

Chapter 9, pp. 94-115, reprinted with permission in slightly modified form, from *Common Interests, Uncommon Goals: Histories of the World Council of Comparative Education Societies*, eds. Vandra Masemann, Mark Bray, & Maria Manzon. Comparative Education Research Center, 2007.

The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES)

Elizabeth SHERMAN SWING

The Comparative and International Education Society (CIES), formerly the Comparative Education Society (CES), celebrated its 50th anniversary in 2006. From its inception it has viewed itself as international. This chapter, which is based on material in the CIES Collection in the Kent State University Archives, begins with a prehistory: the conferences at New York University that led to the formation in 1956 of the CES. It then reviews institutional directions in the early years of the Society – study tours, the first Constitution, and the launching of the *Comparative Education Review*. Next, it examines organisation building from 1960 to 1975 – leadership and finances, constitutional reform, the name change, and the issue of meeting separately as a society. It then focuses on growth and consolidation in the years 1975 to 1990 – years when the CIES sought relationships with other societies on its own terms, established archives, created the Honorary Fellows designation, set up the Eggertsen Lectures, years also of explicit skirmishes over ways of knowing. The chapter closes with an examination of the period 1990 to 2006 – a contested election, fiscal and tax matters, systemic change in a new Constitution, expansion of the committee structure, and political and ideological concerns.

Prehistory, 1954-1956

The New York University Conferences

The CIES evolved from annual conferences on comparative education first organised by William W. Brickman at New York University in 1954. Brickman's conferences reflected the spirit of the times. The post-World War II era – as Brickman later pointed out (1966) – was an era of proliferating international educational institutions, including UNESCO, the Centre for Comparative Education at the University of Ottawa (Canada), and the Research Institute of Comparative Education and Culture, University of Kyushu (Japan). It was also an era when a distinguished group of European senior scholars, including Joseph A. Lauwerys, Nicholas Hans, Isaac Kandel, and Friedrich Schneider set a standard for what might be achieved in comparative education scholarship. Brickman's concern was the low status of comparative education in the United States, "the apparently widespread feeling that the comparative study of foreign systems of education is decorative rather than functional and hence of little value to the teacher" (Brickman 1954a, p.8). He therefore set out to prevent "dilettantes from pre-empting" a field so open that "anyone who so desired could leap into the vacuum" (Brickman 1966, p.8). Although only 35 people participated in the initial New York University conference, Brickman labelled his edition of their papers: "Proceedings of the *First Annual Conference on Comparative Education*" (1954). In so doing, he signalled that this group would henceforth occupy comparative education turf in the United States.

The first objective was to rescue the term "comparative education" from association with "junketlike tours abroad and the resultant courses" run by amateurs (Brickman 1977, p.398) – to gain for the field "recognition in the academic and professional world as a group of scholarly-minded, serious specialists with high standards of teaching, research, and publication" (Brickman 1966, p.8). Brickman's remedy, which he addressed in a paper entitled "A Plan for the Training of Professors of Comparative Education" (Brickman 1954b), was a rigorous programme of post-doctoral study, research, foreign language training, and school visits. The eminent scholar, Robert Ulich of Harvard, who was keynote speaker at the first conference, also stressed foreign languages and travel (Ulich 1954, p.14). Like Brickman, Ulich located the field within a humanist tradition in which the frame of reference was Eurocentric, and the dominant tools were history and languages.

Humanist frame of reference notwithstanding, the focus of the New York University conferences was also prescriptive, pragmatic, and pedagogic. The theme of the first conference, 'The Role of Comparative Education in the Education of Teachers' (1954), was followed by 'The Teaching of Comparative Education' (Brickman 1955), 'Comparative Education in Theory and Practice' (Brickman 1956a), and 'Comparative Education and Foreign

Educational Service' (Brickman 1957a). The Comparative Education Society which evolved from these conferences began its existence as a branch of the National Society of College Teachers of Education.

Formation of the Comparative Education Society

In 1954, shortly after the first New York University conference, Brickman, Gerald Read of Kent State University, and Bess Goodykoontz of the United States Office of Education met in Washington DC "to explore the possibility of designing a program that would provide a significant and first-hand experience in Europe for professional educators who had a responsibility for teaching courses ... that dealt with education in other lands" (Brickman 1966, p.7). Although discussion of a formal organisation had antedated this meeting, the impetus for action was the discovery that group rates for study tours required a pre-existing group. To meet this requirement, at the close of the Third New York University Conference on 27 April 1956, Brickman and Read proposed that participants form a society (Brickman 1956b). Read's report in the minutes of the event is succinct:

Those present voted in favour of the formation of a Comparative Education Society. The Society came into being the next day.

The CES would hold annual meetings in Chicago in conjunction with the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the National Society of College Teachers of Education, and the Association of Student Teaching. In addition, it would organise a Comparative Education Section of the National Society of College Teachers of Education. Summer meetings would take place during annual study tours.

Membership in the CES was to be "open to professors and students of comparative education and other Foundations of Education, to those persons who have responsibilities in the area of comparative education in organisations other than colleges and universities, to those persons in professional education and other disciplines who are interested in comparative education" (Read, Minutes). Its goals were ambitious: to promote and improve the teaching of comparative education in colleges and universities; to encourage scholarly research in the field; to interest professors of all disciplines in the comparative and international dimensions of their specialties; to promote inter-visitation of educators and on-the-spot studies of school systems throughout the world; to cooperate with specialists in other disciplines in interpreting educational developments in a wider cultural context; to facilitate the publication of studies and up-to-date information on comparative education; to encourage cooperation among specialists in comparative education in studies, exchange of documents and first-hand description of education; to cooperate wherever possible with such organisations as UNESCO, the International Institute of Education, and the Organisation of American States". CES would "publish newsletters, monographs, yearbooks and other publications, either independently or in cooperation with other organisations". It would also sponsor programs of visitation to other lands and would even call upon its members to serve as hosts to foreign educators in the United States (Read, Minutes, 27 April 1956).

William Brickman was elected President; Robert Sutton, Ohio State University, Vice President; and Gerald H. Read, Kent State University, Secretary-Treasurer. A Board of Directors was established, "with members selected from each of the various regions of the United States" (Read, Minutes). The first Board consisted of Claude Eggertsen, University of Michigan; George Z.F. Bereday, Teachers College, Columbia University; David Scanlon, Newark State Teachers College; Bess Goodykoontz, US Office of Education; Flaud Wooton, University of California; Harold R.W. Benjamin, Peabody College for Teachers; William Johnson, University of Pittsburgh; and Robert Ulich, Harvard University. Thereafter, an invitation was sent to 500 educators to become charter members of the Society for a fee of US\$2.00 per year. The society had 155 members after this solicitation (Read, Minutes, 27 April 1956).

Brickman later pointed out that the group who formed the Comparative Education Society consisted of junior scholars. "One might have expected an initiative from such internationally recognised scholars as Professor Joseph A. Lauwerys of England, Professor Walther Merck, Dr. Franz Hilker, and Professor Reich Hylla of West Germany; and Professors Robert King Hall, Thomas Woody, and Flaud C. Wooton of the USA, but none was forthcoming" (Brickman 1977, p.398). In Brickman's view, therefore, the founding of the society "could be regarded as an act of rashness perpetrated by a relatively younger generation rather than as the outcome of deliberation by the outstanding experts of the field". Nevertheless, Brickman persuaded senior scholars such as Flaud Wooton and Robert Ulich to join the first Board of Directors.

