

# PÄDAGOGIK, DISCIPLINARY INSTITUTIONALIZATION AND DICTATORSHIPS: ON THE HISTORY OF A DISCIPLINARY FIELD AND ITS PROBLEMS<sup>α</sup>

*Pädagogik, institucionalización disciplinar y dictaduras: sobre la historia de un campo disciplinar y sus problemas*

Antonio Fco. Canales<sup>β</sup>

Fecha de recepción: 21/03/2020 • Fecha de aceptación: 21/05/2020

**Abstract.** This essay reflects on the questions posed by historical research regarding the institutionalization of educational sciences and *Pädagogik*, on the occasion of the publication of the book *Education and “Pädagogik”: philosophical and historical reflections (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)*, edited by Blanka Kudláčová and Andrej Rajskey. In a first part, the essay deals with the problems of translating into English the concepts used to account for European continental cases and the dangers of misrepresenting their historical logic. A second part focuses on the discussion of the chapters of the book and defends the need to advance in a theoretical framework on the boundary between science and politics in the case of dictatorships and to allow for the experience of the former Communist countries to be included.

**Keywords:** Educational sciences; *Pädagogik*; disciplinary field; institutionalization; Communism.

**Resumen.** Este ensayo reflexiona sobre las cuestiones que plantea la investigación histórica sobre la institucionalización de las ciencias de la educación y la *Pädagogik*, al hilo del libro *Education and “Pädagogik”: philosophical and historical reflections (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)*, editado por Blanka Kudláčová y Andrej Rajskey. En una primera parte, el ensayo se ocupa de los problemas de la traducción al inglés de los conceptos utilizados para dar cuenta de los casos continentales europeos y los peligros de tergiversar su lógica histórica. Un segunda parte se centra en el comentario

<sup>α</sup> This work was supported by the MINECO/FEDER under Grant National Research Project FFI2015-64529-P.

<sup>β</sup> Dpto. de Estudios Educativos. Facultad de Educación. Universidad Complutense de Madrid. Rector Royo Villanova, sn. 28040 Spain. antcanal@ucm.es  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7035-1194>

*de los capítulos del libro y defiende la necesidad de avanzar en un marco teórico sobre la frontera entre ciencia y política en el caso de las dictaduras que permita incluir la experiencia de los países comunistas.*

**Palabras claves:** Ciencias de la educación; Pedagogía; campo disciplinar; institucionalización; comunismo.

The book *Education and “Pädagogik”: philosophical and historical reflections (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)*<sup>1</sup> has the clear mission of vindicating a tradition of thought in education that the editors have wisely decided to call *Pädagogik* and not *educational sciences*, as it is usually translated. We should applaud the courage shown by the editors Blanka Kudláčová and Andrej Rajský; it was past time that somebody finally addressed the problems derived from the accepted English translation, given that *Pädagogik* and *educational sciences* are not equivalent at all. *Pädagogik* responds to another intellectual tradition that the translation hides.

In reality, the issue goes far beyond a question of translations. Historians of education publishing in the international sphere have difficulties expressing their reality in English and each one, from his/her individual case, believes him/herself to be an exception to the general rule, desperately trying to fit a particular reality into the English categories. However, when we leave the bilateral relationship with Anglo-Saxon scholarship and finally start talking to each other, we come to realize that it is actually the other way around and that we are not the exceptions, but the rule. The situation we are faced with is indeed Kafkian, as we try to fit our common reality —the norm— into a language created for two particular cases, the United Kingdom and the United States, that are the exception.

The point is that in Spain there were no “teachers”; there were *maestros* and *profesores*, as in France there were *instituteurs* and *professeurs*, and in Italy *maestri* and *professori*. Without knowing the exact case in German, Slovak, Czech, Serbian or Polish, one might suspect it will be similar. Why two words instead of just one? History provides us with the explanation. In continental Europe there was a social and academic gap

<sup>1</sup> Blanka Kudláčová and Andrej Rajský (eds.), *Education and “Pädagogik”: philosophical and historical reflections (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2019).

between elementary school teachers and secondary teachers due to the fact that schoolteachers did not go to college, nor to *Gymnasien*, *licées* or grammar schools. In other words, they did not follow the prestigious academic track of the bourgeois classes. Schoolteachers were *the people*, and as such they were trained in institutions aimed at popular education. And again, we face the problem of giving a name to that particular training. On the continent there were no teacher training colleges, but rather *escuelas normales*, *écoles normales* or *scuole normali*, because “college” means university, and that was precisely the point behind the difference between *maestros*, *instituteurs* or *maestri* and *profesores*, *professeurs* or *professori*. Thus, historians are forced to use periphrases, with compound expressions such as a schoolteacher and secondary teacher, teacher training schools, etc, as a way of highlighting these differences in English.

