European Education, vol. 38, no. 3, Fall 2006, pp. 19–47.

ISSN 1056–4934/2006 $9.50 + 0.00.
DOI 10.2753/EUE1056-4934380302

Gita Steiner-Khamsi

The Development Turn in Comparative Education

George Z.F. Bereday, perhaps better known for his scholarship than for his eloquence and wit, tells of an incident that occurred during the 1958 USSR study tour of the U.S. Comparative Education Society:

> They [Soviet government officials] have a habit of taking passports away from tourists. I am a refugee from Communism, and when they took mine away, I followed the passport with my eyes out of the room. They noticed this and on the last day of my visit, they brought back nine passports, but mine was not among them. They looked at me and said, "We will put you in the Soviet university." My eyes opened wide and they had a big laugh, and then they pulled out my passport. An apoplectic kind of joke. Which goes to prove that the definition of a foreign country is where everything is funny except the jokes. (Bereday 1959, p. 46)

The mere thought of trading his professorship at Teachers College, Columbia University in New York, for a position at a Soviet university was to Bereday, an immigrant from Poland to England and then the United States, both ridiculous and abhorrent. As I will point out in this article, it would have been, however, equally unappealing to Soviet comparative education researchers to swap their academic positions with researchers in the United States. There was no doubt among Marxist-Leninist researchers that "bourgeois comparative education," epitomized by the U.S. Comparative

Gita Steiner-Khamsi is a professor of comparative and international education at Teachers College, Columbia University, New York. Her two most recent books are *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending* (New York: Teachers College Press, 2004) and (with coauthor Ines Stolpe) *Educational Import: Local Encounters with Global Forces in Mongolia* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006).

Education Society, was in cahoots with the "imperialist-neocolonialist cultural foreign policy of the U.S.A." (Kienitz 1967, p. 103).

For researchers in socialist countries, U.S. bourgeois educational research denied its ideological foundation and thereby functioned as a pseudoscientific machinery of the U.S. government, to help perpetuate more effectively the myth of meritocracy in a society that is supposedly classless or middle class. Furthermore, U.S. comparative education took the export of this "false consciousness" to a global scale and was actively involved in countries that the U.S. government had selected as target countries to topple revolutionary governments. The name change from "Comparative Education Society" (CES) to "Comparative and International Education Society" (CIES) in 1969 confirmed the development turn that had taken place a decade earlier. Marxist-Leninist researchers read the paradigm shift as a clear sign that the U.S. comparative education community had discovered the Third World as a new terrain from which it could launch its pseudoscientific expeditions in support of U.S. imperialist interventions. All in all, contempt for the academic enterprise of the competing superpower was mutual, as were attempts to secure influence in the "nonaligned" countries of the Third World by means of international cooperation, technical assistance, and international educational development.

The formative years of comparative education societies

The 1950s and 1960s were formative years for comparative education societies in different parts of the world, including the United States and Soviet Union. In need of finding a noncapitalist source of inspiration, socialist authors resorted to N.K. Krupskaia (Lenin's wife) as a discursive founder of Marxist-Leninist comparative education. Most textbooks on comparative education mention her briefly in the introductory chapter before moving on to a more substantial methodological and theoretical discussion of the field. While in exile with her husband, Krupskaia is said to have visited schools in England, France, Switzerland, Germany, and Poland to learn about schooling in democratic societies (Wiloch and Atzmon 1976). She wrote on pedagogical issues (e.g., *Public Education and Democracy,* 1915), edited a journal (*On the Path to a New School*), and established the Society of Marxist Educators, which included a comparative studies division titled "Foreign Education." Until the late 1950s, Marxist-Leninist comparative education placed the emphasis exclusively on education in capitalist and socialist countries. The development turn, that is, the emphasis on developing countries, was foreshadowed by the establishment of UNESCO in 1945, consolidated during the arms, space, and technology race of the 1950s and 1960s, and finally taken to a global scale during the period of *détente* (1968–75) when the two superpowers divided up the Third World into two distinct world-systems.

For comparative education researchers in the United States, Soviet education was first an object of admiration, and in the following two decades a counterreference for all that U.S. education was not supposed to be or never wished to become. At the founding meeting of the Comparative Education Society at New York University in 1956, the contrastive analyses between education in the United States and education in the Soviet Union were placed at center stage.[1] Soviet education became a primary point of reference after the launch of Sputnik in 1957, a position reinforced once Iurii Gagarin became the first man in space in 1961. The Soviet downfall coincided with reports in the 1970s and 1980s in which dissidents spoke up against political repression and wrote about the widespread "economy of shortage" in socialist countries.

Marxist-Leninist perceptions of bourgeois education developed in the opposite direction—from negative to positive. Soviet accounts of U.S. education were extremely critical in the 1950s, and became somewhat more positive in the mid-1980s. Contempt for the U.S. "play school," lack of universal access to education, and particularly the inability to deal with racism and school segregation was greatest in the 1950s and the 1960s. The U.S. educational system was not only seen as rotten to the core, but also at such a low stage of development that it was not deemed worthy of comparison with the Soviet system. In the mid-1980s these negative perceptions finally gave way to a genuine interest in understanding education in capitalist countries, including in the United States.

In this article I compare the world-systems of U.S. comparative education with the geopolitical distinctions made by Marxist-Leninist comparative education in the German Democratic Republic (GDR). The analysis covers the cold war period from 1956 to 1983. The year 1956 marks the establishment of the U.S. Comparative Education Society in New York. It is also the year the Office for Overseas Education [Büro für Auslands-pädagogik]—a precursor to the Section Comparative Education at the GDR Academy for Pedagogical Sciences—was established in East Berlin (John 1998, p. 50ff). Important sources of information for my study were the official journals of the two societies, *Comparative Education Review* (United States) and *Vergleichende Pädagogik* (German Democratic Republic), as well as publications and documents by U.S. and East German comparative education researchers of that time period.[2] My investigation of the impact of the cold war on comparative educational research in the East (Germany) and the West (United States) ends with 1983, when the influential report *A Nation at Risk* was released (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983). With this report U.S.

education authorities openly admitted the weaknesses of the U.S. educational system and pointed out the strengths of the Japanese and (West) German systems. The report, released in the early days of glasnost, was widely reviewed in journals of socialist education societies and interpreted as a positive sign that U.S. educational researchers were finally engaging in constructive self-criticism (e.g., Meese 1989). For many researchers in the East, this was seen as a signal to let go of the claim that Soviet education was far superior to bourgeois education. In 1989, much later than representatives of other Marxist-Leninist comparative education societies and shortly before the fall of the Berlin wall, Hans-Georg Hofmann, president of the GDR Comparative Education Society, acknowledged that the exclusive focus on studying education in the Soviet Union and United States was outdated:

> For a long period schools in the Soviet Union and United States were regarded as world-class educational systems and served as an orientation for educational reform in other countries. Beginning in the early 1980s, however, their influence diminished. . . . New educational systems, and in particular the theoretical and practical achievements of systems such as Japan, France, Austria, but also in the Republic of Czechoslovakia, in the People's Republic of Korea, and in Cuba, emerged and moved to center stage of global scientific attention. (Hofmann 1989, p. 365)

Although reference to the educational system of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG)—which *A Nation at Risk* identified together with the Japanese system as one of the two systems worth emulating—was conspicuously missing from Hofmann's list of exemplary educational systems, the 1983 report marked an opening-up to self-criticism. This was true not only in the United States, but also in the Soviet Union and its allied states. With the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the turbulent political events that followed the year after throughout the socialist world, Marxist-Leninist comparative education societies were dissolved. In the former GDR, universities and academic associations were purged of Marxist-Leninist scholars, and almost all were dismissed, downgraded to clerical positions, or offered early retirement. In other formerly socialist countries, the comparative education societies gradually reconstituted themselves with either new members or old members with a new ideological orientation.