About the founding of the Comparative Education Society, George Bereday, the first editor of the *Comparative Education Review*, had a similar but somewhat different perspective. In a letter to Walter F. Cronin, Office of Intelligence Research, Department of State, about his plans for the *Comparative Education Review*, Bereday noted:

Originally the Society germinated in a small group of people. Few of these have established a claim to competence in some aspects of comparative education; for most, their interest in the field was far greater than their competence. After some deliberation at the college [Teachers College, Columbia University], I have decided to join and support the Society rather than creating factions and splinter groups in the field.... At present the demand for comparative education has far outrun the supply and many teach the subject who from the point of view of training they received have no business teaching it.

Bereday went on to provide an overview of the academic interests of several founding fathers:

At present two of the men at the helm of the Society major in research in the Soviet area. William Johnson, the vice-president, represents George Count's political-educational school. I myself represent the sociological, Harvard Russian Research Center orientation.... William Brickman, the president, has also some interest in the area. I think this is an overemphasis.... Fortunately my first major is not Soviet but Western Europe, England in particular; David Scanlon, one of our directors is working on Africa and Fundamental Education. This points in the direction of the kind of general coverage in which I am interested for the *Review* and for the Society. (Letter, Bereday to Cronin, July 29, 1957)

Defining Institutional Directions, 1956-1960

Study Tours

The newly minted CES faced an immediate challenge: to implement the program of seminars and study tours planned by Brickman, Read and Goodykoontz. During the summer of 1956, a group of educators and academics led by Brickman and Read visited schools and universities in Denmark, Germany, Switzerland, France, the Netherlands and England. In the course of this tour, the Society held its first international meeting in Geneva, Switzerland, where on September 1, 1956, tour participants heard papers on the study of education in Switzerland and in the USA and on schools in Germany. We now know that George Bereday (Letter to Walter F. Cronin, 29 July 1957) was concerned about "unsettledness" in the Society because of foreign tours, an issue over which Isaac Kandel later resigned from the Board of Directors. Nevertheless, the Society sponsored an imaginative series of excursions to Venezuela, Brazil, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Ecuador, Japan, Korea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanganyika, the Republic of South Africa, the Congo Republic, Nigeria, Ghana, and Liberia. During the Society's first six years, Brickman and Read led groups to five continents and 24 countries. Of particular significance was the five-week trip to the Soviet Union in 1958 at a time when the US State Department had not yet obtained an exchange agreement with the Soviet Union (Bereday et al. 1960).

The First Constitution

The CES held its first annual meeting in Chicago on 14 February 1957, with 39 members present and a balance in the Treasury of US\$392.11 (Read, Minutes). At that time, a series of practical decisions were made. The fiscal year was to start on January 1, 1958, and those who were members at that date would become charter members. Of equal importance, a committee chaired by Kathryn G. Heath, U.S. Office of Education, was appointed to frame a Constitution. At the second annual meeting in Chicago, February 20, 1958, with 111 members present, drafts of a Constitution were discussed. At the third annual meeting in Chicago, February 12, 1959, the decision was made to poll the membership by mail for ratification of the Constitution. This process was officially completed on June 1, 1959.

The first Constitution (1959) defined the shape and scope of the Society. It called for annual elections and an annual professional and business meeting; a President and a Vice-President, each elected for a one-year term but eligible for a second term; a nine member Board of Directors elected three at a time, each for a three-year term; and two Executive Committee Officers appointed by the Board, the Secretary-Treasurer and the Editor of the *Comparative Education Review*. *Robert's Rules of Order* would be the arbiter of parliamentary disputes. The Constitution was amended in 1975 to provide for one-year successive terms by the Vice President, President-Elect, and President respectively, and thus a two-year preparation for the Presidency. The Society, however, has remained recognizably the organisation created in the Constitution of 1959.

Provision in the first Constitution for election by the membership of the President, Vice President, and the Board of Directors, rather than their appointment by a group in power, reflected the political traditions in which the Founders of the Society were acculturated. The fact, moreover, of term limits for officers, board members, and appointed officers ensured that no clique would dominate the Society for long. This outcome appears to be intentional. In March 1964 George Bereday wrote a letter to Robert E. Belding of the University of Iowa in which he noted: "The founders and directors of the CES are most anxious not to dominate its affairs, hence their desire to stay in the background as much

as possible". This posture, however, plus the rapid turnover of officers prescribed by the Constitution, has led to an unanticipated outcome in the years that followed: a loss on the Board of members with historical memory.

The Constitution calls for Regional Meetings (Article IV, Section 2) to be arranged by the Executive Council. What has developed instead is an active network of geographical groups whose meetings are encouraged but not coordinated by the parent organisation. The New York University conferences continued until 1959. Thereafter, Northeast Regional Meetings of the Comparative Education Society took place respectively at Teachers College, Columbia University, Jersey City State College, the US Office of Education, Syracuse University, the Pan American Union and the University of Bridgeport. By 1965, there were regional conferences in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania; Madison, Wisconsin; Berkeley, California; and Montreal, Quebec (Canada).

Comparative Education Review

Article V, Section 1, of the first Constitution directed the Society to publish a professional journal "which shall be distributed to members without further cost other than membership dues". On April 25, 1957, a few months after the first annual meeting, William Brickman, David Scanlon, George Bereday, and William Johnson "met to discuss the probability of publishing a *Comparative Education Review*" (Read, Minutes). The journal first appeared in June 1957 with George Bereday as Editor and Gerald Read as Business Editor. It has been published continuously ever since. Teachers College of Columbia University financed the first issue; New York University, Harold Benjamin of Peabody Teachers College, and William Brickman, the next two issues. Thereafter, the journal relied on members' subscriptions and dues (Read, Minutes; Bereday 1958). The first issue contained a brief introductory statement by Brickman, in which he prophesied that *Comparative Education Review* would "become an organ of importance in the United States and abroad" (1957b, p.1

Reception of the new journal was mixed. Bereday received letters of congratulation from Benjamin, Ulich, Cronin, and Eggertsen, although the latter expressed some concern that the *Comparative Education Review* might overlap with his *History of Education Journal*. A negative assessment was penned by Joseph Lauwerys of the Institute of Education, University of London, who wrote (Letter to Bereday, June 13, 1957): "I am by no means clear in my mind whether it is a good thing to have such a Review. There is already in existence the *Hamburg Journal*, our own *Year Book*, the *Journal of Education Studies* . . ." Bereday replied that Brickman would have put out something if he [Bereday] hadn't (Letter to Lauwerys, June 19, 1957). – Even Founding Fathers had professional rivalries. After seeing the first issue of the *Comparative Education Review*, Lauwerys expressed even greater concern. "I cannot see what good a publication of this kind can do – indeed, it is likely to do harm. . . Forgive my bluntness. There are involved here academic and professional standards" (Letter to Bereday, nd., June or July 1957). After learning more about the journal, Lauwerys recanted. "Don't get worried. All is well. I suppose as you think and say, I wrote in the heat of the moment" (Letter to Bereday, July 15, 1957). He went on to say that he would have responded differently had he known of Bereday's plans to review, in a subsequent issue of the *Comparative Education Review*, the *Year Book of Education*, of which he and Bereday were joint editors. He had been concerned that the British contribution to comparative education was to be slighted.

