Imagining Comparative Education: Past, Present, Future.

This study is shaped by several concerns: the desire to address the future of comparative education, and the desire to argue that the future as well as the past may be understood better if viewed through a lens of hermeneutical imagination, with its power to enter into and bear witness to "exemplary" narratives of the past and present. The study stimulates the narrative imagination with its power of disclosure and seeks to suggest how a radical hermeneutic of imagination may help reanimate what is valuable. To develop the argument, the study is organized around the following questions: (1) How have comparative educators, and related scholars, used their creative imaginations to construct new knowledge and understandings about ways of representing changing educational phenomena and relations? (2) What genres and forms of representation have been appointed or elaborated, and how have these choices influenced ways of seeing and thinking? and (3) Can this self-reflexive history of imagination in practice be patterned as an intertextual field of difference, as a comparative cultural map that may help to open new vistas into the past and the future? The narrative is organized using an outline borrowed from Michel Foucault. (Includes 4 tables, 2 figures, 11 notes, and 83 references.) (BT)
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Comparative research begins, in my view, with a destabilization of self-with a felt need for encounters with difference that invite one to imagine alternatives. While we would not want to abandon the efforts to generate theories and concepts that transcend cultures, we also want theories that address real human experiences. Culture nearly always entails encounter with the unexpected... To imagine culture, then, and at the same time to *culture* the imagination, is the task of comparative education in the next century (Diane M. Hoffman). [2]

I still hope that there is room in the field for those scholars whose work is driven by intellectual curiosity and playfulness, because as in the natural sciences, the serendipitous outcomes of such endeavors may have substantial long-term policy implications (Philip J. Foster). [3]

Imagination is more important than knowledge. To raise new questions, new possibilities, to regard old problems from a new angle, requires creative imagination and marks real advance in science (Albert Einstein). [4]

**Introduction**

Several concerns shape this contribution to the special issue. Foremost is my desire to respond to Editor Stromquist's request that I address "the future of comparative education." But, as a historian, this charge gives me pause, for where are the data? Also important is my desire to argue that our future as well as our past may be understood better if viewed through a lens of hermeneutical imagination with its power to enter into and bear witness to 'exemplary' narratives of the past and present. The notion of hermeneutics is used here to denote the study of understanding, of interpretation, and of how meaning can be borne out of existential uncertainty.

To develop this argument, I have organized the study around three questions, i.e.

- How have comparative educators, and related scholars, used their creative imaginations to construct new knowledge and understandings about ways of representing changing educational phenomena and relations?
- What genres and forms of representation have been appropriated or elaborated and how have these choices influenced ways of seeing and thinking?
- Can this self-reflexive history of imagination in practice be patterned as an intertextual field of difference, as a comparative cultural map that may help to open new vistas into the past and the future?

I should, perhaps, also share a third concern. This is my desire to move beyond the sterile polarities of modernist rule-making and poststructuralist nihilism in knowledge work. While there is certainly space for both rules and irony in comparative studies, in this paper I should like to privilege the narrative imagination with its power of disclosure which I believe marks our basic ethical ability to imagine oneself as another. Here I join the authors of the three opening quotes to argue for a re-empowered imagination to help us move beyond our present aporia of the deflated sovereign subject. More specifically, I seek to suggest how a radical hermenenetic of imagination may help us reanimate what is valuable, if nascent, in modernity by reinscribing its betrayed promises. Kearny (1998:224) puts this argument well:

> Not to wager on the historically motivated utopias [of modernity] is to condemn imagination to the circles of mirror-play... incapable of discerning differences and making judgements. The challenge of the post-modern imaginary is to chart a course between the idolatry of the new and the tyranny of the same.