I argue in my broader research on the history of the comparative method that the influence of the cold war is evident in several contemporary features of U.S. and German comparative and international education. Prominent among these is the dominance of development and area studies in U.S. comparative and international education, as well as the absence of development studies in contemporary German comparative education. The latter is true despite the fact that development studies was an important feature of East German Marxist-Leninist comparative education. Also important is the preoccupation of U.S. comparative education with contrastive analyses of educational systems conceived as diametrically opposed to the U.S. system. In the United States, Sovietology was soon replaced by Japanology, followed by, after more than a decade of relative inertia, Islamology. Whereas research on educational practices in the Soviet Union, Japan, or the Arab world—all regions that were seen at one time or another as economic or political threats to the United States—attracted great public attention, this populist type of research did not make it into German comparative education. In German comparative education, the period of transnational contrastive analysis was short-lived: It existed only during the period of the cold war, when West German researchers published on East German education and vice versa. Finally, I observe a varied interest in studying those educational systems that are perceived as similar or comparable to one's own. It is significant that U.S. comparative education researchers rarely compare U.S. education with education in other parts of the world; as if there are no lessons to be learned from experiences in other countries. The only country that seems to serve as a "reference society" (Schriewer et al. 1998) for educational reform in the United States is Great Britain, and even this is limited to neoliberal school reform and vocational education. It seems there is no cross-national "policy attraction" for U.S. analysts unless the reforms happen to emanate from Great Britain.[3] This is in stark contrast to German comparative education research, traditionally enamored with observing, documenting, and publishing on reforms in countries perceived as comparable in context. During the cold war, interest in educational reforms of other countries applied not only to comparative education in the Federal Republic of Germany, but also in the former German Democratic Republic. The GDR also displayed an enormous interest in developments in other "socialist fraternal states," particularly Soviet reforms.[4] This article focuses exclusively on the first point, that is, the emergence of development and area studies in U.S. and GDR comparative education during the cold war period.

The creation of the Third World

The wave of decolonization in Africa and other parts of the world was in large part complete by the late 1960s. The worries of the two superpowers were many: With whom do these newly emerging countries trade, with whom do they side in international conflicts, and for whom do they vote in the newly established multilateral organizations of the United Nations? It was a concern but also a great opportunity to expand one's influence in the so-called neutralist or nonaligned countries. It was a matter of greatest importance to the superpowers that the governments and people in these newly established nation-states, most of them impoverished from centuries of exploitation, make up their minds and choose their allies. After all, both communism and capitalism were global projects, communism perhaps more explicitly than capitalism. According to Marxism-Leninism, socialism is merely an interim stage to the eventual achievement of communism. Communism, in turn, rests on the condition that every country in the world commit itself to the socialist path of development. Similarly, capitalism's survival depends on the constant expansion of markets, continuously increasing the number of consumers, along with access to cheap labor and raw material enabling low production costs and greater individual profit.

Which were the target countries of the two superpowers? Where did they attempt to secure their influence? An analysis of funding patterns provides a glimpse into the political and strategic interests that the United States and Soviet Union were pursuing during the cold war. The Greenbook, periodically compiled by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) for the U.S. Congress, is a valuable source for analyzing funding priorities and target countries of the U.S. government. The Greenbook presents figures on U.S. overseas loans and grants, listed under three categories: economic assistance (USAID grants and loans, Food for Peace, Peace Corps, etc.), military assistance (Military Assistance Program, International Military Education and Training Program, etc.), and other U.S. government loans (export–import bank loans, direct loans, etc.).[5] Judging from the statistical information (USAID 2001), the Middle East has constituted the highest priority for the U.S. government. Israel was by far the largest recipient, followed by Egypt. Israel has received $81 billion since its creation, and Egypt has received $53 billion since the early 1970s. Another country regarded as a high priority was South Vietnam. During its short existence it received $24 billion in the form of U.S. grants and loans. In contrast, all of sub-Saharan Africa received only $31 billion between 1945 and 2001 (Westad 2005, p. 156).

Alberto Alesina and David Dollar (2000) take their analysis of statistical information on loans and grants a step further and present a multivariate analysis of donor strategy that considers trade openness, democracy, civil liberties, colonial status, direct foreign investment, initial income, and population of the target countries. Their analyses are not restricted to U.S. government loans and grants, but include all donors from market economies. They find that former colonial empires (in particular, Portugal, the United Kingdom, France, Australia, and Belgium) spend more than half of their external aid on their former colonies. From 1970 to 1994, Portugal channeled 97 percent of its aid to its former colonies. In comparison, the United Kingdom allocated 78 percent, France 57 percent, Australia 56 percent, and Belgium 54 percent of their external funding to former colonies. The variable of being a "U.N. friend" also proved important for donors' selection of target countries. The variable measures whether the target country has voted in line with the donor at U.N. conferences. This variable accounts for the Japanese funding pattern in the post–cold war period. In the past decade, Japan directed funds to poor countries in return for a vote on admitting Japan as additional member of the U.N. Security Council. Although Alesina's and Dollar's regression analyses cover all capitalist donors, their findings confirm the trend reported earlier for the U.S. government. Of all the donor strategies that capitalist countries employed to select target countries, political and economic interests in the Middle East, in particular access to a region with oil reserves, have overshadowed other considerations.

The authors (ibid., p. 40) also calculate the likelihood of a country receiving aid from capitalist countries if relevant variables such as initial income of the country or population size are held constant. Their findings illustrate the high funding priority of the United States and its allies in the Middle East. All other factors kept constant, Egypt received 481 percent more, and the value for Israel is off the scale. According to Alesina's and Dollar's regression analysis, Israel should receive—based on the indicators used for other aid recipient countries—virtually no aid. Instead it receives $400 per capita from its closest allies (United States, Germany, Italy, Austria, and the Netherlands). The two features that are least important for receiving aid are "being relatively open" (toward international trade) and "being relatively democratic" (index from Freedom House on a scale of 1 to 7). These findings reflect the preference of the U.S. government for funding either dictatorships that were undemocratic and isolationist but open to trade with the United States or states such as Guatemala, Argentina, Iran, Syria, and Iraq that were intensively courted by the communist competitor. With the withdrawal of the United States from UNESCO (1984–2002) and the U.S. government's investment in and control of the World Bank, the selective funding of educational reforms became a potent educational policy and intervention tool applied to Third World countries. The loans and grants of the World Bank rewarded like-minded regimes for preserving their free market economies despite the attraction that communist aid had to offer, particularly in the educational sector.

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were to market economies what the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) was to socialist countries: a conglomeration of countries that served to maintain the stability of the international currency (dollars versus rubles), enable international trade, and contribute to the economic growth of its poorest member states. Even though the economic objectives of these disparate international financial institutions were similar, their models of development varied considerably. Westad juxtaposes the two different models of development succinctly:

> One [development model], symbolized by the United States, promised intensive urban-based growth in both the private and the public sectors, the import of advanced consumer products and the latest technology through joining a global capitalist market, and an alliance with the world's most powerful state. The other, that of the Soviet world, offered politically induced growth through a centralized plan and mass mobilization, with an emphasis on heavy industry, massive infrastructural projects, and the collectivization of agriculture, independent of international markets. (Westad 2005, p. 92)

The two different conceptions of development had great repercussions for educational development in the Third World. The U.S. model emphasized economic growth, decentralization, decrease of public expenditures, and privatization, whereas the Soviet model focused on human capacity building, centralization, increase of public expenditures, and collectivization. As expected, the Soviet emphasis on human capacity building was more beneficial to educational development in poor countries. By the end of the cold war, most socialist countries achieved universal access to education and had much higher literacy rates than those Third World countries that were aligned with capitalist donors (see Steiner-Khamsi and Stolpe 2006). Both superpowers, however, struggled with their reputation in the Third World. The U.S. model was reminiscent of capitalist exploitation during the colonial period. The Soviet model remedied the shortcomings of the capitalist model by emphasizing social justice and equality, but it suffered from its reputation for exporting second-rate products and technology to poor countries.