Therefore, something so simple as a single word, “teacher”, becomes a weapon of mass destruction of our past, our reality and our identity. The use of the word “teacher” simply erases much of our educational past: that which has to do with the schoolteacher as a member of the popular classes, with the difficult process of the professionalization of schoolteachers as they strove for access to the university, with the status and salary conflicts between schoolteachers and secondary teachers when integrating the system through the lower secondary school, and with the resistance of secondary teachers to accommodating their practices to what was required of them in the common secondary school. All of this disappears just by saying “teacher”.

Something similar happens with “secondary education”, which in Spain is a neologism of yesterday, because *education* has never been used for the educational system, but rather *enseñanza*, *enseignements* or *Erziehung*. Historically, rather than “secondary education”, which never was used, “second” or “middle teaching” referred to what was taught between the elementary school and the university, this being its only aim, since neither vocational schools nor teacher training schools were considered to be at the same level as *institutos*, *Gymnasien* or *licées*. All of this complex historical reality that is still relevant today simply disappears with “secondary education”, as does the fact that those responsible for the change of the name of the Ministry of Instruction or Teaching to Education both in Italy and Spain were not the leftists of the sixties,

but the Fascists, for whom it has always been very clear that they did not come only to teach..., but to educate.

If we go further and we understand education to be not simply teaching, but a process of personal formation, a *Bildung*, it is obvious that English becomes a cage that imprisons the historical realities we are trying to express in this language.

Returning to the book, the editors have chosen to sidestep this paradoxical situation by sticking with the German term. In doing so they are underlining the fact that *Pädagogik* and *educational sciences* are not equivalent at all. On the contrary, educational sciences are understood rather as an alternative and an overcoming of *Pädagogik*, which is usually seen as a form of metaphysical, ancient and old-fashioned thought. Thus, *educational sciences* supposedly represent modernity and values the empirical and especially the practical, as opposed to the rancid, speculative heritage of *Pädagogik*. But this approach to the knowledge on education carries at least two risks. One is its crumbling into several different disciplines that speak only of a particular aspect. Faced with this problem, the editor Andrej Rajský, in a very interesting chapter, defends philosophy as a unifying principle, as a basis from which to build a new general reflection on education and as the basis for rebuilding a new *Pädagogik*: "On this argument *Pädagogik* does not only assimilate and collect knowledge from various sciences. It engages with sectorial theories, passes through them transversally and integrates them, with the intention to distinguish and apply their specific knowledge to education" (p. 85). The second risk is clearly the loss of meaning in the reflection on education. Educational sciences tell us *how*, but they cannot address the *ends*, which correspond to the *should be*, to the normative dimension, to philosophy. Unless we fall into the loop, as often happens in our faculties, of turning the process into an end. Education becomes thus a *doing* - continuously and the more the better - surely to avoid thinking about what we are doing.

In summary, the book reflects on the place and the role of this academic tradition that the editors bravely call *Pädagogik*. The reflections proposed by the book are rich and polyhedral, consisting of no fewer than 21 chapters written by authors from 13 countries, grouped into three geographical spaces: Central Europe, with Poland, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary; South Eastern Europe, with former Yugoslavian

countries, Bulgaria and the Ukraine; and finally South Western Europe, with Spain and Italy. While this is a geographically accurate presentation, in common terms we might say that the book is about what was called Eastern Europe (the former Communist countries) plus Spain and Italy. We will see later that the experience of Communism is a central theme in the book.

The book has two clearly differentiated parts: a philosophical part and a historical one. The philosophical part is in itself an exercise of *Pädagogik*, a reflection on the current relationship of this tradition with education in general and with the sciences of education in particular. In addition to the excellent chapter by Rajskey cited earlier, this part includes contributions by Zdenko Kodelja from Slovenia, who reflects on what the philosophy of education is, by Rafał Godoń from Poland on the Anglophone Philosophy of education, by David Rybák from the Czech Republic on the idea of education beyond objectifying science, and by Iryna Predborska from the Ukraine on continental *Pädagogik*. Zvonimir Komar from Croatia defines the continental *Pädagogik* as a way of thinking based on *Bildung*; Dariusz Stępkowski from Poland addresses the interesting issue of the teaching of Ethics separate from religion and its complex relationship with what we might understand as a moral education; Naděžda Pelcová from the Czech Republic studies Eugen Fink's relationship with the psychology of Czech education; and Jan Hábl, also from the Czech Republic, vindicates Comenius.