By opening some kind of a horizon—albeit disputatious—for our diverse actions we gain greater power to imagine things existing otherwise. The horizons of social imagination, as we shall see, are tentative, provisional and also fragile. But they are open to all and, perhaps, provide comparative educators with our best hope for something better. Or as Paul Ricouer claims in his useful historical analysis of the social imaginary as literary text, "... without imagination, no action" (Gerhart, 1979).
Where the pre-moderns tended to see the image as a mirror, and the moderns as a lamp, the post modern model of the image is akin to a circle of mirrors where each viewpoint reproduces the surface images of all the others in a play of infinite multiplication. Recent attempts to break out of this so-called postmodern mirror play of simulacra, i.e., reproductions without originals, propose a hermeneutic of imagination that relocates the crisis of creativity in a world refigured or prefigured by our imaginings. This does not mean that the imaginary must return to a foundational ontology of being or a realist epistemology of knowing, or to grand ideological utopias, which would yearn to anchor our images in their arrogant categories. Rather, a radical hermeneutics of imagination seeks to re-establish the link between text and history, to recognize the possibility of an intermediary course between the extremes of humanism—where imagination, as in Blake (1794) rules supreme—and postmodernism where imagination, as in Lyotard (1992) floats as just another signifier in a giddy play of signs. Today, as we look ahead to the new century, I believe we require more than ever the power of imagining to recast other ways of being in the world, other possibilities of existence and to wager once again that imagination lives on. Perhaps the best response to the postmodern news that 'imagination est morte' is "Vive l' imagination!" (Kearny, 1998). This is also my thesis, and the tocsin of hermeneutic thinkers who hold that imagining is a mode of being-in-world which makes and remakes our Lebenswelt—or life world—by disclosing new possibilities for self-understanding and interaction over time (Reed-Danahay, 1997).

Early Varieties of Imagination

Beginning with the earliest Western texts, imagination has been portrayed in terms of good and evil. Biblical commentary identifies imagination, as in the Adam and Eve story, with the human potential to convert the given confines of the here and now into a more open horizon of possibilities.

Buber (1952), for example, sees a dualistic tendency in how the biblical tradition of commentary and the early Greeks viewed image making:

Imagination is seen as good and evil, for in it man can master the vortex of possibilities and realize the human figure proposed in creation, as he could not do prior to the knowledge of good and evil. It offers the greatest danger and greatest opportunity at once. To unite the two urges of the imagination implies to unite the absolute potency of passion with the one direction that renders it capable of great love and great service. Thus and not otherwise can man become whole."

Plato and Aristotle recognized imagination, i.e. the making of images, as a uniquely human attribute, but warned that humans can only mirror truths of the omniscient gods. Imagination may under the strict supervision of reason and revelation be used to instruct the faithful, but nearly all early and pre-modern texts share a deep suspicion that imagination threatened a natural order of being. Thomas Aquinas puts it well in his caution that imagination has the potential to make everything "other than it is."

While I include the early historians Herodotus (B.C.E. 550) and Ibn Khaldun (1378) as exemplary practitioners of narrative imagination and cultural comparisons, it is not until the 16th century and the age of humanism that imagination came to be seen as a powerful human attribute, as a lamp projecting light from a single source of creativity—the human soul (Bowra, 1961).

But before our examination of earlier and current imaginative practitioners and their texts, it may be helpful to organize my narrative using an outline borrowed from Michel Foucault (1966). Foucault sought to identify in texts the major epistemic episodes, or discursive modes, of Western European thinking. His textual comparison will serve my purpose of organization via visual display equally well. It should be noted, however, that neither of us seek to construct a matrix or table where reality is boxed according to some timelessness and universality of determination—i.e. as in a modern discourse of the Enlightenment. Rather, I offer my interpretation in Table 1 below as a heuristic where reality is seen to take a linguistic turn; i.e., to take on aspects of the linguistic mode in which it is presented to consciousness (White, 1987), and where the texts selected are read as modes of representation prevailing at a given time and place (Foucault, 1970).