Foreign Relations

Given Lauwerys' response to the launching of the new journal, the diplomatic skills displayed by Bereday in rounding up senior scholars, particularly international scholars, to give legitimacy to the fledgling *Comparative Education Review* were all the more remarkable. Both Joseph Lauwerys and Nicholas Hans eventually joined the *Review's* Editorial Board, but only after a careful balancing act. In response to Bereday, Hans had written (Letter to Bereday, March 15, 1959): "I am quite willing and ready to take part in your publication on the condition that Lauwerys is also on the board. As I am working now in his department, I would not like to represent the Institute of London without him". Meanwhile, Bereday approached Isaac Kandel, to whom he wrote (March 3, 1959):

Your point about the younger generation not measuring up to the older in Comparative Education is well taken, humiliating as this fact is to me personally. But, in any case, we in our culture don't make nearly enough use of elder statesmen, and if our discipline is to thrive in the future, we need to have your support and blessing . . . So please, please agree to being on our Board and I shall profit as I have always tried to do so in the past, from your experience and guidance.

By then, Bereday had persuaded James Bryant Conant, former President of Harvard, Franz Hilker, and Robert Ulich to join his Board; and in the next few years he enrolled Friedrich Schneider of Germany, Pedro Rosselló of Switzerland, and Torsten Husén of Sweden.

The Board of Directors of the *Journal's* parent organisation, the Comparative Education Society, also reached out to established scholars from beyond the United States. During the 1960s, its Board included: Edmund J. King,

Vernon Mallinson, and Joseph Lauwerys, United Kingdom; Pedro Rosselló, Switzerland; Joseph Katz and Reginald Edwards, Canada; Irma Salas, Chile; and Philip J. Idenburg, the Netherlands. In addition, during this era two Canadians served as President – Joseph Katz in 1961 and Reginald Edwards in 1969. By 1962, 47 of the Comparative Education Society's 564 members, were "foreign" (Read Minutes). In 1965 Gerald Read (Minutes) reported an "all-time high of 1082 active members spread all over the world". In 1966 there were members from 44 countries (*CES Newsletter* 5, June 1966).

Organisation Building, 1960-1975

Leadership, Finances, and Constitutional Revision

In the years following the founding of CES, a core group assumed positions of leadership. William W. Brickman served as President from 1957 to 1959. Gerald Read served as Secretary-Treasurer from 1957 to 1965.

George Bereday served as *Comparative Education Review* editor from 1957 to 1967, except when he was replaced temporarily in 1961-62 during a sabbatical leave by Hu Chang-tu of Columbia University. Harold Noah of Columbia University served as editor from 1967 to 1971. He was followed by Andreas M. Kazamias, University of Wisconsin-Madison, who served from 1971 to 1978.

This was an era of incremental financial growth. In 1957 Gerald Read reported a balance of US\$554.11 in the Society's accounts; in 1963, a balance of US\$8,409.68. In 1968 there were total assets of US\$21,624.02 (*CIES Newsletter* 10, March 1968). By then, the Society was preparing for annual professional audits. There were, nevertheless, recurring concerns over solvency and over the need to increase membership, over the fact that officers frequently "bootlegged" secretarial assistance from their home institutions, a theme that would echo in the years that followed. In the 1960s, however, non-financial issues dominated: constitutional revision, the question of a name change, and the decision to hold separate instead of joint meetings with groups with which it was affiliated.

Constitutional revision was a consensus undertaking. As Gerald Read pointed out at the Board of Directors Meeting on February 15, 1967, the draft revision of the Constitution, which appears in the December 1966 *Newsletter*, "formalised procedures which have been in operation for the last few years". The revised Constitution gave student members of the Society the same rights and privileges as active members. It designated as officers of the Society: the President, Vice President, immediate Past President, the nine Directors, the Secretary, the Treasurer, the Editor, and the Business Manager. It also specified that the Vice-President succeed to the office of President after one year. Changes were discussed at the Annual Meeting in Chicago, February 17, 1967, and submitted thereafter to the membership by mail ballot for ratification. The *CIES Newsletter* for January 1968 reports that the revised Constitution was now official.

The Name-Change Issue

Of greater concern than the Constitution was the issue of a name change. According to the January 1966 *Newsletter*, the instigator of the change was Joseph Katz, University of British Columbia (Canada), who suggested that Comparative and International Education Society might better indicate the global character of the organisation. At the next annual Business Meeting on February 16, 1967, R. Freeman Butts put the issue before the membership. Twenty-four were in favour of a change, fourteen against, with two abstaining. The following year the Committee on a Change of Name, chaired by Reginald Edwards, submitted, after exhaustive exploration, a very thorough report (*CIES Newsletter* 10, March 1968). Among names discussed in the Edwards' Report are Society for Comparative and International Education, International and Comparative Education Society, International Education Society, and, of course, Comparative and International Education Society. It cannot be a total coincidence that Joseph Katz, who initiated the name change, became the first president of the Canadian Comparative and International Education Society, which held its first meeting in 1967.

The Edwards Report reflects what is still remembered as a heated debate. Opinions ranged from support of no change to strong support for a change that would emphasise the idea of *international* education. Reasons *for* and *against* were both theoretical and practical. It was argued that responsibilities such as cultural exchanges, student exchanges, Peace Corps, UNESCO, United States Agency for International Development, the International Education Act, world colleges, and university-to-university programs had transformed the academic discipline of comparative education as it was practiced during the era of Michael Sadler and I.L.Kandel. Professionals in administration, guidance, or curriculum were more likely to want affiliation with an international organisation than with an exclusively academic organisation. A change in name would bring together people different from the academics attracted by comparative education, would better describe the membership of the Society, and would provide a basis for special interests. There was also the practical concern that government and non-governmental agencies dispensing funding might overlook the Comparative Education Society if it did not have the word *international* in its title.

Members of the Society were far from unanimous on this issue. Included in the Edwards Report is the following fervent statement:

There are two major reasons why I would not wish to see a change of name at this juncture. The first concerns the different natures of the two topics – Comparative Education and International Education – and the second, a negative one, concerns the ‘opportunist’ thinking which seems to attach to some aspects of international education. It has taken rather more than ten years to get this far in Comparative Education, and only now are we beginning to lay serious claim to being able to make any worthwhile comparisons, and to adopt methods which are presumed to underlie our studies. We have lacked good data, good methods, good training, and above all, as in so many aspects of education, we have lacked good theories. Now that these deficiencies are less obvious in Comparative Education, it might be preferable to capitalise on the skills we have acquired. In this respect International Education remains a more diffuse, more amorphous concept, and I cannot see many testable theories emerging in this area. (Edwards Report 1968, quoted in Comparative Education Society Minutes, February 14, 1968.

In an undated essay in the CIES Collection and in a 1968 letter to the Editor, *CER*, Vol. 12, no. 3 (376-378), Erwin Epstein, who was later to become editor of the *Comparative Education Review*, questions the motives for the change. From his perspective, broadening the base of support for the field might realign factions “and even alter the nature of the field itself”. For Epstein the word *international* connotes a “less analytic type of activity, ... concerned more with practice and *implementing* (in contrast to the study of) policy” than is comparative education, which is more academic. These arguments still reverberate.