This reference to Comenius leads us to the chapter by the late Giuseppe Mari, who argues that Comenius is the most modern of modern authors. At this point, a tribute has to be paid to him because he raises two very wise questions that make him an extraordinarily attractive author to read carefully. The first is his way of approaching the crisis of modernity. Instead of postmodernism, Mari puts his money on a *revised modernity*: "I think that it is better to explore constructively a 'different' modernity, rather than to seek to escape from modernity's problems by embracing irrationality and relativism" (p. 67). A second element is his courageous criticism of pedagogical rhetoric regarding competences. He says that the discourse of competences reduces education to the technical and ignores the ethical, thus picking up Rajskey's previously mentioned demand on the normative dimension of *Pädagogik*. This approach by Mari contrasts sharply with that of Lyudmyla Gorbunova

from the Ukraine, who reproduces the current official educational discourse with all of its rhetoric about competences.

The second part of the book is historical, focusing on the institutionalization of *Pädagogik* as a university discipline. It is an extremely valuable exercise in the comparative history of the discipline and its publication in English for an international audience is critical. It is difficult to think of a comparable attempt apart from the *History of Educational Studies* edited by Peter Drewer and Christoph Lüth in 1998.<sup>2</sup> In this sense, this book is a treasure, constituting a fundamental basis for any comparative study on the history of *Pädagogik* as an academic discipline. We can hardly stress enough its importance as a baseline or starting point, a first step for further exploration. So many interesting cases placed side by side force us to move forward within a common theoretical framework, using common analytical categories

With respect to the theoretical framework, different authors refer to that established by Pierre Bordieu and his notion of “disciplinary field” which, in turn, although no one quotes him, is a direct heir of the Kuhn “paradigm”. In their chapter, the Hungarians András Németh and Imre Garai quote Stichweh and Becher.<sup>3</sup> On our research team we use the framework proposed by Rita Hofstetter and Bernard Schneuwly.<sup>4</sup> However, both are basically similar. All of these authors point to four elements in the consolidation of a discipline:

1. An institutional infrastructure
2. A scientific communication network
3. The cognitive products of the discipline
4. The support for the socialization of young scientists

<sup>2</sup> Peter Drewer and Christoph Lüth (eds.), *History of Educational Studies* (Gent: Universiteit, 1998), *Paedagogica Historica* Supplementary 3.

<sup>3</sup> Rudolf Stichweh, *Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1994); Tony Becher, *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines* (Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989).

<sup>4</sup> Rita Hofstetter and Bernard Schneuwly (eds.), *Emergence des sciences de l'éducation en Suisse à la croisée de traditions académiques contrastées. Fin du 19e - première moitié du 20e siècle* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2007). For the application of this framework to the Spanish *Pädagogik*, see Yasmina Alvarez González, “La pedagogía española bajo el primer franquismo, 1939-1959. Reorientación disciplinar e institucionalización”. (PhD diss., Universidad de La Laguna, 2019).



It would be very interesting to systematically apply these categories to different cases in order to organize the information in the same way and see what it results in, much in the manner of Bereday's old recipe in comparative education.

A second issue present in all chapters dealing with the intervention of Communism in the discipline is the complex relationship between science and politics. I believe that the authors have not theoretically developed this line, having contented themselves to point out that Communism imposed an extreme ideologization and submission to Soviet *Pädagogik*. While this is certainly true, the subject is much more complex and needs some theorization.

The relationship between science and politics has been a constant during history and is not exclusive to Communism. On our research team, we have been studying the Spanish case from the theoretical framework of the Social Contract for Science, which tried to account for the remarkable role of the State in scientific development in the twentieth century.<sup>5</sup> This framework arose after the Second World War as a consequence of the great science projects organized by the State such as the Manhattan Project, and attempted to explain this relationship in terms of a mutually beneficial contract by which scientists granted science and technology to politicians for the development of the country or for their armies, while the politicians in return gave the scientists the funds they needed to carry out their research. The model was based on the premise that there was a clear boundary between science and politics that guaranteed that scientists were regulated by the Mertonian ethos of communism (in opposition to secrecy), universalism, disinterestedness and organized skepticism.