(Table 1 about here)

The Renaissance Imaginary

I have chosen two 'exemplars' of the Renaissance imaginary, i.e. selected historical texts of Erasmus Reterodamus (1467-1536) and of Jan Amos Comenius (1592-1670). Both men can be seen as early practitioners of international education in a European context. The Dutch humanist and peace advocate Erasmus imagined a liberal, classical education to replace the rote learning of medieval scholasticism. His new Latin school was 'liberal' in that it was based on free will, which even children were seen to possess, and belief that the tutor had the wisdom and skill to use persuasion and gentleness, not the imposition of precepts.
Table 1. My visualization of Michel Foucault's poststructuralist comparison of how the imbricated "epistemes"—i.e., the rules, or codes, of European "scientific discourse"—have changed over time. I have taken the liberty to add a fourth epistemic episode, i.e., the 'Postmodern,' that was, perhaps, only incipient at the time of his study. Source: Adapted from M. Foucault (1966) Les Mots et les choses [Words and Things], (Paris, Gallimard).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imaginary Era</th>
<th>Episteme</th>
<th>Focus On</th>
<th>Favored Representation</th>
<th>Comparative Education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance</td>
<td>Humanism: unity</td>
<td>Man, resemblance</td>
<td>Translations and pictures, the Analogical</td>
<td>Erasmus (1512), Comenius (1628)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Rationalism: order</td>
<td>Natural history, nomenclature</td>
<td>Statistics and grids, the taxonomic</td>
<td>Berchtold (1789), Condorcet (1792), Basset (1808), Juillien (1817)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Realism: progress</td>
<td>Time, differentiation, disciplines</td>
<td>Nomothetic explanations and Scientific models, the mimetic</td>
<td>Durkheim (1894), Dewey (1929), Holmes (1958), Husén (1967), Bowman (1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
His methods and pedagogical aims were shaped by the literary imagination, i.e. training in literary invention, the of a personal style by studying different classical writers (i.e. Plato or Cicero et al), and the adoption of a critical all literary texts (Margolin, 1993). Erasmus achieved great success with his international project. His translations
critical works spread throughout Latin—reading Europe via the annual trade fairs. He remained a Catholic priest and humanize the Roman church. He eventually broke with his friend Martin Luther, who without humor called him an or ‘roving rat’ for spreading his powerful ideas that a liberal and humane education offered man’s best hope for operation, and possible salvation. Luther counter argued that humans are slaves of sin, and only God’s grace—and n— can deliver them from their fundamental misery (Margolin, 1993).

Comenius, a bishop of the Protestant Czech Moravian Brotherhood presents a second towering example of the imaginary. Working “on the run” during the turmoil of the 30-Years War, Comenius' metaphysics drew heavily on scholasticism inspired by Aristotle. Yet in espousing Francis Bacon's (1561-1626) inductive 'science,’ he also d to the emerging rationalism of the 17th century. Comenius was the first to conceive of a full-scale science of which he saw as the means to achieve his even more ambitious philosophical project of a universal Pansophism. This al and imaginative philosophy sought “to teach all things to all men” and is detailed in his The Great Didactic (agna, 1628) first published in Leszo, Poland where he taught as a refugee pedagogue. Something of the scope and imagination is indicated in the foreword to this astonishing work: “We venture to promise a Great Didactic . . . the teaching all things to all men, and indeed of teaching them with certainty, so that the result cannot fail to follow. ish to prove all this a priori, that is to say, from the unalterable nature of the matter itself . . . that we may lay the of the universal art of founding universal schools'.[5]

ile his attempt to create a unique synthesis of nature and man through education had little if any institutional impact, deas promulgating international education, world peace, and the pedagogical utility of images (he produced the first textbook completely composed of pictures in his Orbis Pictus [1658]) have made a powerful and lasting impression. in Union along with The World Court, UNESCO, IIEP, the IBE et al all embraced, at one time or another, his id scientific imaginary as their true forerunner (Rossello, 1943; Piaget, 1993). Today even the postmodernists would, kindly on (and then deconstruct) his pansophic principle that “everything . . . from all points of view, must be put othing is to be left out.”

he argued would mean that
the slower and the weaker the disposition of any man, the more he needs assistance. Nor can any man be id whose intellect is so weak that it cannot be improved by culture.[6]

rd to his fair and farseeing view on the education of girls:

any good reason be given why the weaker sex should be excluded altogether from the pursuit of wledge. . . . They are endowed with equal sharpness of mind and capacity for knowledge. . . . Why efore, should we admit them to the alphabet, and afterwards drive them away from books?[7]