These concerns notwithstanding, on February 14, 1968, the Board of Directors unanimously approved a name change. The issue was put before the Business Meeting two days later, following which mail ballots were sent to the membership. The September 1968 *CES Newsletter*, No. 11, reports 200 ballots returned: 149 in favour of a change and 51 opposed. “Thus, Article I, Section I, of the Constitution is now amended to read: The name of this organisation shall be the Comparative and International Education Society”. *CIES Newsletter*, no. 12 (12 December 1968), now using the new name, reported: “By vote of the membership the name of the Society has been changed to Comparative and International Education Society. From this issue onward, the title [of the Newsletter] will be *Comparative and International Education Society Newsletter*”.

The Separate Meeting Issue

Until 1970 the Comparative Education Society met annually in Chicago during February, coordinating its meetings with those of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, the National Society of College Teachers of Education, and the Association of Student Teaching – organisations with which it affiliated at the time of its inception. In an era, however, when Bereday, Holmes, Noah and Eckstein were exploring new methodologies in comparative education, identification with teacher education was beginning to weaken. In 1964 the Board talked of coordinating their meetings with the American Education Research Association (AERA) while retaining identification with teacher education. By 1965, there was talk of autonomous meetings or of meetings in which the intellectual focus was oriented more toward philosophy and the social sciences than toward teacher education. As noted by Robert Lawson:

The success of the specialised meetings at the University of Chicago last year might indicate a favourable response toward an independent annual conference, or one in conjunction with the other ‘Educational Foundations’ fields (i.e., history of education, philosophy of education, sociology of education, social psychology of education). That is, the conference would be directly oriented to field of specialisation and relationships which are reflected in disciplines in the humanities and social sciences (i.e., history, sociology, political science), since these may be more direct than our relationships with other fields in education. (Letter, Robert Lawson to Donald Adams, October 8, 1965)

In 1966, the year William Brickman gave an address on “Ten Years of the Comparative Education Society,” the annual February meeting was still taking place in Chicago in conjunction with the National Society of College Teachers of Education (NSCTE). There were, however, difficulties identifying a sufficient selection of useable papers; also difficulties when the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE) announced its own central theme (Minutes, Executive Committee, October 11-12, 1966). In February 1968, the fact that the Society needed to seek permission from the NSCTE in order to plan three of its own sessions came under Board scrutiny. In October of that year, the Executive Committee examined ongoing problems of coordination, and it also discussed the “larger question of where and with whom the Society should meet annually”. By March 1969, the

Society was ready to experiment with a meeting independent of the AACTE/NSCTE in Chicago but to continue cooperation with the other societies on a reduced scale.

In September 1969, the Society announced plans for a separate annual meeting in Atlanta in 1970:

For the year 1969-70 our Society decided to separate the holding of a meeting in Chicago from the holding of the annual meeting. Thus, still in conjunction with NSCTE, and along with the History of Education Society, the John Dewey Society, the Philosophy of Education Society, and the American Education Studies Association, we shall also arrange a meeting at Chicago, in February 1970, in addition to the Annual Meeting to be held in Atlanta in March 1970. (*CIES Newsletter* 15, September 1969)

It is not difficult to figure out which of the meetings was more important. The Chicago meeting would feature only graduate students, whereas senior scholars would meet in Atlanta. Meanwhile, the Executive Committee decided that the Vice President would decide each year on the location of the Annual Meeting (Executive Committee Minutes, October 10-11, 1969).

The CIES continued to interact with education societies from its past, but in a muted way. In 1970 R. Freeman Butts chaired meetings of the Foundational Coordinating Committee, which consisted of: the American Educational Studies Association (AESAs), the CIES, the History of Education Society (HES), the John Dewey Society (JDS), the Philosophy of Education Society (PES), and the Society of Professors of Education (SPE, formerly NSCTE). Three of these societies were willing to have AACTE do administration and secretarial tasks through a joint secretariat in Washington. The other three, including the CIES, were *not* (*CIES Newsletter* 17, March 1970). In March 1970 the Board discussed plans for the CIES sessions at the AACTE Chicago meeting but decided instead to hold its own Annual Meeting in San Diego in 1971. At this point, Philip Foster moved that the site of the Annual Meeting move around the country and be located in a different region each year.

Three CIES conferences took place in 1973: San Antonio, site of the annual meeting; Chicago, where a group from the CIES met with education associations from the past; and the University of Iowa, which held a Regional Conference (*CIES Newsletter* 27, 1973). However, not every CIES member was happy with these geographical experiments. Philip G. Altbach called on the Society “to reconsider our decision of a few years ago to hold our conventions separately from the AACTE meetings in Chicago” (*CIES Newsletter* 27, 1973). Altbach’s concern was that recent recipients of the Ph.D. needed access “to a wide range of employment opportunities”, for which the AACTE format would be superior. “The situation of comparative education and that of the academic profession generally has changed greatly in the past few years and . . . it would be at least a good idea to think about returning to the ‘fold’ of the broader community of teacher educators”. Altbach also noted the central location of Chicago as an airline travel hub for faculty members in an era when travel funds appeared to be drying up.

Altbach’s was not the only voice on this issue. Ursula Springer also spoke of the need to continue contact with “foundations” societies, especially the American Educational Studies Association (AESAs). In her report for the Committee on Professional Concerns (*CIES Newsletter* 28, May 1973), Springer noted the low visibility of the CIES in the education profession and the danger of losing support in the colleges. She also pointed out “that it would be in our professional interest to develop a set of ‘competencies’ that we can accept and publicise in our *Newsletter*, so that the CIES members may utilise them if their situation and interest calls for it”. At the Business Meeting in 1973, a subcommittee was formed to draft this set of ‘competencies’, an effort that reflected a preoccupation in the world of teacher education at that time. Concern about competencies was short-lived, but it was symptomatic of the degree to which the CIES had strayed from an earlier professional focus.

No CIES-sponsored sessions were held at the AACTE Conference in Chicago in February 1974. The Board, however, expressed “support for participation at the Conference in order to provide Mid-Western members with participatory opportunities” (Minutes, March 1974). In a letter to the Board (May 21, 1974), Robert Lawson, the incoming CIES President, announced San Francisco as the site of the CIES conference in 1975. There would be an extra day for sessions; but “our thought that we might arrange the meeting in cooperation with one or more other Societies could not be worked into the conference pattern”. A Chicago session, coordinated with AACTE was to be run by Malcolm Campbell. In a letter to W. D. Halls, Oxford University (May 23, 1975), Lawson clarified the situation: “The CIES meetings held annually in Chicago are continued as a contribution to the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. The annual CIES conference is held separately, this past year in San Francisco, March 26-29, 1975”. Lawson noted that a group unrepresentative of the CIES was to be found in Chicago, thus making it clear that the San Francisco meeting represented the real CIES, an organisation with its own identity.

Growth and Consolidation, 1975-1990

Relationship with Other Societies

After 1975, the CIES, now meeting independently from other organizations, continued to seek collaborative relationships with other professional groups. In 1980 it appointed Leo Leonard, University of Portland, and Edward Berman, University of Louisville, to represent the CIES at the annual meeting of the Council of Learned Societies in Education.

