* (Surrey: Fontana Books, 1973), pp. 45-60.

⁸M. Carnoy, *Education As Cultural Imperialism* (New York: David McKay, 1974); and Barrington Moore, Jr., *The Social Origins of Totalitarianism and Democracy* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1966).

⁹See: Robert Koehl, "Cultural Imperialism as Education: An Indictment," *Comparative Education Review*, vol. 19, no. 2 (June, 1975), 276-285; and Jan Currie, Review of *Education As Cultural Imperialism*, *Journal of Educational Thought*, vol. 9, No. 3 (December, 1975), 217-219.

methodology and terminology as cultural and political barriers to winnow out or translate issues with raw and immediate political connotations into what are called "scholarly" formulations, but are really a-political (i.e. conservative) statements of problems in a politicized world? It is time that Comparative Educationists addressed themselves to these and other similar questions.

C. H. Katz
The University of Calgary

* * * * *

Hubert C. Johnson. *Frederick the Great and His Officials*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1975. Pp. 318. \$17.50.

To many, the image of Frederick the Great is one of a fierce warrior and indefatigable imperialist who promoted Prussian power and laid the foundation of the future German empire. All this is correct, but it does not do justice to a remarkable man of many parts. Thomas Carlyle called him "the last of the Gods." Others referred to him as the "roi philosophe" and as the sage of Sans Souci. During his declining years and in spite of an unattractive personal appearance, he was "der alte Fritz" and Fridericus Rex to his admiring subjects.

In point of actual fact, Frederick II (1712-1786) has not always been credited with significant achievements in areas other than the military. After a rebellious and miserable youth, during which he was on the point of being executed by his own father, he ascended the throne of Prussia in 1740 and had a long reign until his death. The positive side of his youth was marked by a Francophile education under the guidance of a Huguenot refugee, as well as by an interest and competence in flute playing and musical composition.

French thought and culture exercised a deep influence on Frederick's life. His admiration for and correspondence with Voltaire is well known. In addition, he felt the impact of D'Alembert and other thinkers of the Enlightenment. Furthermore, his Gallic fanaticism was not only manifest in his 40 volumes of French language literary, historical, and philosophical writings, but also in his neglect of Lessing and Goethe. Indeed, he would regard French as a language fit toward humans and German as proper toward dogs.

Frederick's free-thinking attitude was instrumental, no doubt, in his furtherance of religious tolerance, freedom of conscience, and a relatively free press. He succeeded in advancing agriculture and industry, instituting judicial and administrative reforms, and introducing a French-type and unpopular system of taxation. While he looked upon himself as "the first servant of the State," he turned out to be a Father-figure rather than a figurehead.

It would not do, in an essay emphasizing the peaceful arts, to omit the military exploits of Frederick the Great, as he was already styled during his lifetime. His three Silesian wars, including the Seven Years' War, resulted in the territorial aggrandizement of Prussia, generally at Austria's expense. He was brilliant as a battlefield leader, so much so that Napoleon became an assiduous student of his military methodology.

In the area of education, Frederick exhibited many Progressive tendencies. By way of example, he objected to rote memorization and other mechanical modes of instruction and learning. To him, meaningful education should con-