Most recent authors point out that this has never been the case, not even in democratic societies or in their liberal precedents, and is even less so today. The new perception is that the boundary between science and politics is not a line, but a more or less broad area populated by

<sup>5</sup> Amparo Gómez Rodríguez, "The 'Social Contract' for Spanish Science before the Civil War", in *Science Policies and Twentieth-Century Dictatorships: Spain, Italy and Argentina*, eds. Amparo Gómez, Brian Balmer and Antonio Fco. Canales (London: Routledge, 2016), 27-58. Amparo Gómez Rodríguez and Brian Balmer, "Ciencia y política: una cuestión de fronteras", en *Estudios políticos de la ciencia. Políticas y desarrollo científico en el siglo XX*, eds. Amparo Gómez and Antonio Fco. Canales (Madrid: Plaza y Valdés, 2013), 15-34.

various entities. Obviously, in totalitarian regimes such as Nazism or Communism this boundary area extended dramatically. In these regimes, science was subject to strong interventions by politicians who intended to replace the rules of scientific research and the mechanisms of selection and promotion of the scientific community by their own ideological or religious criteria.<sup>6</sup> As Németh and Garai state:

The socialist-communist scholar elite became an ideology-producing elite instead of examining natural and social phenomena by using traditional and strictly controlled scientific methods. Their most important task was to serve the interest of the expanding political field. (p. 222)

It is very significant that this statement is practically the same as that which we published on Spanish science under the Franco Regime:

The postwar scientific policy was not looking for credible scientists, or efficient technicians, but men of proven ideological affinity to put at the forefront of the formidable apparatus built to generate a new way of knowing at the service of God and the Empire<sup>7</sup>

However, we have to be careful, because according to this line science would be doomed to collapse under these regimes. And the truth is that this did not happen at all. Under the Nazi regime, Germany kept producing top quality science, and let us not forget that the Soviet Union maintained a technological challenge to the West for decades (let us leave the case of Spain aside). There was a correction factor that avoided collapse due to over-ideologization: the search for efficiency. After all, the Nazis wanted to win a war and the Soviets the military challenge of the United States. Therefore, pragmatism became an important counterweight to ideology. Another counterweight lay in the strategies that the scientific communities developed to preserve their autonomy against the regime.

<sup>6</sup> Amparo Gómez Rodríguez, “Ciencia y pseudociencia en los regímenes fascistas”, en *Ciencia y fascismos: la ciencia española de posguerra*, eds. Amparo Gómez and Antonio Fco. Canales (Barcelona, Laertes, 2009), 13-47.

<sup>7</sup> Antonio Fco. Canales, “La política científica de posguerra”, en *Ciencia y fascismo. La ciencia española de posguerra*, eds. Amparo Gómez Rodríguez and Antonio Fco. Canales (Barcelona, Laertes, 2009), 105-135.



*Pädagogik*, of course, is useless when it comes to winning a war or landing on the moon. This leads us to a second concept: boundary disciplines. We define boundary disciplines as those in which the weight of ideological, political and religious elements are greater than the actual disciplinary or scientific elements. Physics is Physics, no matter how much we refer it as Jewish Physics versus Aryan Physics; this is only rhetoric. But such is not the case of History or social sciences or health sciences either, in which ideological elements play a great role. If we have to look for a paradigmatic boundary discipline, that would undoubtedly be *Pädagogik*, precisely because, as was defended in the first part, it has at its core a philosophical component that places the question of principles and values in the forefront. And neither is its supposedly empirical and scientific version saved from this situation, because it is developed against a background of assumptions that can barely hide their ideological character beneath the data. Németh and Garai again perfectly capture this difference between boundary sciences and the rest when they point out that: "They [the Communists] thought that politically neutral scholars of natural sciences could cause less harm than their fellows from the humanities" (p. 218). *Pädagogik*, on the contrary, had to be tightly controlled by people identified with the regime.

All of the chapters in this part of the book are wonderfully suited for studying these issues. We can start with the excellent chapter by the editor Blanka Kudláčová that sets the pattern of this type of study for Slovakia. This guideline is followed by Edvard Protner and Tadej Vidmar in their study of Slovenia. Let me combine both.