Throughout the 1980s, the CIES maintained relationships with organisations such as AERA, UNESCO, WCCES, the Council of Learned Societies in Education, as well as the United States Office of Education (Executive Committee Minutes, Atlanta, March 16, 1988), all professional organisations that have an international scholarly thrust (*CIES Newsletter* 94, May 1990). In 1990 the Society had affiliations with the Council of Learned Societies in Education; with NCATE, to which it contributed an annual fee of US\$200; as well as with the Alliance for Education in Global and International Studies, to which it contributed US\$150 dues;

Besides the Council of Learned Societies in Education, which consisted of member societies in various areas of the social foundations of education, an “umbrella” organisation of which the CIES has been a member (in fact a founding member) is the World Council of Comparative Education Societies (WCCES). In 1974, however, there was concern that ratifying the WCCES Constitution would mean endorsing a “supersociety” (*CIES Newsletter*, 34, December 1974). However, Robert Lawson and others successfully argued for ratification.

Moreover,, the CIES has committed itself explicitly to support the WCCES. A statement issued by the Board at the Society’s 1985 annual meeting, and again endorsed by the Board at the 1986 meeting, spells out this commitment: the CIES encourages members to attend WCCES congresses, to appoint CIES representation to WCCES committees when requested to do so, to publish news of WCCES in the *CIES Newsletter*, to contribute dues assessed by WCCES, and to expect that CIES members will assume the cost of participation in committees or congresses of the World Council. Within this framework, many CIES members regularly attend WCCES congresses and serve on WCCES committees. In 1997 the CIES board decided that the official CIES representative to WCCES should be a Past President, who would serve for two years, thus skipping a Past President every other year (Minutes of the Board of directors, March 23, 1997).

Establishing Historical Memory: Creation of the Archives

A measure of the growing maturity of the CIES was the establishment in 1980 of the Society’s own archives. Formal discussion of the need to preserve the past dates from a proposal by Beatrice Szekely in 1978 that was distributed to the Board the following year by Philip Altbach. At that time, the Board endorsed a motion by Gail Kelly that archives be established as a long-term project. To get started, the Board voted a grant of US\$600 to Beatrice Szekely for the current year and another US\$600 for the following year. Thereafter, President George Male announced the Society’s intent:

In March 1979 the Board of Directors approved the concept of establishing an archive where papers and documents of the CIES would be available to historians, researchers, and others. It is even possible that some of the outstanding members of the Comparative Education field might wish to deposit their papers in such an archive upon retirement. I have appointed a committee to consider proposals from any university that might wish to have the CIES archive established at that institution. The exact nature of a CIES archive is yet to be determined so any proposals should briefly indicate how the archive would function, the role to be played by the Comparative and International Education Society and what support (financial, staff and room space) the institution would provide. (*CIES Newsletter* 54, December 1979)

Although Beatrice Szekely was subsequently unable to undertake supervision of this project, the idea slowly gained momentum. One possibility explored by President George Male would have used the “Papers in Comparative and International Education” collection at Teachers College, Columbia University, for the CIES papers. Such an arrangement, however, would have excluded Brickman, Anderson, Eggertsen, and others not connected with Columbia. It also required an initial financial outlay. Male then appointed an Archive Committee, consisting of Franklin Parker, Claude Eggertsen, and William Brickman. Thereafter, at the urging of Philip Altbach (Letter to Kim Sebaly, May 19, 1980), Kim Sebaly submitted a proposal for a CIES Collection in the Special Collections of the Kent State University Archives. This proposal was promptly accepted, and plans for its implementation joyfully announced:

For the first time, the CIES has established a permanent archive for the papers and documents of the Society. The American History Research Center in the Kent State University Library will be the repository of the CIES Archives and will take responsibility for processing and maintaining the Society’s papers in cooperation with the College of Education at Kent State University, which has assigned a full-time graduate assistant to the project. These materials will be available for use by scholars. (*CIES Newsletter* 58, December 1980)

The CIES Collection in the Kent State University Archives has become an important resource in the field of comparative education. It now occupies close to 81.5 cubic feet, of which 39 cubic feet are processed and included in its online inventory. The Collection holds records from before the founding of CIES, *CER* records, issues of *CER* and the *CIES Newsletter*, correspondence by CIES officers, minutes of Board meetings, and video interviews of past CIES Presidents. Kent State University Archivists, Nancy Birk, and her successor, Cara Gilgenbach, have guided the day-to-day supervision of the Collection. Of particular importance is the work of Kim Sebaly, a Kent State faculty member and long-time CIES member who has generously donated his time and expertise to the Collection.

Societal Identity Markers: Honorary Fellows and the Eggertsen Lectures

A first attempt to honour “Elder Statesmen” was introduced at the CIES Annual Business Meeting in 1970, at which time the Board recommended an honorary membership category limited to 10 members. This proposal, which was defeated by a vote of 13 in favour, twenty opposed, was premature (Minutes, Annual Business Meeting, March 23, 1970). The idea re-emerged in 1981 in a memo to the Board from Erwin Epstein suggesting that CIES find a way to honour “some of our *illuminati* who have retired or are about to retire” (Epstein, Memo to Board, July 7, 1981).

In 1983, the Awards Committee proposed that the CIES appoint selected senior members as “Fellows of the CIES” (*CIES Newsletter* 67-68, April/June 1983). Thereafter, criteria for the Honorary Fellow designation were prepared by Philip J. Foster, Chair of the Awards Committee, Thomas J. La Belle and Vandra Masemann, later aided by Noel McGinn. Of particular concern was the question of posthumous awards. (George Bereday had just died.) The membership, however, voted to reject “Posthumous Honorary Fellow” status (Business Meeting Minutes, April 20, 1985). Nevertheless, in 1990 an article in the *CIES Newsletter* (No. 95, September 1990) refers to George Bereday as an Honorary Fellow, thus confounding historical memory. The criteria agreed upon in 1985 limited the number of Honorary Fellows to five “*living* members” per year until 15 are identified (later limited to one a year, with provision for holding over nominations if more than one name is submitted.) The age of 60 was set as the minimum age for an Honorary Fellow but changed in 1990 to evidence of a “long and distinguished career”. All nominations, plus recommendations from at least five active members of the Society, were to be forwarded by the Awards Committee to the Board of Directors, which would make the final decision.

The first two Honorary Fellows, Claude Eggertsen and C. Arnold Anderson, were appointed in 1987; the second two, Harold Noah and Philip Foster, in 1990. These were followed by Mary Jean Bowman, Andreas Kazamias, Gerald H. Read, and R. Murray Thomas – all appointed in 1991. Thereafter came Max A. Eckstein (1994), Noel McGinn (1997), Don Adams (1998), Rolland Paulston (1999), Elizabeth Sherman Swing (2000), Norma Tarrow (2001), Mathew Zachariah (2002) and Robert Arnove (2003). Joseph Farrell and William Rideout were announced in 2006 to receive the honour in 2007.

Another societal marker is a lecture series inaugurated by Associates of the Social Foundations Program at the University of Michigan to honour Claude A. Eggertsen, a Founder of the CIES, its president in 1963, and one of its first two Honorary Fellows. Eggertsen’s vision of comparative and international education inspired generations of CIES members, including, among others: Susanne Shafer, Robert Lawson, George Male, Val Rust, Victor Kobayashi, and Kim Sebaly. The first Eggertsen Lecture, “Comparative Education and Social Concern,” was delivered in 1980 at the annual CIES conference in Vancouver, Canada, by Brian Holmes, Institute of Education, University of London. Other Eggertsen Lecturers included: Wolfgang Mitter (1981); William Brickman (1982); Hans Weiler (1983); Harry Judge (1987), Ruth Hayhoe (1988); Zoya Malkova (1989); Torsten Husén (1990); and Edmund King (1991).