The first testing ground for Soviet aid was the People's Republic of China. As part of the Sino–Soviet Friendship Treaty, the Soviet Union established a large aid program that equaled 7 percent of Soviet national income for the period 1953–60 (Westad 2005). As with other Soviet interventions, the expectation was to help establish the Soviet brand of state socialism in countries that received aid. In an attempt to intervene more effectively in the Far East (China, North Korea, North Vietnam), the Institute of Oriental Studies of the Academy of Sciences was established in Moscow. In 1960 an institute for the study of Africa was added. A year later, in 1961, Soviet knowledge of the Third World was further expanded with the establishment of an additional institute of the Academy of Sciences devoted to the study of Latin America (Westad 2005). The declared strategy of Soviet aid was to support national communist parties in different parts of the world in their anti-imperialist struggle against the United States and its allies. With this rhetoric, aid was given to any country that had a nucleus of a communist party intent on overthrowing the government. For example, substantial military, economic, and humanitarian assistance from the Soviet Union, as well as from Cuba and the GDR, were channeled into the Eritrean People's Liberation Front, the African National Congress (operating from outside apartheid South Africa), the Movimento das Forças Armadas in Angola, the Mouvement National Congolais, and numerous revolutionary groups in other African countries and continents.

Historical facts matter a great deal in this type of research. It is important to bear in mind that the configuration of allies changed continuously over the thirty-year period of the cold war. For example, the principle of superpower equality (détente) lasted from 1968 to 1975. Established by U.S. President Richard Nixon and Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev after the defeat of U.S. forces in Vietnam, détente constituted mutual recognition that each superpower (the United States and the USSR) could intervene in domestic affairs of other countries. Aid, technical assistance, or educational development work were discovered as effective tools of political intervention. The superpower détente was severely resented by China, which for years had objected to U.S. foreign policy more rigorously than the Soviet Union. Acknowledgment of a peaceful coexistence between the two superpowers, a plan the Soviet Union had pursued since the 1950s, signaled for China's leader Mao Zedong a betrayal and a de facto suspension of the world communist project. The Soviet Union, in turn, was convinced that China aimed to replace the Soviet Union as the international communist superpower. Situating itself as a flagship socialist country that, with its Great Leap Forward, overcame illiteracy, poverty, and underdevelopment, China considered itself a leading example for other poor countries. The fallout with the Soviet Union in the early 1960s led to Mao's peculiar Three-World Theory, which situated China at the center of the South, from where the anti-imperialist struggle against the richer nations was to be orchestrated.[6] Thus, in the 1960s, the Third World was exposed to several spheres of influence: the United States and its allies, the Soviet Union and its allies, and China. The communist parties in Vietnam and Indonesia closely collaborated with China, and perhaps the most visible international involvement of Chinese experts was the construction of the railway linking Zambia to the Tanzanian coast.

The international race over the patronage of the south became an issue of survival for the United States and the Soviet Union. In both world-systems, competition over nonaligned nations was treated as a priority and government funding was made available for all kinds of institutions, including higher education. Universities in the United States and in the Soviet Union experienced a boom in area and development studies in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Similarly, socialist governments invested in the establishment of research and teaching institutions for Third World studies. For both world-systems, the study of languages and cultures of nonaligned countries was just the first step toward operating in these countries as technical assistants, and ultimately securing international trade and political support. Not surprisingly, comparative education—both in the West and in the East—greatly benefited from this infusion of government funds during the period of the cold war.

The Third World in U.S. comparative education

In the United States, Congress passed the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) in 1958 to improve the quality of education (especially in math, sciences, and foreign-language instruction), and increase access to postsecondary and higher education by means of student loans and scholarships. A total of ten areas ("titles") were listed as eligible for federal funding. In higher education these new areas were Title II (student loans), Title IV (national defense fellowships), and language and area studies development (Title VI). These funding priorities were initiated in 1958 and are, at a much lower level of funding, available to this date.[7] Announced one year after the launch of Sputnik and presented as a response to a national "educational emergency" (NDEA 1958: section 101), the NDEA actively promoted the study of languages and regions, including those deemed critical to the United States during the cold war. The following excerpt illustrates the tone of panic evident in the Act:[8]

> The Congress thereby finds and declares that the security of the nation requires the fullest development of the mental resources and technical skills of its young men and women. . . . To meet the present educational emergency requires additional effort at all levels of government. It is therefore the purpose of this Act to provide substantial assistance . . . in order to ensure trained manpower of sufficient quality and quantity to meet the national defense needs of the United States. (NDEA 1958, section 101)

A review of the NDEA budget for 1963 illustrates the preoccupation with socialist countries. The top-ranking foreign languages in the early 1960s were Chinese and Russian. To be precise, 16 percent of the budget for modern foreign language graduate fellowships was spent for Chinese and 13 percent for Russian, followed by Arabic (11 percent), Japanese (10 percent), Spanish (10 percent) and other languages (Office of Education 1963, Figure

20). The U.S.–Soviet cultural exchange agreement of 1958 made it possible to take a peek behind the Iron Curtain in the form of organized study visits or tours. The interest in Soviet and East European languages and studies dropped drastically in the 1970s when government funding for foreign language and area studies dwindled. The number of doctorates earned in Soviet and East European studies at American universities, for example, was at a peak in the decade 1970–79 (3,598 doctorates), but then dropped by 60 percent in the period 1980–87 (Atkinson 1988).

Although the rhetoric for establishing the NDEA was clearly embedded in the language of the cold war, a great number of foreign language and area studies—regardless of whether they were in socialist countries—benefited from the infusion of government funds. In 1958, the U.S. commissioner of education designated eighty-three languages as critically needed and identified six of them for first priority in development: Arabic, Chinese, Hindi-Urdu, Japanese, Portuguese, and Russian (Spanish was added in 1996, after the announcement of the U.S.–Latin American Alliance for Progress). By the end of 1962, four years after the implementation of the NDEA, fifty-six of the eighty-three "critical languages" received federal support and fifty-three centers for area and language studies in higher education were established.

The boost in federal support for higher education generated very attractive incentives to establish area studies as well as development studies in education and the social sciences. At Columbia University, for example, the School of International Affairs (SIA), established in 1946, was able to build seven regional institutes in the period 1946–62. The graduate school of education of Columbia University (Teachers College), in turn, embarked on "a decade of development" in 1957 and pursued a systematic plan to infuse international education in all programs taught at Teachers College (Butts 1966).[9] The success was limited and lasted only as long as funding from the U.S. government and philanthropies (especially the Ford Foundation) was available. Instead of internationalizing existing graduate programs of education at Teachers College, a separate degree program (International Educational Development) was created, and added to the existing program Comparative and International Education. Ironically, the coexistence of two international programs at Teachers College should not be interpreted as an asset, but rather the expression of a failed attempt to internationalize Teachers College graduate programs in education. Nevertheless, the original plan to internationalize an entire graduate school of education is indicative of the political priorities in the 1950s and 1960s.[10] Also, other experiments lasted only as long as external funding was made available, such as, for example, a three-year program leading to a master of arts in international affairs and doctor of education (joint degree of SIA and Teachers College), or a program in education and African studies, offered jointly by Teachers College and the Columbia University Institute of African Studies, and a program in Education and Latin American studies offered jointly with the Institute of Latin American studies. Students acquired a two-year certificate from the respective regional institutes of SIA, as well as an Ed.D. degree at Teachers College. The plan was to cover the entire world, that is, to establish joint degrees between Teachers College and all of the seven regional institutes of SIA. However, federal funding for language and area studies and for technical assistance in Third World countries was drastically reduced during the Vietnam War. At Teachers College, the numerous initiatives and experiments of the Institute of International Studies could be sustained for another eight years with funding from the Ford Foundation (1965–70), but were put to rest as soon as external funding dried up.[11] The Vietnam War not only diverted federal funding from the education sector to the army, but also created the image of the ugly American abroad. Freeman Butt summarizes the negative portrayal of U.S. technical assistance and its negative impact on international education as follows:

> The air of disenchantment surrounded other aspects of American foreign policy, notably, of course the Vietnam War. By association, American educational influence came under attack in some nations as "academic colonialism." (Butts 1968, p. 1)

The United States Peace Corps, founded three years after the passage of the NDEA, had the mission to first understand and then influence the hearts and minds of people abroad. Ultimately, the coverage of the NDEA also moved into this arena. In the same year, 1961, Congress passed the Foreign Assistance Act. U.S. foreign assistance was reorganized in ways that distinguished between military and nonmilitary aid. As part of the Act's mandate, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) was created to administer economic assistance programs.