Imaginary
exemplars of the Classical imaginary with its idea fix of reducing moral, political and educational questions to mathematics—or a Mathesis Universalis—we move from Holland and Moravia to France. Leading this highly project, The Marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794) attempted to promulgate one rational law to govern a republican other to create a secular national educational system. His scheme sought to abolish the traditional geographical France in favor of a geometrical grid. Today he would most likely be enchanted with GIS, or geographical stems (Mendelsohn, 1996).[8] While Condorcet’s classical imagination may have found form in foundational grids : concern to use reason and logic to design one educational system seemingly without dogma for children of different i:s, cultures, and futures so as to produce at least the minimum of universal feeling and knowledge needed to secure the state is no less alive and pressing today. In his “First Memoir on Public Instruction” (1790) Condorcet warned he saw as a new evangelistic trend where the cult of the Nation, Nature and the Liberty Tree had begun to replace science and personal responsibility. He pointed out that schools, now secular, had new high priests in disguise, a rk against the revolutionary political class. Robespierre, the principle target. never forgave him.

re Condorcet’s classical imagination brought rationalism and the grid to national educational planning, it was the educators Count Leopold Berchtold, César Basset and Marc-Antoine Jullien who first sought to apply statistical support of practical educational policy recommendations (Fraser, 1964). Jullien also looked to related fields
Table 2. A comparison of genres of imagination and forms of representational practice constructing comparative and international education discourse over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of creative imagination</th>
<th>Textual products</th>
<th>Illustrative texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
be ideological and dialectical, not positivistic and empirical—even if it shared the Enlightenment belief in the accessible truth of a real world.

The Marxist imaginary in practice saw class struggle as the means to overthrow bourgeois democracy and replace it with socialist society. Accordingly, as a critique of the status quo it largely remained—and remains—outside of institutions controlled by the bourgeois class. Today, the Marxist imaginary continues bowed if not broken in its earlier forms of dialectical materialism, and more widely in analytical, critical, and even ‘anti-essentialist’ feminist variations (Delanty, 1999; Gibson-Graham, 1996).

A serious problem with these ‘schools’ is seen by Terrel Carver to be their claim to reflect the truth of the real Marx. Trapped in assumptions of normative universalism, they largely fail to see themselves as narrators-in-a-context. In denying their own plurality, they deny the possibility of a pluralist Marxist story needed because the problems of exploitation are plural (Carver, 1998). In seeking to make Marxist critique more reflexive, or self-knowledgeable, Carver’s imaginative reading of Marx’s thesis Capital reformulates ideology as a protocol of interpretation. He claims that the hermeneutics of Gadamer and Ricoeur, Derridean deconstruction, and the Cambridge ‘contextualists’ have all profoundly altered the way that reading a text is conceived, and that interpretive work on Marx today needs to catch up with and not simply reject the postmodern intellectual age. Using techniques of textual and narrative analysis on Marx’s writings, he even finds a mild form of postmoderism in Marx’s extensive use of metaphor, in his imagery, concepts, and stories. In sum, he finds multiple Marxs with continuing utility to question problems of possessive individualism (Torres, 1998), Disneyism and global capitalism (Castoriadis, 1997), and how we might confront and critique all manner of exploitation, including socialist exploitation (Outhwaite, 1983).

The long sequence of social and educational texts over the Classical and Modern eras exhorting the creation of a ‘science of education’ and ‘a scientific comparative education’ would seem to have culminated in 1969. In that year Noah and Eckstein published their argument that: ‘...systematic, empirical testing appears to offer the best hope for the progress of comparative education...’ (1969). Yet, curiously, their text offers little if any serious scientific proof to support their plea for a scientific choice. They fail to test their own hypothesis. Instead, the reader finds a profusion of whimsical quotes from Alice In Wonderland, and a somewhat puzzling conclusion that ‘hidden factors’ will always threaten to make their hypothesis testing method problematic, and at best only a useful ‘heuristic’ (p. 180). Today, aside from occasional exhortations for more ‘hard data’ or a ‘correct critical analysis,’ scientific calls for a positive or dialectical social science of education and society seem to have run their course (Beck, 1993) and, as claimed in Table 3 below, there has even been a shift towards more reflexive and heterogeneous methods opening to multiplicity and indeterminacy in the natural sciences as well.