Epistemological Differences

The CIES has overseen its share of internecine debates over epistemology, frequently between academicians and pragmatists. During the 1980s, however, the possibility for intellectual dissonance – thinking within, or thinking outside, the “black box” – was particularly pronounced. Two collections of articles from the *Comparative Education Review* illustrate the complexity of what was taking place. A book edited by Philip Altbach, Robert Arnove and Gail Kelly (1982), featured studies that illustrate “*diverse* methodological issues”. A companion volume, *New Approaches to Comparative Education*, edited by Philip Altbach and Gail Kelly (1986), demonstrated a “range of orientations”. In each volume the emphasis was on diversity: a diversity of scholars – World Bank pragmatists, economists, sociologists, anthropologists; a diversity of research paradigms – structural functionalism, critical realism, conflict theory, neo-Marxism, ethnography, gender studies, human capital theory, typological theory. As the decade progressed, swords were crossed, usually in a friendly way, over research paradigms. Even the annual presidential address could become an occasion for laying down the gauntlet. See, for example, “Currents Left and Right: Ideology in Comparative Education” (Epstein 1983), “Comparative Education and the Problem of Change” (Kelly 1987), “Aesthetics as a Dimension for Comparative Study” (Hackett 1988), “Ways of Knowing” (Masemann 1990), “Post-modernism and its Implications” (Rust 1991).

In 1990 two long-time, highly respected CIES members, Vandra Masemann, an anthropologist, and George Psacharopoulos, an economist, squared off in the pages of *Comparative Education Review*. Psacharopoulos (1990) attacked scholarly articles that were, in his words, “overly descriptive, in the sense that they provide long, non-quantitative accounts” (p.369). He looked instead for a theory that leads to testable propositions, such as the human capital theory. In her Presidential Address, “Ways of Knowing” (1990) Masemann focused on the preference of indigenous people for experiential knowledge and their resistance to empirical positivism. She questioned the utility of quantitative methodology because, in her view, it had led to the replacement of a moral basis for schools with statistical data and to a shift away from holistic knowledge. The juxtaposition of these competing research paradigms is a vivid illustration of the challenge the CIES faced then and continues to face in accommodating its disparate membership under one umbrella.

Contentious Issues and Systemic Change, 1990-2006

A Contested Election

In the 1990s, the CIES could take pride in its not inconsiderable achievements. Its journal, the *Comparative Education Review*, had achieved international recognition under Philip Atlbach (1979-1988) and Erwin Epstein (1989-1998), who was succeeded by John N. Hawkins of UCLA in 1999, and by co-editors, Mark Ginsburg and David Post, of the University of Pittsburgh and Pennsylvania State University in 2004. Most routines were in place, including annual meetings in a new locale each year. The Society was developing a responsible network of committees. Its membership was growing. It was about to receive an endowment. Nevertheless, in 1990 and in the years that followed, the CIES found itself facing a series of contentious issues.

The most immediate issue was a contested election, an event that threw the society into uncharted territory. As Val Rust, then CIES President, pointed out to the aggrieved candidate (letter to David Wilson, 5 June 1990:

Concern has been raised for several years that we must become more formal. . . In the past we have operated almost as a large family acting with a sense that CIES members would respond responsibly and ethically with regard to the election process. . . The process has been ‘sloppy’ in many respects.

At a meeting for incoming members of the Board of Directors on the last day of the 1990 conference, the day following public announcement of election results, a Board member, Norma Tarrow, after discussion of election anomalies, moved that the election be invalidated. This motion challenged the legitimacy of the “newly elected” members of the Board of Directors present at this meeting. Board members whose terms had expired were, of course, not in attendance. President Val Rust, therefore, ruled that a quorum was not present. In the weeks that followed, with the aggrieved candidate for Vice President ready to pursue legal remedies, Rust contacted all members of the outgoing Board by mail for a vote on whether or not to nullify election results. The Board, however, voted to let the election results stand, on the argument that no fraud or maliciousness had taken place. In July in Madrid, CIES Board members who attended the Comparative Education Society in Europe (CESE) Conference (too few to constitute a quorum) held an inconclusive emergency session. There was at this point no constitutional procedure for resolving the impasse.

A legal crisis was averted. The President, Val Rust, and Past-President, Vandra Masemann, wrote a letter of apology to the aggrieved candidate. The following year, the aggrieved candidate allowed his name to be put into nomination for the office of Vice President, and won. Meanwhile, reforms recommended by an Ad Hoc Elections Committee chaired by Steve Klees were put in place and subsequently written into the Bylaws of the Constitution of 1998. Ballots would be sent only to *individuals* on the membership list, *not* to institutions. A special address sticker would be provided for the signed, sealed envelopes in which ballots were to be returned. Envelopes without the prescribed signature and address sticker, or not received by the deadline, were to be disallowed. With these reforms, elections have taken place without incident since 1990. In 2004, moreover, the CIES inaugurated an electronic voting process that appeared to be tamper proof.

Fiscal and Tax Matters

The CIES has always had financial concerns. A *Newsnote* in 1965 about the *Comparative Education Review* gives a graphic example: “We are sorry about these delays but we have no paid staff. All editorial and business work of the journal is done gratis”. The gratis frame of reference continues to this day. A particular problem is funding the annual conference, which has become larger and more complicated as the Society has grown. What had been a small gathering of friends had become a business venture. The question of how a President-Elect can come out ahead, or at least break even, while handling the multi-fold details of planning the conference program is a continuing concern, particularly to potential candidates for the office of Vice President.

The relationship of the CIES to the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) of the United States Government is another example of difficulty in transforming a gathering of like-minded scholars, not always the most practical people, into a larger professional organisation. In all probability it did not occur to the academics who filled the office of Treasurer during the early years of the Society that the organisation might some day have to apply for non-profit, tax-exempt status. This innocence was shattered during the 1980s when the CIES found itself in complex correspondence with the IRS (Letter to Erwin Epstein from the IRS District Director, February 25, 1982, for example). Eventually, after assistance from a lawyer, the long struggle ended. In Board Minutes for March 12, 1992 is the statement: "The Board has received tax-free status, retroactive to its inception. The Society can now receive contributions. Tax returns must now be filed by the Secretariat". Difficulties recently reappeared because the Treasurer from 1999 to 2003 unaccountably neglected to file the tax form required of a tax-exempt organisation. The present Secretariat, however, is capable and vigilant.

In 2000 CIES found itself in the happy position of receiving its first endowment: a bequest of US\$100,000 from George F. Kneller, a UCLA professor of the philosophy of education. Terms of the endowment included a directive that the bequest be made "in securities that will appreciate along with the factor of inflation," that it be controlled and managed "as an autonomous entity," rather than mingled with other funds, and that income from the bequest be used for an annual lecture, "to be presented before the general assembly or members (and others) by a distinguished scholar or personage," and to be called "The George F. Kneller Lecture" (Secretariat Report, March 7, 2000). In a curious way, this gift ties the CIES to an almost forgotten humanist past; for Kneller also left bequests to the Philosophy of Education Society and to the American Educational Studies Association.