Even though the "decade of development" lasted in most American universities for just ten years, it entirely transformed the field of U.S. comparative and international education. Before the heyday of language and area studies, U.S. comparative and international education research was exclusively Eurocentric, with a few exceptions in the form of "applied research" (projects) in developing countries. The proportion changed radically in the 1960s: With the exception of Soviet education, there was virtually no funding made available to study education in Europe. Most funding, and consequently the research focus, was directed toward educational development in the Third World. What has remained a constant in U.S. comparative and international education is the tool of single-country studies as the main method of inquiry dominating comparative education since its inception as an academic field. Even though this feature, that is, the lack of cross-national comparison in U.S. comparative education, has been repeatedly criticized (Carnoy 2006; Noah 2006; Noah and Eckstein 1969), it has endured to the present. What has changed, however, is the disciplinary background of U.S. comparative education researchers. As mentioned before, and, despite contrary assessments, reiterated here[12] (Steiner-Khamsi and deJong-Lambert 2006, p. 84), until the 1960s comparative education in North America was firmly based in the discipline of history. It opened up only in the past four to five decades to other disciplines in the social sciences (anthropology, economics, political science, sociology).

A brief comparison of U.S. educational reform strategies used during the cold war and during the ongoing war on terror is appropriate here. Since 2006, there has been talk of passing a new NDEA as an educational offensive to win the war on terror. Education was, as it is today, directly tied to national and global security, and federal expenditures for education more than doubled in the four years after the NDEA was passed in 1958 (Senate of the United States 2006, p. 2). Even though the funds were administered by the Department of Education, the language used to pass the Act in Congress was soaked in the language of the military-provoking anxieties that the country would lose the race in science, technology, and arms. The magnitude of NDEA becomes immediately apparent if we compare the educational measures of the late 1950s with those of today that the U.S. government has initiated to combat the war on terror. Such a comparison is not far-fetched, since many political commentators compare September 11 (2001) to the launch of Sputnik (October 1957). Both events were hyped as a shock to the nation and triggered a host of government interventions. In education, the parallel is striking, and reflected in the 2005 National Security Language Initiative[13] established by President George W. Bush and the plan of democratic senators, backed by the Association of American Universities (2006), to pass the so-called New NDEA of 2006. However, if the federal government were to allocate the same amount for education in the interest of "national security" as it did with the NDEA in 1958, it would cost $400–500 million, that is, approximately ten times more than it is spending nowadays for Title VI and Homeland Security fellowships (Brainard 2005). In both eras—the cold war and war on terror—public expenditures for winning the "war" were massive. During the cold war, however, the allocation of funds to the education sector was considerably higher—in fact, ten times higher—than today.

The Third World in GDR comparative education

The development turn also occurred in Marxist-Leninist comparative education in the late 1950s, but subsequently, since the 1990s, the focus on developing countries has almost completely disappeared with the dissolution or reconstitution, respectively, of former socialist comparative education societies. The objective had been to support the anti-imperialist struggle in the Third World. The Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the USSR opened a section on comparative education in 1966 (Sokolowa 1966). According to Malkova, the comparative education section of the Academy was well staffed: Already by 1970, 35 full-time scholars worked in collaboration with economists, philosophers, historians, and anthropologists (Malkowa [Malkova] 1970; see also Sokolowa 1966).

The academies of pedagogical sciences in other socialist countries followed suit.[14] Typically, the comparative education sections comprised three research divisions: education in socialist countries, education in capitalist countries, and education in developing countries.

A notable exception was comparative education in the German Democratic Republic, which from the outset included a fourth division dealing exclusively with education in the Federal Republic of Germany (Busch 1983; Kienitz 1994). In fact, the Bureau for the German Question [Büro für gesamtdeutsche Fragen] in East Berlin preceded the establishment of a comparative educational research unit. The Bureau was opened in 1954, two years before the other three divisions were integrated into a new unit under the name "foreign education" [Auslandspädagogik]. Finally, in 1974, the GDR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences established a section on comparative education studies. The label "foreign education" was replaced with a name more commonly used in other socialist countries: comparative education.

The fact that comparison with West German education preceded comparative studies of education in socialist, capitalist, and developing countries is not incidental. In discussing the impact of the cold war on GDR comparative educational research, one needs to keep in mind that in East Germany the neighboring Federal Republic of Germany was perceived as the greatest anticommunist threat. Officially, the impetus for creating the GDR Bureau for the German Question was to maintain links to West German researchers and to reflect on the common German heritage in education (Busch 1983). The original, officially stated objective of German–German collaboration did not materialize and, on the contrary, both sides made great efforts to identify fundamental differences between East and West German education in an attempt to create and preserve a distance between the two systems (Anweiler 1990; see John 1998). When the wall went up in 1961 to prevent further mass emigration to West Germany, the cautious encounter between the two systems transformed into open hostility. After 1961, the GDR Bureau for the German Question was charged with the task of vilifying the FRG educational system. The Bureau ceaselessly criticized FRG educational researchers for disseminating anticommunist propaganda, for their vicious concealment of German colonial policy, and for being subservient to the imperialist educational policy of the FRG.

During the cold war, the narrow focus on education in the other Germany was also discernible in FRG comparative education. After the end of World War II until 1990, the bulk of government funding for comparative education in the FRG was earmarked for studies on education in East Germany, Central and Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union. Several comparative education research units, notably the ones at the German Institute for International Educational Research in Frankfurt am Main and at the University of Bochum, West Germany, produced—under the directorship of renowned comparative education researchers Wolfgang Mitter (Frankfurt) and Oskar Anweiler (Bochum)—numerous studies on education in European socialist countries.

The German Democratic Republic journal of comparative education, *Vergleichende Pädagogik,* regularly reported on educational developments in other countries. It listed the reports in the four sections (socialist countries, capitalist countries, Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany), developing countries). The headlines, listed below for two issues of the 1977 volume, capture the normative feature of comparative studies: the accounts of educational developments in capitalist countries and in the FRG evoke images of a fundamental crisis, the reports on developments in socialist countries document progress, and the ones on (nonaligned) developing countries, finally, imply an urgent appeal for socialist aid.

Headlines in *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1977, vol. 13, no. 3:

Socialist countries:
"GDR: Conference of Educational Experts from Socialist Countries"
"GDR: Apprenticeship for Each School Graduate"
"USSR: Labor Education in Middle School"
"USSR: People's Education in the Kyrgyz Republic"
"USSR: Successful Results of People's Education in Azerbaijan"
"People's Republic of Poland: New Curriculum Reform Drafts Are Being Discussed"
"Mongolian People's Republic: More Schools Until 1980"
"Socialist Republic of Vietnam: Training of Subject Teachers"

Capitalist countries:
"Great Britain: The Quality of the Educational System Continues to Decrease"

Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany):
"FRG: The Imposition of Ideological Manipulations in History Education"
"FRG: Child Labor Increases"

Developing countries:
"Mexico: Demands for Better Education"

Headlines in *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1977, vol. 13, no. 4:

Socialist countries:
"Closer Cooperation of 'Comparative Education' with Journals of Fraternal States"
"USSR: 60 Years October Revolution"
"USSR: Importance of Labor Education"
"USSR: 80,000 Foreigners Complete Vocational and Higher Education"
"Teacher Education in Vietnam"
"Iraq: Emphasis on Compulsory Education"
"People's Republic of Yemen: School Reform Has Been Initiated"
"India: Soviet Textbooks in Indian Universities"
"Afghanistan: Educational Reform"

Capitalist countries:
"Great Britain: Female Teachers Are Discriminated Against"

Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany):
"FRG: Children of Immigrants Without Any Perspective"
"FRG: Educational Misery Increases"

Developing countries:
"Bolivia: Illiteracy"

The GDR journal of comparative education was published in a shorter version in 1960 and had, at 3,000 copies per issue, a vast circulation (John 1998, p. 105). The journal was expanded in 1965 and issued four times a year. Beginning with the first issue of *Vergleichende Pädagogik,* the journal distinguished between the four groups of countries. Over the four decades of the journal's existence, several synonyms surfaced. For example, "education in fraternal states" was used interchangeably with "education in socialist countries," "imperialist countries" was a synonym for "capitalist countries," and correspondingly, "anti-imperialist countries" meant "developing countries." Approximately half the reports and articles published in the journal were on educational development in socialist countries, in particular on education in the Soviet Union.[15] The strategic plan of 1961–65 for comparative education, issued by the GDR Ministry of Education, demanded such disproportional attention to Soviet education: "*Socialist countries*, led by the

Soviet Union: The numerous experiences should be evaluated and used for the development of a socialist school in the GDR and for our propagandist initiatives in West Germany" (cited in John 1998, p. 57; emphasis in original).