Kudláčová shows us the institutionalization of *Pädagogik* with the first chair in 1922 for Chlup, which was occupied in 1938 by Čečetka. Something similar is found in Protner and Vidmar's chapter on Slovenia. The first chair was created in 1919 after the birth of the University of Ljubljana and was occupied by Ozvald; later Gogala, the leader of the Pedagogical seminar, was incorporated. Chlup, Čečetka, Ozvald, Gogala..., these are names that we have to know and that should help us realize that there were many more people thinking about education beyond those we usually hear about in international literature.

We have therefore a prewar process of development that was cut off by the arrival of Communism, which imposed a rebuilding of the discipline in accordance with its ideological principles. Then the purges and

substitutions began. In Slovakia, Čečetka was purged and *Pädagogik* was re-founded in a Communist fashion in 1948 by Ondrej Pavlík, a man who responded to the expected profile, having been a Communist militant before the war. In Slovenia, Gogala managed to survive because of his condition as resistance fighter, but the new strongman was Smitdt who, as he later acknowledged, did nothing more than put pedagogical music to the letter marked by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

This process corresponds almost identically to the Spanish case, where the process of institutionalization of *Pädagogik* during the first third of the century, masterfully described by Gonzalo Jover, was radically truncated after the civil war. After the exile of almost all the prewar professors, *Pädagogik* was rebuilt *ex novo* around the figure of Víctor García Hoz, a young Catholic militant linked to Opus Dei who identified completely with the regime. In all cases it was the triumph of ideology over disciplinary content.

However, at this point two issues remain on the table and are worth developing. The first of these involves the strategies used by scientists to survive.<sup>8</sup> Gogala applied himself to non-problematic issues, while Čečetka was rehabilitated twice. The second topic is disciplinary continuity. A consolidated discipline cannot consist solely as a pure political and ideological discourse; it has theories, but it also includes practices, ways of approaching the problems that constitute what Kuhn calls exemplars. What happened with these exemplars after the arrival of Communism, and what were the new core disciplinary contents and practices on which the discipline was to be rebuilt? In Spain, curiously, it was experimental pedagogy, the purest quantitativism.<sup>9</sup>

The rest of the chapters on Communist countries do not quite follow this scheme, which is so useful and interesting for Slovakia, Slovenia and Hungary. The Czech case, presented by Tomáš Kasper and Dana Kasperová from the Czech Republic, shows that after the division of the

<sup>8</sup> Amparo Gómez Rodríguez, Antonio Fco. Canales and Brian Balmer, "Science Policy under Democracy and Dictatorship: An Introductory Essay", in *Science Policies and Twentieth-Century Dictatorships. Spain, Italy and Argentina*, eds. Amparo Gómez, Brian Balmer and Antonio Fco. Canales (London: Routledge, 2016), 1-26.

<sup>9</sup> Antonio Fco. Canales, "From soul to matter: the new Spanish Francoist pedagogy's plunge into experimental pedagogy and the influence of Raymond Buyse", *Paedagogica Historica* 55, no. 3 (2019): 451-469.

Charles University in 1882, two interpretations of *Pädagogik* could be found in Prague: that of the German speculative tradition inherited from Otto Willman, and that of the Czech part initiated by Adolf Lindner, much more empirical and scientific. This line would flourish after independence in 1918, subject to a greater influence of the United States. In Hungary, the Germanic tradition remained and was developed by noble Catholic gentlemen. Suzana Miovska-Spaseva shows in her chapter on Macedonia the total subordination to Soviet *Pädagogik* after the establishment of a university in 1946, in spite of the conflicts and tensions between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. In Bulgaria, according to Albena Chavdarova, a degree in Philosophy and *Pädagogik* was established in 1904, which was split in 1923 giving place to two chairs, one for *Allgemeine Pädagogik*, and the other for Didactics and Methodology. The professors were men who had received their formation in Austria and Germany and therefore fully identified with the German tradition.

Leaving behind the former Communist countries, Simonetta Polenghi addresses the Italian case. The author shows that the conflict between the Italian state and the Catholic Church favored the predominance of positivism among Italian professors of *Pädagogik*. This trend broke at the beginning of the century with the emergence of a particular pedagogical current: the neo-idealism that began with Benedetto Croce and found its maximum leader in Giovanni Gentile, who reigned over the Italian discipline during the tens and the twenties, even serving as Mussolini's first minister of Education. Followers of *attualismo* were the professors Radice and Condignola. In the thirties, however, *attualismo* saw challenges from two sides: from the Catholic side by Cassoti and Caló and from the modern side by Volpicelli, who collaborated with the Fascist minister Bottai in the late thirties. After the war, there was a change leading to a greater openness to Western modernity with the introduction of Dewey by Borghi and Condignola himself. Polenghi, fortunately, is sensitive to the gender issue and introduces the case of Valeria Benetti Brunelli, whose succession of Lombardo Radice as full professor was postponed. It was not until 1967 that Dina Bertoni Jovine was appointed for a chair.