(Table 3 about here)

Imaging Comparative Education Today

In Table 4 below, I have summarized how some sixty ‘exemplary’ texts in comparative education since the 1950s represent different aspects of knowledge, i.e., knowledge control and organization, knowledge relations with different ways of seeing and notions of ‘being’ (i.e., ontology), and the like. Note how Table 4 rather closely tracks the major shift in scientific knowledge production from the ‘Newtonian’ mode to the ‘postpositivistic’ mode described in Table 3 above (Gibbons, 1994).

(Table 4 about here)

Table 4 presents a diachronic view over the past half century, or so, where I conclude that the tropes and metaphors most commonly found in the discourse of our field can be seen to create three eras or textual episodes, i.e., that of ‘orthodoxy,’ ‘heterodoxy,’ and ‘heterogeneity.’ Today the tropes of difference, multiplicity, space, community, and risk, are ever more evident and influential. These figures of speech are most often present in the post modern imaginaries (Delanty, 1997). While I may see them as shaping a new cultural code, or ‘episteme’ in Foucault’s terms, others may find refuge in the continuation of many, if not all, earlier knowledge communities with their codes of shared meaning. Here, clearly, where you choose to stand will play a large part in what you see to be the past, present, and future of our field (White, 1987). But today, the choice is ours to make and situate (Stafford, 1996).

In Figure 1 below, I contrast a synchronic view of our field across present time with Table 4 and its sequence of historical eras. Figure 1 maps my reading of the positions of major knowledge communities—or standpoints—in the ‘debate’ on postmodernism. All points of view in this debate, including the mapper’s, are identified in the discourse and located in the intertextual field. In this way, it is possible to construct a new more open and heterotopic representation of knowledge work in our field capable of offering equal space to all verbal and visual texts constructing a debate (Erkkila, 2000).
Table 3. A postpositivist juxtaposition of the sites of opposition between the Newtonian model of classical science (Mode 1) and "the new mode of knowledge production" (Mode 2). Source: M. Gibbons et al. (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge*, p. 21 (London: Sage).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mode 1</th>
<th>Mode 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic interests</td>
<td></td>
<td>20  Context of application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciplinary context</td>
<td></td>
<td>30  Transdisciplinary context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homogeneity of sites and practitioners</td>
<td></td>
<td>40  Heterogeneity of sites and practitioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hierarchical and institutionalized organization</td>
<td>• Egalitarian and transient organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative autonomy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technicity</td>
<td>• Reflexivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Peer review</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Various considerations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Control and Organization:</td>
<td>Orthodoxy; hierarchical and centralized</td>
<td>Heterodoxy: Emergence of &quot;neo-&quot; variants and new inquiry perspectives</td>
<td>Heterogeneity: Disputatious yet webbed knowledge communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Relations:</td>
<td>Hegemonic and totalizing</td>
<td>Paradigm clash—i.e., &quot;either/or&quot; competition of incommensurable world views</td>
<td>Pluralistic post-paradigmatic—i.e., rhizomatic and interactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Ontology:</td>
<td>Realist views of being predominate</td>
<td>Realist and relativist views contest reality</td>
<td>Perspectivist views encompass multiple realities and situated truths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Framing:</td>
<td>Functionalism and positivism dominant</td>
<td>Functionalist, critical and interpretivist worldviews compete and decenter</td>
<td>More eclectic, reflexive and pragmatic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Style:</td>
<td>Parsimonious and value-free</td>
<td>Agonistic and partisan</td>
<td>Increasingly intertextual, rhetorical and contingent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Gender:</td>
<td>Maleness: Logic dominant</td>
<td>Feminist ideas emerge, compete, decenter</td>
<td>Gender issues more open and indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge/Emotions:</td>
<td>Optimism and confidence</td>
<td>Distain, incredulity, and exhilaration</td>
<td>Ambivalence—i.e., nostalgia for certainty; delight in diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Products:</td>
<td>Law-like crossnational statements the ideal</td>
<td>Competing ideologies</td>
<td>Explanation, interpretation, simulation, translation and mapping.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
representations of modernity, in contrast, seek an orthodoxy of vision where difference is made into the Same, or when this is not
possible, the other is made invisible. Simply put, the postmodern imaginary is now working at full tilt to make visible what which
modernity made invisible—i.e., differences of race, class, gender, ideas, dreams. In this work, the postmodern imaginary seeks
to encompass a panorama of the whole, and to zoom back in order to take up any viewpoint within it. This imagination, as seen
in Figures 1 and 2, spatializes its patterns and visualizes its concepts, so it can guide and inform thought in the imaginative modes
of free spontaneity, material possibility, panoramic perspective and figurative visibility. Here the power of imagination is linked
with the power of images to provide an immediate and unresolvably ambiguous intuition of simultaneous significance that is
anathema to modernity’s insistence on linear certainty and univocity (Jay, 1993)