The educational interest in developing countries experienced a boost in 1971 when the GDR was admitted as the 131st member of UNESCO. Like other socialist states, the GDR defined its UNESCO mandate as twofold: First, to demonstrate the inextricable link among politics, economics, and educational development. Developing countries committed to combating illiteracy need first to abolish exploitative structures that these countries have inherited from their colonial past. The prospects for eradicating illiteracy and securing universal access to education depend on whether revolutionary forces succeed in disempowering the ruling class in developing countries that hindered in the past, and continue to prevent in the present, equal access and outcomes in education. Thus, the fight against illiteracy must go hand in hand with an anti-imperialist, communist struggle against the ruling class that identifies with and executes orders on behalf of Northern countries, in particular the United States. The first mandate implied the need to document and make public the experiences from former developing countries, such as the Central Asian Soviet republics, that had successfully combated illiteracy soon after they chose the socialist path of development. Second, to challenge the monopoly over the project of world peace that the imperialist members of the United Nations tended to appropriate. In response to the claim of ownership over the project of world peace made by NATO member states, and by the United States in particular, the Soviet Union emphasized its active role as a founding member of the United Nations and highlighted its friendly ties with "the progressive states of Asia, Africa, and Latin America" (Vavilov, Matveyev, and Oleandrov 1974, p. 18) to advance world peace. For Marxist-Leninists, communism was the only guarantor of world peace and international security, and the Soviet contribution consisted in networking progressive or socialist forces in different corners of the world so that these forces could resist colonialist and neocolonialist exploitation. The "progressive policy in present-day conditions," which the Soviet Union attempted to strengthen, was quite narrowly defined in that it included only governments either already committed to or seriously interested in the socialist path of development (ibid., p. 19).

The unhappy Marxist-Leninist encounter with progressive forces in market economies deserves a special note. Progressive scholars, public intellectuals, or politicians in the West that advocated social justice or equity without calling for a revolution were seen as the real (class) enemy. It made their cause only more despicable if they referred to Marx or Engels to substantiate their appeal for nonrevolutionary social changes. In fact, these progressives in education, ranging from John Dewey and his followers to Ivan Illich or

Paulo Freire, were regarded as great a threat to communism as blatant fascist, imperialist or anticommunist demagogues who naively defended bourgeois ideology. A popular fallacy that progressives in the West were advancing was the belief in "reforms" and, by implication, an acknowledgment that class-based societies are fixable (Multilateraler Expertenrat 1984). The term "reform," advanced by Marxist or neo-Marxist intellectuals in the West, carried negative connotations in the East. After all, the educational systems of capitalist societies are beyond repair or reform. In addition, Marxist-Leninists in the East were quick to point out that in a class society a reform, fundamental or incremental for that matter, is admitted only if it corresponds with the economic interests of the ruling class.

The widespread disregard for a bourgeois ideology wrapped in progressive rhetoric cannot be overstated. Accusations of "pseudoprogressive" analyses were directed against any scholar who dared to write empathetically about Soviet education. For example, in one of the most widely read Marxist-Leninist books on education in capitalist countries, Chorolski (1986) criticizes Robert Tabachnik and Thomas S. Popkewitz for reducing comparison to the educational sector rather than recognizing that the main distinction between socialist and bourgeois education lies with the differences in the economic and political foundation of the two systems. Precisely because bourgeois or pseudoprogressive comparative education researchers are, according to Chorolski (ibid.), so narrow or biased in their methodology, publications on socialist education [such as the ones by Tabachnik and Popkewitz] risk encouraging the reader to either selectively borrow from, or completely disregard the socialist experience in education.

Skepticism against progressive forces in nonsocialist countries is also mirrored in the arguments with which the GDR expert for multilateral organizations, Dr. Ilse Gerth, criticized the progressive tendencies within UNESCO. In internal documents to her superiors at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences, Gerth regularly reported on the outcomes of UNESCO meetings and reiterated what the correct Marxist-Leninist reactions to UNESCO programs and resolutions should be. Perhaps the most graphic illustration of Marxist-Leninist review style is the edited booklet on the 18th General Assembly Meeting of UNESCO (Gerth 1975). The editor selects controversial topics that were discussed at the 18th General Assembly and has response essays prepared on four topics. The headings of the four topics read as follows:

—the theory of the "world educational crisis"

—the bourgeois conception of life-long learning

—the terminology and feature of "innovation" in educational planning and activities

—the bourgeois position on "immigrant workers" (ibid., p. 3).

The editor, Ilse Gerth, starts out by summarizing the UNESCO position on a controversial topic, then examines and compares the topic in the customary three groups of countries (capitalist countries, socialist countries, developing countries), and finally wraps up the correct Marxist-Leninist response to the UNESCO position. To announce the parts with the correct response, she consistently titles the third section "What is there to say?" [Was ist dazu zu sagen?]. Beyond differences in review style, Marxist-Leninist comparative researchers presented convincing arguments against the universal usage of UNESCO constructs. For example, the concept of "world educational crisis" (see Coombs 1967) was sharply criticized. What bothered them most was that U.S. president Lyndon B. Johnson supported work in this area (Gerth 1975). In her review of the UNESCO document 19 C/4 (Program of UNESCO for 1977–82), Gerth dismantles the world educational crisis as a bourgeois construct and requests that the imperialist member states basically speak or write for themselves (Gerth 1976a). After all, there was no educational crisis in socialist countries. On the contrary, socialist countries already had superior education in place, because socialism shielded the educational sector from the types of crises the capitalist countries at the time were typically exposed to. Another vehemently attacked UNESCO term was the concept of permanent or lifelong education. Marxist-Leninist educational researchers (Gerth 1975; Széchy 1986) resented the selective borrowing of a concept that was saturated with socialist conceptions of education. The concept of lifelong learning is quintessentially socialist. Not only should socialist systems be credited for having successfully implemented the notion of lifelong learning, but also it must be acknowledged that high-quality lifelong learning requires a political, economic, and social environment—such as socialist—in which lifelong learning is truly valued. Gerth writes,

> Only the socialist educational system, which includes preschool, school, afterschool, as well as all stages of postsecondary education, provides the necessary foundation for lifelong learning of high socialist quality. The socialist society implements the teachings of the founders of Marxism-Leninism in practice by conceptualizing learning as a lifelong process. (Gerth 1975, p. 42)

Research on multilaterals and, in particular, on the U.N. system has only begun to reflect on the cold war era. With easier access to archival material in both world-systems, past accounts of important historical events are in need of reexamination. As mentioned in previous publications (Steiner-Khamsi and deJong-Lambert 2006, p. 89; Steiner-Khamsi and Stolpe 2006, p. 78 ff.), the role of socialist countries in leading, for example, the 1974 UNESCO Revolution, has not been sufficiently investigated. Although Phillip Jones

(1988, 2005) and Karen Mundy (1999) report in some detail on the demand for a new international economic order that was put forward during the 18th General Assembly in 1974, they tend to reduce the revolution to a shift in power relations between First and Third World countries. A singular event, the election of Amadou-Mahtar M'Bow from a Third World country (Senegal) to secretary general in 1974, has attracted too much attention for explaining why the United States, the United Kingdom, and Singapore left the organization a decade later. Other events during the 1974 meetings of the General Assembly that hint at the politicization of the organization, such as the UNESCO resolution against the Chilean military junta or against the Israeli occupation of Arab territories, deserve equal consideration. As Gerth, a GDR comparative education researcher and government representative for multilateral organizations, noted in her report on thirty years of UNESCO, the 18th General Assembly was a breakthrough for socialist countries (Gerth 1976b). The majority of member states finally recognized, after years of insistence by the first three socialist members (USSR, Ukraine, and Belarus) "the need to understand the political dimension of educational issues" (ibid., p. 356). The victory of the socialist position over U.S. perspectives, defeated during the 18th General Assembly, is amply documented in GDR comparative education.

Comparison quo vadis?