Systemic Change: The Constitution of 1998

The Constitution and Bylaws of 1998 brought systemic change to the CIES. In the past, amending the Constitution had been a cumbersome process that involved soliciting approval of two thirds of CIES members by mail over a three-month time period. In a Memo to the Board of Directors on March 3, 1991, Val Rust argued for a less complicated system: "As you know, we have never had a set of Bylaws. Rather, as issues have arisen we have been content to change the CIES Constitution. This has resulted in a fairly complicated document that has procedural detail in it not appropriate for a constitution".

The Constitution of 1998, of which Rust is a major author, is divided into two parts: a semi-permanent, but lean Constitution, followed by the Society's first set of Bylaws. Amending the Constitution still requires two-thirds approval by mail ballot. Passing or rescinding a Bylaw, however, requires no more than a two-thirds affirmative vote by a quorum of the Board, a procedure that can take place during a regular board meeting (Article XII, Sections 1 and 2). It can also take place electronically (Bylaws, Article V, Section c). In 2000, using streamlined procedures in the new Constitution, the Board amended the Bylaws to convert three newer committees from Ad Hoc to Standing Committee status: the Investment Committee, the Gender and Education Committee, and the Under-Represented Ethnic and Ability Group (UREAG).

In addition to Bylaws, the Constitution of 1998 created a new office – Historian, an office with a three-year renewable term and Executive Committee status. The CIES Historian is charged with supervising archive maintenance, with ensuring the deposit of necessary documents therein, with advising the Society on "matters of historical fact," with facilitating research projects, with coordinating communications with other collections related to the Society, with serving as Parliamentarian, and with reporting annually to the Board of Directors. In 1999, the Board of Directors appointed as its first Historian, Elizabeth Sherman Swing, whose Ph.D. dissertation advisor was William W. Brickman, the first President of the Society.

Systemic Change: Expansion of the Committee Structure

A significant recent development is a trend toward a decentralisation of CIES activities through expansion of the committee structure and, more recently, through Special Interest Groups. At the time the Constitution of 1998 was ratified, the CIES had three Standing (permanent) Committees: the Nominations Committee, the Awards Committee, and the New Scholars Committee. The Nominations Committee (Constitution, Article VI, Section 2), which is composed of members "who are not holding office in the Society," is responsible for selecting a slate of candidates for the annual election: two each for the office of Vice President and for three members of the Board of Directors. The Awards Committee, which came into being 1981 in order to select the winner of an award for the best article each year in the *Comparative Education Review* (since 1990 called the Bereday Award), selects the Gail P. Kelly Dissertation Award winner, the Joyce Cain Award winner; and is responsible for submitting Honorary Fellow nominations to the Board for final vetting. The New Scholars Committee, which traces its origin to a student caucus at the annual meeting in 1988 (*CIES Newsletter* 86, January 1988), converted from Ad Hoc to Standing Committee status in 1991. At that time it changed its name from Young Scholars Committee to New Scholars Committee, "to

reflect age diversity among students and scholars who are entering the field of comparative and international education". This well-established group has its own website, runs highly successful dissertation workshops, and has assumed responsibility for videotaping interviews of former CIES Presidents. Three newer committees came into existence because of concerns within the CIES. The Investment Committee is a response to the Kneller Endowment. The Gender and Education Committee and UREAG represent a response to pressing human rights concerns.

That gender had become a dominant issue in the CIES is in part a reflection of the woman's movement in the larger society. It is also a reflection of the pioneering work of the late Gail P. Kelly, a prolific scholar who was Associate Editor of the *Comparative Education Review* (1979-1988) and President of the CIES (1986). We should note that gender equality was not a pressing concern in the early years of the CIES. Minutes of a discussion by the Board in 1961 of the characteristics looked for in a Vice President describe the ideal candidate as "a young *man* who shows potentiality in the field of comparative education". (Italics added). It was not until 1976 that the Society elected its first female President, Susanne Shafer. Since then, Barbara Yates, Gail P. Kelly, Beverly Lindsay, Vandra L. Masemann, Nelly Stromquist, Ruth Hayhoe, Heidi Ross, Karen Biraimah, and Kassie Freeman have served in this office. Even so, of the 46 CIES Presidents, only ten have been women.

The structural response of the CIES to gender issues dates from 1989 when President Vandra Masemann created a Gender and Education Committee with Nelly Stromquist as chair. The committee, whose subsequent chairs were Karen Biraimah, Heidi Ross, Margaret Sutton, Mary Ann Maslak, and Shirley Miske, has existed ever since, a respected gadfly within the Society. In 1990 it set out to explore what was still unfamiliar territory: participation of women on boards of professional organisations and as contributors to journals; gender issues in doctoral dissertations in comparative education; the position of women as university professors and in international agencies. Its request, for example, that the editors of *Comparative Education Review* provide them with a breakdown by gender of the number of articles submitted, accepted or rejected was the first such inquiry in the history of *CER* (Minutes, Board of Directors, March 24, 1990). In addition to its role in setting up the Gail P. Kelly Award in 1994 for the best dissertation with social justice and equity issues in an international or comparative context, the Gender and Education Committee has for a number of years hosted increasingly well attended pre-conference workshops. Tangible evidence of the increasing importance of the committee structure, and of this committee in particular, is the fact that three of the Gender Committee chairs – Nelly Stromquist, Karen Biraimah, and Heidi Ross – became Presidents of the CIES.

The Under-Represented Ethnic and Ability Group (UREAG) also came into being because perceived grievances. UREAG traces its genesis to 1990 when Kassie Freeman, Paul Emongu and Victor Kobayashi petitioned to convene a committee to investigate how to insure "greater ethnic equity in all dimensions of our professional activities". The Board unanimously approved this proposal (Minutes, March 24, 1990). Subsequently, concern over access to CIES meetings for those with physical disabilities came under the purview of this committee. Leaders of UREAG have not hesitated to ask that their voices be heard (Gezi, *CIES Newsletter* 108, 1995) or that slots be available in the conference schedule for presentations and "Global Village Dialogue". Kassie Freeman has spoken eloquently of the "reluctance, almost resistance, to acknowledge that there are different cultures within the USA that warrant greater understanding and inclusion" (Freeman, *Newsletter* 108, January 1995).

UREAG maintains its own website and has supported members with travel grants to attend CIES meetings. In 2000 it established an Award for Distinguished Research on African Descendants, the Joyce Lynn Cain, in honour of a faculty member at Michigan State University, "a colleague and a devoted scholar of comparative education" (*CIES Newsletter* 124, May 2000). Kassie Freeman, the first chair of UREAG, became a CIES President. She also ran a highly successful conference in New Orleans (2003) organized by Dillard University, a historically black institution.

Political and Ideological Concerns

During the 1990s and beyond, the CIES grappled with an increasing number of political and ideological issues. Particularly troubling was the issue of apartheid in South Africa. Should CIES welcome at its annual meeting representatives of a regime that denied justice to a majority of its people? (*CIES Newsletter* 93, January 1990). A Norwegian scholar, Yngve Nordkvelle, wanted to keep all South Africans, including those opposed to apartheid, out of conferences as a way of putting pressure on a corrupt political system (Letter from Nordkvelle, February 6, 1989). Joseph Di Bona of the CIES saw a different challenge: "Nothing can be so unsettling, and therefore so morally enlightening, as face-to-face interaction with real champions of policies we detest. We need to teach our students the link between racism at home and fascist policies of South Africa" (Letter, Di Bona to Masemann, June 5, 1989). The Society eventually decided not to adopt a boycott. What it did do was to approve a statement that subsequently appeared on much its correspondence until apartheid ended: "The Comparative and International Education Society

is opposed to apartheid in South Africa and condemns that country's laws and policies which deny basic human rights".