(Figure 1 about here)

Imaging A Future Comparative Education

How then, looking both back and ahead, are we to imagine a future comparative education? True Believers, be they
realists or relativists, will project an orthodoxy, rather a perceived orthodoxy or metanarrative, to the end of time. As a pluralist,
my view ahead sees the possibility of multiple futures limited only by our ability to imagine and craft new worlds. Certainly, the
rules for world-making have never been more open—or dangerous (Lemert, 1995). Where modern thought has been largely
shaped by notions of progress and scientific rationality, Anderson (1990) argues that powerful new ideas are at this moment
permeating our consciousness, and our work:

Changes in thinking about thinking: explanations of reality are increasingly understood as human constructions.
The ability to reflexively ‘step out of—or into’ different reality constructs or ways of seeing while remaining
a whole person will, as in Figure 1, facilitate future comparison.

Changes in identity and boundaries have been quickened by technological change—i.e., the emergence of
cyberspace and virtual reality, and by emergent global civilization with its pressing concerns for human rights
and resistance to global deterioration. Comparative educators will also need to situate their knowledge work
in heterotopias of difference (i.e., as ‘translators’ and ‘facilitators’), as well as in their favored communities
of shared culture and dreams, as both colleagues and advocates.

Changes in how we represent our separate ‘truths’ will require us to be less parochial and more self-
knowledgeable in representing contested realities. As knowledge becomes ubiquitous and perhaps, degraded,
craft skills in visualizing and mapping oceans of conflicting data (as in Figures 1 and 2 below) will become
more demanding and rewarding (Böhme, 1997).

(Figure 2 about here)

Clearly, new opportunities and dangers for representing reality in the field of comparative education have emerged with
the recent withering away of the modern imaginary and its grand stories of progress and Utopia (Antonio, 1998). Today,
heterogeneity and a spatialized ontology in all spheres of human activity open new opportunities for border crossing and comparison
that, as in Figure 1, accept and attempt to pattern the space of difference in its own terms—i.e., as an open exchange
or debate and conflicting perspectives (Paulston, 1996). This challenge will require that comparative educators go to work and
master the ideas and craft required by both the linguistic, the spatial, and the pictorial turns, the three emerging cultural forms of
our postmodern time, forms that enable and shape Figures 1 and 2. These representations of the rhetorical, spatial and pictorial
imaginations have too long been neglected in our discourse. They will also, I believe, serve well as useful guides to knowledge
work and representation in the next century as cultural forms part company with ascriptive positions to make possible greater
cultural options for comparative educators, more possibilities for nonlinear meaning-creation and anti-hegemonic critique
(Delanty, 1999).