Arguably, in the political "East" there was no Marxist tradition in comparative education. Such a tradition had to first be invented. Folk accounts of Krupskaia's grand contribution to establishing the science of comparative education between 1917 and 1945 were supposed to fill the void. Self-referential in direction, the references to Krupskaia enabled Marxist-Leninist comparative education researchers to generate their own founders of discursiveness. Externalization, or references to sources or experiences outside the Marxist-Leninist world-system, were only made to draw and preserve intellectual boundaries. In other words, references to bourgeois comparative education were made to distance oneself, contrast the different paradigms, and to help sharpen one's own Marxist-Leninist position. Precisely because comparative education—along with all other bourgeois academic fields—had to be reinvented in order to survive, there was a flurry of academic debate over how to redefine it in terms of Marxism-Leninism.

In the Comparative Education Society of the GDR there was a fascinating intellectual debate on the objectives and methods of comparative research in education. The debates were initiated by Werner Kienitz, professor of comparative education and deputy editor in chief of the journal *Vergleichende*

Pädagogik. An outstanding and devoted researcher with great integrity, Kienitz highlighted, for example, the fundamental difference between a bourgeois research paradigm that purports to be "value-free" and detached from any practical implications, as opposed to a Marxist scientific approach that is transformational, that is, useful for the revolutionary project of establishing a just and equitable society (Kienitz and Mehnert 1966, p. 233). This first essay on the objectives and tasks of a Marxist comparative education was released in 1966 (ibid.). The journal *Vergleichende Pädagogik* published between 1972 and 1975 eleven articles in debate format written by East German scholars as well as authors from the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Over the same period, the controversies over how to redefine "bourgeois" comparative education in terms of Marxism-Leninism led to lively discussions at the annual meetings of the Comparative Education Society in the German Democratic Republic and other socialist countries. The 1975 annual meeting in Leipzig sealed the intriguing discussion with a summary and official statement on the method of comparison. At center stage of the academic debate was the question of whether comparison should be universally applied, given that capitalist school systems are, from the Marxist-Leninist perspective, at a lower stage of development (Kienitz 1972). The debate is documented in *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, and the two exponents of the debate were the editor in chief Hans-Georg Hofmann (against comparison) and the deputy editor in chief Werner Kienitz (for comparison).

Hofmann (1975) argued that comparison should be exclusively applied to "intrasystem" comparison, that is, for comparison with other socialist countries and particularly with the Soviet Union, acknowledged as having attained the highest level on the socialist path of development. The argument was made that developments in capitalist educational systems should be observed and reported, but not compared. The anticomparison position gained ardent support from Ilse Gerth (1973), in charge of international relations at the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the GDR. Subsequently, in line with positions held by the communist party, these opponents of cross-national comparison obtained a stamp of approval by the Comparative Education Society of the GDR. At their annual meeting, held in Leipzig, the debates over the past decade were reiterated and Kienitz's initial suggestion to compare educational systems in both East and West was officially dismissed (Kienitz 1972). Hofmann (1975) summarized the distinctions between bourgeois and socialist comparative education discussed at the past few annual meetings and concluded that Marxist-Leninist comparative education should abstain from comparison *across* political systems.

Starting in 1975, GDR researchers refrained from using the term "comparative education" for intersystem or cross-national comparison, and instead resorted to *Auslandspädagogik* (foreign education). At the same time, they ceased to engage in country-comparison and instead developed one-country studies, that is, extensive documentation of educational systems in capitalist countries with the sole purpose of documenting how far capitalist educational systems lagged behind socialist ones. The method of comparison was applied only to comparable educational systems, that is, to Soviet education and socialist educational systems. In contrast, educational developments in capitalist countries, in West Germany, and in developing countries was amply documented but never compared to education in East Germany.

In the political "West," the phase of critical self-reflection has yet to be initiated in U.S. comparative and international education. In 2006, the U.S. Comparative and Education Society (CIES) and its journal *Comparative Education Review* celebrated their fiftieth anniversaries. What was conspicuously missing from the commemoration was reflection on paradigm shifts in the field of comparative education, in particular on the cold war period in U.S. comparative education. In the discussions on the formative years of the the CIES and the *Comparative Education Review*, the cold war is ignored in historical accounts to the extent that one wonders whether a serious taboo is involved. Could it be that the race of the two superpowers over patronage in developing countries, the patronizing role of international educational development, and the cold war agenda in development studies, are seen as embarrassing details in the history of comparative education, which preferably should be overlooked?

The cold war triggered the development and area studies turn that U.S. comparative education experienced in the 1960s. The development turn has not only had consequences for the selection of target countries of research, averting attention from high-income countries and directing attention to low-income countries, but also huge methodological repercussions. Since the passage of the National Defense National Education Act (1958) and creation of the Title VI Foreign Language and Area Studies fellowships, there are incentives to focus on one country only. Given their kinship with historians, most comparative education researchers have always seen themselves as area specialists, focusing on the history of education in a "foreign country." However, despite their area or context specialty, they did compare. Their analysis was embedded in contextual comparison.

In retrospect, the period of greatest territorial gain in comparative education was also the era of greatest methodological loss: with U.S. political interventions targeting developing countries in the 1950s and 1960s, comparative education gained terrain. The field was no longer restricted to North America and Europe, but now encompassed any country with which the U.S. government either entertained friendly ties or intended to forge a bond. Typically these countries were low-income, developing countries. With attention drawn to developing countries, the project of comparison was suspended; not for its methodological limitations (e.g., difficulty of conducting solid contextual comparison) but, in my opinion, for chauvinist reasons: What is there possibly to learn from countries that are at a lower development stage? What bourgeois education was to Marxist-Leninist comparative education, education in developing countries was to comparative education in the United States: deemed too inferior to be comparable. In an attempt to imitate area specialists or cultural anthropologists, the field of comparative and international education has increasingly and uncritically shifted toward qualitative single-country studies. What some of the graduate programs are producing is unemployed, second-rate cultural anthropologists, with little knowledge of educational theory and comparative education, and even fewer skills for participatory educational policy analysis and planning. One of the main causes of this paradigm shift relates to the economics of academic careers in the United States. It is more efficient and cheaper to conduct research in just one country, and single-country dissertations or research projects are completed faster than field-based comparative studies in two contexts/communities/countries. Furthermore, the qualitative methods used to conduct single-country studies are often naively equated with case-study methodology or ethnography.

The chauvinism involved in single-country studies is also discernible in the choice of target audience. *Qui bono?* Who benefits from single-case studies in comparative and international education? The target audience is typically situated in the First World, even though the object of study is education in the Third World. Rather than publishing their research in the language as well as with publishers of the country in which the comparative education researchers conducted their research, they tend to publish exclusively for themselves, that is, for a First World academic audience.

I started out with an anecdote by remarkable Sovietologist and comparativist George Z.F. Bereday. It appears suitable to end this article with the words of his student and renowned successor at Teachers College, Columbia University. By way of concluding my reflections on the development turn in U.S. and GDR comparative education, I would like to draw on Harold H. Noah's astute observation with regard to the development turn. His observation reflects my own criticism of the narrow focus on development and area studies in U.S. comparative and international education that emerged during the cold war, and endured into the present:

> Obviously, the thirty-five years since 1970 has seen tremendous organizational growth [in U.S. comparative and international education]. Now, I will not speak at all; my lips are sealed on whether there has been qualita-

> tive improvement. There certainly are differences. . . . It is just very different in one way, but very much the same in another way. There are still, as there were before, lots and lots of single-country studies. And the big question always is: is that comparative education? Couldn't these studies just as well have been published in a society of education journal in that country, a political science journal in that country, or in an educational journal in that country? Why is it comparative education? That question still worries me. (Noah 2006, DVD excerpt 00:15:28–00:16:58)

Notes

1. Soviet education was the only area-specific topic at the 1956 meeting. All other topics dealt with theories, methods, or concepts of comparative education (see Brickman 1966; Campisano 1988, p. 35). George Z. Bereday was asked to compare education in the United States with Soviet education (Bereday 1957). The other three topics, scheduled by the co-organizers William Brickman and Gerald Read, were: (1) the theoretical foundations of comparative education, (2) the current importance of the subject as an area of study and research, and (3) an examination of definitions, aims, and values of comparative education and the concept and general principles of comparison. The participants discussed the practical applications of comparative education in the second half of the program.