There were other contentious issues. After the 1989 Tiananmen Square incident, the CIES opposed selection of Beijing as the site of the next WCCES Congress. In 1997, it recorded opposition to gender discrimination in education in Afghanistan. In 2003 it wrote to US President George Bush concerning difficulties encountered by foreign students and scholars in getting visas for entry to the United States.

A different set of issues erupted over the so-called World Bank Bibliography. This database across academic disciplines called for an annotated bibliography on education reform and management resources to be prepared by members of the CIES with World Bank funding (*CIES Newsletter* 124, May 2000). After the first instalment was published, some in the CIES questioned whether this project represented a *partnership* between the CIES and the World Bank, an uncomfortable prospect for a vocal group in this organization. Once the project ended, the issue receded, but it nevertheless remains an example of a fundamental difference in worldview between liberal academics and pragmatic researchers, a difference reminiscent of the comparative education/international education cleavage of many years ago.

In 1992 a CIES member wrote to then-President Stephen Heyneman: "I believe the welfare of the CIES mandates that individuals refrain from imposing their personal philosophical or political commitments on the society. What distinguishes the CIES from other groups involved in comparative work, in addition to its interdisciplinary reach, is both its academic base and the true sense of camaraderie among its members" (Letter, Norma Tarrow to Heyneman, February 15, 1992). In 1997 Gary Theissen asked whether the Society should go beyond being a convener and information disseminator. Could, or should, it do a better job in representing intellectual, moral, and technical values and principles? (*CIES Newsletter* 114, January 1997). CIES is still grappling with an answer to that question.

Afterword

For those to whom it speaks, the CIES has become more than just a professional association. Loyalty runs deep and long. The members' list for June 1966 includes a roster of familiar names of those who remained active: Donald K. Adams, Philip Altbach, Malcolm B. Campbell, Max Eckstein, Erwin H. Epstein, Philip Foster, Kalil I. Gezi, Edgar B. Gumbert, Andreas Kazamias, Robert Lawson, Harold Noah, Seth Spaulding, the late David Wilson, Mathew Zachariah, the late Gerald H. Read and the late Rolland Paulston. Even among the younger generation, the CIES conferences has a special ambience. Asked what the Comparative and International Education Society has meant to her, a graduate student member of the Board of Directors offered this heartfelt testimony (Maria Fatima Rodrigues, *CIES Newsletter* 121, May 1999):

The annual CIES conference creates a social space where human beings from many different parts of the world connect on topics of mutual interest and learn from one another (even from those [with whom] they may strongly disagree). The greatest value of being a member of this society has come from my interactions with people who have different frames of reference and different realities.

It is possible to argue that the CIES is still a work in progress, but it is one whose "different frames of reference and different realities" give it strength.

References

- Altbach, Philip G., Arnove, Robert F. & Kelly, Gail P. (eds.) (1982): *Comparative Education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Altbach, Philip G. & Kelly, Gail P. (eds.) (1986): *New Approaches to Comparative Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Bereday, George Z.F. (1958): Editorial. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.1, No.3, pp.1-4.
- Bereday, George Z.F.; Brickman, William W. & Read, Gerald H. (1960): *The Changing Soviet School*. Cambridge: Riverside Press.
- Brickman, William W. (1954a): 'Report on New York University's First Annual Conference on Comparative Education', in Brickman, William W. (ed.), *The Role of Comparative Education in the Education of Teachers*. Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on Comparative Education. New York: School of Education, New York University (April 30), pp.8-9.

- Brickman, William W. (1954b): 'A Plan for the Training of Professors of Comparative Education', in Brickman, William W. (ed.), *The Role of Comparative Education in the Education of Teachers*. Proceedings of the First Annual Conference on Comparative Education. New York: School of Education, New York University (April 30), pp.17-22.
- Brickman, William W. (ed.) (1955): *The Teaching of Comparative Education*. Proceedings of the Second Annual Conference on Comparative Education. New York: School of Education, New York University (April 29.)
- Brickman, William W. (ed.) (1956a): *Comparative Education. A Symposium*. Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on Comparative Education on 'Comparative Education in Theory and Practice'. Reprinted from *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol.30, No.3, pp.113-160.
- Brickman, William W. (1956b): 'Report on New York University's Third Annual Conference on Comparative Education', in Brickman, William W. (ed.), *Comparative Education: A Symposium*. Reprint from *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol.30, No.3, p.113.
- Brickman, William W. (ed.) (1957a): *Comparative Education and Foreign Educational Service*. Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference on Comparative Education. New York: School of Education, New York University (April 26).
- Brickman, William W. (1957b): 'A New Journal in Comparative Education'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.1, No.1, p.1.
- Brickman, William W. (1966): 'Ten Years of the Comparative Education Society'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.10, No.1, pp.4-15.
- Brickman, William W. (1973): *Research in Educational History*. Norwood, PA: Norwood Editions.
- Brickman, William W. (1977): 'Comparative and International Education Society: An Historical Analysis'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.21, Nos.2/3, pp.396-404.
- Constitution of the Comparative Education Society (1959): *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.3, No.2, pp.37-40.
- Constitution of the Comparative and International Education Society of 1998 and its Bylaws.
- Epstein, Erwin H. (n.d.): 'A Rose under Any Other Name'. (Undated typescript.)
- Epstein, Erwin H. (1983): 'Currents Left and Right: Ideology in Comparative Education' (Presidential Address). *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.27, No.1, pp.3-29.
- Freeman, Kassie (1995): 'Marginalisation on the Eve of Globalisation'. *CIES Newsletter*, No.108 (January).
- Gezi, Kal (1995): 'Increasing Underrepresented Groups in Education'. *CIES Newsletter*, No.108 (January).
- Hackett, Peter (1988): 'Aesthetics as a Dimension for Comparative Study' (Presidential Address). *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.32, No.4, pp.389-399.
- Kelly, Gail P. (1987): 'Comparative Education and the Problem of Change: An Agenda for the 1980s' (Presidential Address). *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.31, No.4, pp.477-489.
- Kelly, Gail P. & Elliot, Carolyn M. (eds.) (1980): 'Women and Education in the Third World'. Special Issue of *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.24, No.2, Part 2, pp.S1-S267.
- Masemann, Vandra (1990): 'Ways of Knowing: Implications for Comparative Education'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.34, No.4, pp.465-473.
- Psacharopoulos, George (1990): 'Comparative Education: From Theory to Practice, or Are You A:\neo.* or B:* ist?'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.34, No.3, pp.369-380.
- Read, Gerald H. (1956-1964): 'Formation of the Comparative Education Society', Handwritten Minutes. CIES Collection, Kent State University.
- Rust, Val D. (1991): 'Postmodernism and its Comparative Education Implications'. *Comparative Education Review*, Vol.35, No.4, pp.610-626.
- Theissen, Gary (1997): 'A CIES Interrogative'. *CIES Newsletter*, No.114 (January).
- Ulich, Robert (1954): 'Some Observations Concerning the Study of Comparative Education'. WCCES, Second World Congress, Geneva, Switzerland, June 28 – July 2, 1974. (Typed report).