In sum, future efforts to represent and compare socio-educational phenomena will require a deepening of self-
understanding that may leave many behind. The belief that epistemological research genres, such as the scientific text, have “real”
objects and events, which provide a warrant for the knowledge-value of such ‘scientific’ texts is today highly problematic. What
is increasingly recognized is that claims to absolute knowledge cannot be proven and that attempts to achieve hard data and
objectivity result in dilemmas of exclusion, circularity and infinite regress of social facts ‘explained’ by prior social facts. A
hermeneutical approach helps us realize that objects and events are inseparable from the process of apprehension (i.e., the
imaginative process) within which they are formed. So if we are to fruitfully analyze and compare how things in the world take
on meanings, it will be necessary to understand better the imaginative enactments that produce meanings. As I have attempted
to illustrate, imaginative work is not simply an act of disembodied consciousness, but rather consists of historically developed
practices that reside in the very styles and forms in which statements are made. It is now time for comparative educators (perhaps using Figures 1 and 2) to question how our choice of ideas and forms of representation influence our views of how reality is constituted, how meaning and value are created and imposed on an otherwise unruly world (Shapiro, 1988).
Figure 1. A web-like metaphorical mapping of knowledge positions and communities constructing the postmodernity debate in comparative education (and related) discourse. In this visualization of an open intertextual field, arrows suggest intellectual flows, and proper names refer not to authors, but to illustrative texts cited in the paper and juxtaposed above. In contrast to utopias (i.e., sites with no real place) much favored in modernist texts, this figure draws inspiration from Michel Foucault's notion of “heterotopias” (Foucault, 1986: 25). These are portrayed as the simultaneously mythic and real spaces of contested everyday life. Postmodernist texts favor heterotopias, as above, because they are “capable of juxtaposing in a single real place several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible.” Is the future of comparative education to be seen in the notion of heterotopia, or utopia, or perhaps in both, or neither? Source: R. G. Paulston (1999: 445).
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Figure 2. An intertextual mapping of the eight representational genres/forms presented in Table 2. On the far right side of this nonlinear tool I pattern the Apollonian forms of modernist rationality (as Nietzsche said, "... hardened into Egyptian rigidity").

On the far left side, we find what Foucault and I favor, i.e., a Dionysiac "revel of forms." Using the two axes of comparison, the eight genres may be seen to constitute a spatial patterning of the different forms of textual representation constructing our field, or space of imagination, over time. Plato (1977) used the idea of 'chora' as the fertile space of emergent forms in his *Timaeus*. Antessentialist feminists (Gibson-Graham, 1996) have appropriated the notion of 'chora' to explain how knowledge work has until recently been dominated by 'male forms' (i.e., the right sides of Figures 1 and 2). They seek to reclaim all 'fertile space' as feminine (Grosz, 1995). My visualization or mapping in Figure 2 of chora avoids such either-or, gender binaries, and sees all representational forms available as practical choices. This spatialized ontology recasts comparative work as an effort to verbalize and visualize a plurality of forms and perspectives, an effort able to disengage itself from and to question its own imaginative creations (Robinson and Rundell, 1994).
NOTES

[1] I thank professors Maureen McClure and Noreen Garman, and Gregory H. Turner, Department of Administrative and Policy Studies at the University of Pittsburgh, for their contributions of ideas and textual materials.


[8] In this line, Condorcet’s most famous publications are his Essay on the Application of Mathematics to the Theory of Decision—Making (1785) and A General View of Social Mathematics (1793). Condorcet’s plan of 1792 for a universal comprehensive and secular educational system composed of five instructional levels (i.e. “elementary,” “secondary,” “the institute,” “the Lycée,” and the “National Society of Science and the Arts”) was rejected by the National Assembly as unadventurous and overly liberal. He died in prison under mysterious circumstances on March 28, 1794.


[10] The privileging of positivism as the way to truth by William Thompson, Lord Kelvin (1824-1907) is a case in point: “When you cannot measure it, when you cannot express it in numbers, your knowledge is of a meager and unsatisfactory kind.” Quoted in B. Mazlish (1998), The Uncertain Sciences (New Haven: Yale University Press), p. 238.

[11] Both figures may also serve to illustrate the postmodern notion of performativity, where verbal or visual discourse is called to enact what it describes, i.e., a subtle and complex refining of positions. Figures 1 and 2, for example, are not merely constative or argumentative, but seek to exemplify the textual forms and features they are discussing. See C. Howells (1999) Derrida: Deconstruction from Phenomenology to Ethics (Cambridge: Polity Press), pp. 70-71.
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