2. I am grateful to Dr. Bernd John, Bibliothek für bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung (BBF) of the German Institute for International Educational Research in Berlin, Germany, for his advice and guidance on this research project. The BBF library holds all the titles from the former East German Educational Central Library [Pädagogische Zentralbibliothek] and has been an indispensable resource for my research. During my archival research at the BBF in December 2005, Bernd John, former editor of the GDR journal *Vergleichende Pädagogik,* directed me to important sources on GDR comparative education.

3. The "bachelor status" of U.S. comparative educational research, or the "self-referentiality" (Luhmann 1990; Schriewer 1990; see also Steiner-Khamsi 2004) as the primary mode with which policy decisions are made in U.S. educational reform, deserves scrutiny in its own right and will not be discussed further here.

4. More recently, with the release of the poor scores of German students in international student achievement studies (especially PISA) in 2002, this type of comparative research experienced great popularity and helped make the field of comparative education more visible both within academe and the general public.

5. It deserves special mention that the most recent Greenbook (2004) on U.S. overseas loans and grants compiled by USAID blurs the line between military and economic assistance. Expenditures previously listed under military assistance are now listed under economic assistance, accounting for a $1.4 billion shift from military to economic assistance in fiscal year 2003 (USAID 2004, p. v).

6. Mao formulated his Three-World Theory in 1964 (see Westad 2005, p. 162ff.). His world-systems theory placed the United States and the Soviet Union as hegemonic superpowers within the First World. The other industrialized nations that depended economically on the two superpowers constituted the Second World. Finally, China and the poor countries of the South made up a Third World. By means of

revolution against the two superpowers, the countries of the Third World would eventually become the center of international development and power.

7. In 2005, 60 universities were eligible to administer Foreign Language and Area Studies (Title VI) fellowships. The budget for the 2005 fiscal year was $28.2 million and 926 year-long fellowships and 635 summer fellowships were funded. The Title VI international education programs remained the largest source of federal funding in which education is explicitly tied with national and global security. It is followed by the Homeland Security fellowship (created in 2003), which disbursed $15 million, and the National Security Education Program with a budget of $8 million in 2005 (Glenn 2005).

8. The interview with U.S. Senator James McClure (R-ID), the initiator of the NDEA in the Senate, provides very interesting background information on why the launch of Sputnik was seen as an opportunity to request government funding for higher education (McClure 1983).

9. In 1957, the Board of Trustees of Teachers College identified four tasks that would help to mainstream international education among the faculty and students of all degree programs at Teachers College (Butts 1966, p. 3ff.)

10. The strategy of making funds available for faculty members that are willing to mainstream new initiatives is very common in U.S. academe. Apart from the internationalization of U.S. higher education in the 1960s, funds were later made available for multiculturalization (1980s and 1990s), or for a greater integration of technology and distance learning in teaching (the past ten years).

11. The Institute of International Studies received a major grant ($750,000) from the Ford Foundation for the period 1965–70, and a three-year extension (1970–73) with a smaller grant of $90,000 (Butts 1973).

12. In her response to our historical accounts of U.S. comparative and international education (Steiner-Khamsi and deJong-Lambert 2006), Vandra Masemann (2006) disagrees with the assertion that comparative education in North America was, until the 1960s, firmly based in the discipline of history. To substantiate her argument she refers to sociological and anthropological approaches that started before World War I or emerged between the two world wars. It is not apparent, however, how these concurrent developments relate to or have shaped comparative education in the United States. For example, the field of national character studies is not genuinely anthropological, but permeated all behavioral sciences, the humanities and the social sciences including history and comparative education in the early part of the twentieth century. Masemann gives credit to anthropology where no credit is due.

13. In 2002, the U.S. Army reported the "serious shortfalls of translators and interpreters in five of its six critical languages" (Senate of the United States 2006, p. 3): Arabic, Korean, Mandarin Chinese, Persian-Farsi, and Russian. The National Security Language Initiative is supposed to remedy the situation by producing 2,000 "advanced speakers of critical languages" by 2009 who could be employed by the U.S. Army, intelligence and government offices (Liebowitz 2006, p. B29).

14. The GDR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences was established in 1970. Several research units previously hosted in the German Educational Central Institute (Deutsches Pädagogisches Zentralinstitut) were moved into the newly founded Academy of Pedagogical Sciences. Admission of a research unit into the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences was prestigious; it meant the scientific recognition of the discipline or research field. The GDR Academy of Pedagogical Sciences recognized comparative education in 1974 as a legitimate science, and established the Section Comparative Education within the Academy.

15. Busch (1983, p. 135) found in her content analysis of the journal *Vergleichende Pädagogik* that from the 269 articles and reports, published in the period 1965–81, 127 were written on educational developments in socialist countries, 49 dealt with capitalist countries, 66 with the FRG, and 27 with developing countries.

References

Alesina, A., and Dollar, D. "Who Gives Foreign Aid to Whom and Why?" *Journal of Economic Growth*, 2000, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 33–63.

Anweiler, O., ed. *Stand und Perspektiven der erziehungswissenschaftlichen Forschung in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und in der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik.* [Overview and Perspectives of Educational Research in the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic]. Bochum: Arbeitsstelle für vergleichende Bildungsforschung Verlag, 1990.

Association of American Universities. *National Defense Education and Innovation Initiative. Meeting America's Economic and Security Challenges in the 21st Century.* Washington, DC, 2006.

Atkinson, D. "Soviet and East European Studies in the United States." *Slavic Review*, 1988, vol. 47, no. 3 (Autumn), pp. 397–413.

Bereday, G.Z.F. "American and Soviet Scientific Potential." *Social Problems*, 1957, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 208–19.

———. "Is Russia a New Product Threat?" In *George Z.F. Bereday Collection.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1959 (www.pk.tc.columbia .edu), accessed 5 June 2006.

Brainard, J. "Defense Department Hopes to Revive Sputnik-Era Science-Education Program." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2005, vol. 51, no. 36, A18.

Brickman, William W. "Ten Years of the Comparative Education Society." *Comparative Education Review*, 1966, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 4–15.

Busch, A. *Die vergleichende Pädagogik in der DDR* [Comparative Education in the GDR]. Munich: Johannes Berchmans, 1983.

Butts, R.F. *International Studies at Teachers College. Annual Report for the Year Ending June 30, 1966.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1966.

———. *International Studies at Teachers College. Annual Report 1967–1968.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.

———. *International Studies at Teachers College. Annual Report 1972–1973.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1973.

Campisano, C.J. "The Comparative Education Review: Thirty Years of Scholarship." Ed.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University. 1988.

Carnoy, M. "Rethinking the Comparative and International. Presidential Address 2006 of the Comparative and International Education Society." *Comparative Education Review*, 2006, vol. 50, no. 1.

Chorolski, W.S. "Zu einigen methodologischen Aspekten der bürgerlichen vergleichenden Pädagogik" [Methodological Aspects of Bourgeois Comparative Education]. In S. Malkowa, H.-G. Hofmann, and Boris Wulfson, *Die Bildungspolitik kapitalistischer Staaten*, pp. 125–34. Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1986 (original in Russian, published in 1983).

Coombs, P.H. *The World Educational Crisis—A Systems Analysis.* Paris: UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning, 1967.

Gerth, I. "Hat die Vergleichende Pädagogik als Teildisziplin der pädagogischen Wissenschaft eine Berechtigung, oder gibt es nur interdisziplinäre Forschung zur Schulpolitik und Pädagogik im Ausland?" [Should Comparative Education Be Regarded as a Subdiscipline of the Educational Sciences, or Is There Only Interdisciplinary Research on School Politics and Education in Foreign Countries?]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1973, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 286–91.

———. *Zur 18. Generalkonferenz der UNESCO* [The 18th General Assembly Meeting of UNESCO]. Berlin: Akademie der Pädagogischen Wissenschaften der DDR, Arbeitsstelle für Auslandspädagogik, 1975.

———. *Inhaltliche Analyse und Einschätzung des Entwurfs des UNESCO-Dokuments 19 C/4 (Programm der UNESCO 1977–1982) Bereich Bildung, 1976a* [Content Analysis and Evaluation of the UNESCO Document Draft 19 C/4 (Program of UNESCO 1977–1982) Education Sector, 1976a]. Berlin: Bibliothek für bildungsgeschichtliche Forschung, Archiv, APW 15360, AfA, LID/HR—3.339.

———. "Dreissig Jahre UNESCO" [Thirty Years of UNESCO]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1976b, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 353–62.

Glenn, D. "Cloak and Classroom. Many Social Scientists Say a New Government Program Will Turn Fieldwork Abroad into Spying. Can Secrecy Coexist with Academic Openness?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2005, vol. 51, no. 29, p. A14.

Hofmann, H.-G. "Schlusswort der Leipziger Tagung" [Concluding Remarks of the Meeting in Leipzig]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1975, vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 411–31.

———. "Tendenzen der internationalen Bildungsentwicklung" [Tendencies in International Educational Development]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1989, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 365–71.

John, B. *Ideologie und Pädagogik: Zur Geschichte der Vergleichenden Pädagogik in der DDR* [Ideology and Education: The History of Comparative Education in the GDR]. Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1998.

Jones, P.W. *International Politics for Third World Education: UNESCO, Literacy and Development.* New York: Routledge, 1988.

Jones, P.W., with Coleman, D. *The United Nations and Education. Multilateralism, Development and Globalization.* London/New York: Routledge Falmer, 2005.

Kienitz, W. "Die Entwicklung von Vereinigungen der Komparatisten im Ausland" [The Development of Associations of Comparativists Abroad]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1967, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 103–4.

———. "Einige theoretische Fragen der Entwicklung der Vergleichenden Pädagogik als Wissenschaftsdisziplin (Ein Diskussionsbeitrag)" [A Few Theoretical Questions Regarding the Development of Comparative Education as an Academic Discipline]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1972, vol. 8, no. 4, pp. 368–90.

———. "Existenzprobleme, Merkmale, Leistungen und Fehlleistungen einer vergleichenden Pädagogik in der DDR—ein ziemlich persönlicher Zwischenreport" [Existential Problems, Characteristics, Accomplishments, and Mistakes of a GDR Comparative Education—A Rather Personal Interim Report]. In E. Cloer and R. Wernstedt, ed., *Pädagogik der DDR. Eröffnung einer notwendingen Bilanzierung*, pp. 170–89. Weinheim: Deutscher Studienverlag 1994.

Kienitz, W., and Mehnert, W. "Über Gegenstand und Aufgaben der marxistischen Vergleichenden Pädagogik" [Objective and Tasks of Marxist Comparative Education]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik,* 1966, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 227–44.
Liebowitz, R.D. "What America Must Do to Achieve Competence." *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 2006, vol. 52, no. 29, p. B29.
Luhmann, N. *Essays on Self-Reference.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.
Malkowa, S.A. "Über die Aufgaben der Abteilung Auslandspädagogik in der Akademie der Pädagogischen Wissenschaften der UdSSR" [The Tasks of the Department of Foreign Education in the Academy of Pedagogical Sciences of the U.S.S.R.]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1970, vol. 6., no. 2, pp. 137–40.
Masemann, V.L. "Afterword." *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 2006, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 104–11.
McClure, J.A. *The National Defense Education Act, Interview 4, Friday, 28 January 1983.* Senate Historical Office Oral History Project (www.senate.gov/history), accessed 25 June 2006.
Meese, I. *Allgemeinbildende Schule der USA und Japans in der Reform* [General Education in U.S.A. and Japan Undergoing Reform]. Berlin: Akademie der Pädagogischen Wissenschaften der DDR, Arbeitsstelle für Auslandspädagogik, 1989.
Multilateraler Expertenrat. *Auseindersetzung zu Grundfragen der bürgerlichen Schule und Pädagogik. Bilanz der Forschungen des multilateralen Expertenrates "Kampf gegen die bürgerliche Ideologie in Schulpolitik und Pädagogik kapitalistischer Länder" von 1974–1983 zur Unterstützung der Lehreraus- und weiterbildung* [Reflections on Fundamental Issues of Bourgeois School and Education. Research Findings 1974–1983 of the Multilateral Expert Council "The Struggle Against Bourgeois Ideology in School Politics and Education of Capitalist Countries" to Strengthen Teacher Pre-Service and In-Service]. Berlin: Akademie der Pädagogischen Wissenschaften der DDR, Arbeitsstelle für Auslandspädagogik, 1984.
Mundy, K. "Educational Mulilateralism in a Changing World Order: UNESCO and the Limits of the Possible." *International Journal of Educational Development*, 1999, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 27–52.
National Commission on Excellence in Education. *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform.* Washington, DC, 1983.
NDEA (National Defense Education Act). *Public Law 85-864 85th Congress, H.R. 13247, 2 September 1958.* Washington, DC: Congress of the United States, 1958.
Noah, H.J. Videorecorded interview. In G. Steiner-Khamsi and E.M. Johnson, producers, *Comparatively Speaking: The First 50 Years of the Comparative and International Education Society.* New York: Teachers College, Columbia University and CIES, 2006.
Noah, H.J., and Eckstein, M.A. *Toward a Science of Comparative Education.* New York: Macmillan, 1969.
Office of Education. *Report on the National Defense Education Act. Fiscal Year 1963.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, 1963.
Schriewer, J. "The Method of Comparison and the Need for Externalization: Methodological Criteria and Sociological Concepts." In J. Schriewer, ed., in cooperation with B. Holmes, *Theories and Methods in Comparative Education,* pp. 3–52. Bern: Lang, 1990.

Schriewer, J.; Henze, J.; Wichmann, J.; Knost, P.; Barucha, S.; and Taubert, J. "Konstruktion von Internationalität: Referenzhorizonte pädagogischen Wissens im Wander gesellschaftlicher Systeme (Spanien, Sowjetunion/Russland, China" [The Construction of Internationality: Reference Horizons of Educational Knowledge and Social Change (Spain, the Soviet Union, Russia, and China)]. In H. Kaelble and J. Schriewer, ed., *Gesellschaften im Vergleich. Forschungen aus Sozial- und Geisteswissenschaften*, pp. 151–258. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 1998.

Senate of the United States. *New National Defense Education Act of 2006.* Session of the Senate of the United States, 13 June 2006 (www.govtrack.us/congress), accessed 2 July 2006.

Sokolowa, M. "Die Forschungsvorhaben des Staatlichen Pädagogischen Instituts W.I. Lenin zur Vergleichenden Pädagogik und ihre Thematik" [The Research Projects of the State Pedagogical Institute V.I. Lenin in Comparative Education and Related Topics]. *Vergleichende Pädagogik*, 1966*,* vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 247–57.

Steiner-Khamsi, G. "Blazing a Trail for Policy Theory and Practice" In G. Steiner-Khamsi, ed., *The Global Politics of Educational Borrowing and Lending*, pp. 201–20. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., and deJong-Lambert, W. "The International Race over the Patronage of the South: Comparative and International Education in Eastern Europe and the United States." *Current Issues in Comparative Education*, 2006, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 84–94.

Steiner-Khamsi, G., and Stolpe, I. *Educational Import. Local Encounters with Global Forces in Mongolia.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006.

Széchy, E. "Bürgerliche Konzeptionen der permanenten Bildung" [Bourgeois Conceptions of Permanent Education]. In S. Malkowa, H.-G. Hofmann, and Boris Wulfson, *Die Bildungspolitik kapitalistischer Staaten.* Berlin: Volk und Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1986, pp. 94–106 (original in Russian, published in 1983).

USAID. *U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants and Assistance from International Organization. Obligations and Loan Authorizations July 1, 1945–September 30, 2001.* Silver Spring, MD: USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse, 2001.

———. *U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants. Obligations and Loan Authorizations July 1, 1945–September 30, 2004.* Silver Spring, MD: USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse, 2004.

Vavilov, A.; Matveyev, I.; and Oleandrov, V. *The Soviet View of the United Nations.* Moscow: Novosti Press Agency, 1974.

Westad, O.A. *The Global Cold War. Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Wiloch, T.J., and Atzmon, E. "The Development of Comparative Education in the Soviet Union." *Comparative Education Review*, 1976, vol. 20, no. 1 (February), pp. 94–100.