In Spain the question of gender fared somewhat better, since in 1953 María de los Ángeles Galino won the chair of history of education in Madrid, this being the first chair of any specialty to be occupied by a woman. Gonzalo Jover traces in his chapter the institutionalization

process of Spanish *Pädagogik*, which began with the first university chair established in 1904. Spain experienced a significant delay compared to other countries, as it was a Doctorate chair. There were no undergraduate pedagogical studies at the university, and therefore no chairs, until 1932, shortly before the civil war. After the war, the *Pädagogik* degree was not restored until 1944, and only in Madrid, not in Barcelona. Jover concludes with a very interesting account of the debate between *Pädagogik* and educational sciences and their associated meanings that reflects very well the complex relationship between the two terms that Kudláčová and Rajský point out in the introduction.

Finally, we have the chapter by Vučina Zorić, Ksenija Domiter-Protner and Nataša Vujisić-Živković that takes a completely different approach from those covered so far. First, because it does not address currently existing countries, but rather the former Yugoslavia as a whole, and secondly because its approach to the subject is not general as in the rest of the chapters, but particular to the issue of Dewey's reception. The chapter shows that there were translations of Dewey from before the First World War, but that the most important reception came in 1920 with the translation of Claparede's book on Dewey. In 1934 *Democracy and education* was published, with the title *Democracy and Pedagogics*, surely so as not to break with the *Pädagogik* perspective that was prevalent at the time. The authors stress the close relationship between Dewey and the reform of the education system in the thirties, an element that Kasper and Kasperová have also shown for the Czech case. After the war, and as in the rest of Communist countries, Dewey was despised, his method being described as "a degenerate bourgeois philosophy, especially its theory on teaching" (p. 297), in the words of the new Slovenian pedagogy leader Schmidt, referred to above. However - and this is very interesting and connects with the concern expressed above for continuity -, it was as soon as 1955 when a chapter on general pedagogy presented Dewey with a degree of neutrality. Later in 1970 *Democracy and Education* was republished and manuals on *Pädagogik* expounded on his theories even more objectively, pointing out their long-term influence on school practice.

Notwithstanding the generally positive evaluation of the publication given up to this point, there are a number of criticisms to be leveled at it. As mentioned before, the categories of analysis need further development for the sake of facilitating understanding, as not all authors use the same words

to refer the same thing; at times this becomes confusing. There is also a lack of a clear distinction between what is a university and what is not, as well as clear definition of the role of teacher training in the institutionalization of pedagogy. The difference between pedagogical subjects and an actual degree in *Pädagogik* also needs to be made clearer, as does the institutional question of chairs. At least three ways of referring to this issue by different authors can be found in the book: Departments of *Pädagogik* under the direction of professors, professor of *Pädagogik*, and a professor who teaches *Pädagogik*. Obviously, these expressions are not equivalent. Finally, returning briefly to translation and its problems. The *Geisteswissenschaften* cannot be translated as social sciences, as some authors do, because the terms are opposed and contradictory. In fact, the concept of *Geisteswissenschaften* commonly highlighted the impossibility of a science of the social.

In any case, these criticisms are merely suggestions resulting from enthusiasm and from the wish that this work continue. The main virtue of this book is its capacity for impelling new research; it leaves you wanting more, and I believe this is the best compliment that can be made of an academic book.

### Note on the author

ANTONIO FCO. CANALES (Barcelona, 1966) is Associate Professor of History of Education at the Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Spain). He is a specialist in the history of Spain during the twentieth century, with especial attention to education, gender and science. He is the author of books as *Las otras derechas* (Madrid: Marcial Pons, 2006) and co-editor of *La larga noche de la educación española* (Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva, 2015), *Science Policies and Twentieth-Century Dictatorships* (London: Routledge, 2016) and *Women's Education in Southern Europe. Historical Perspectives (19th-20th Centuries)*, Vol 1-3. (Roma, Aracne, 2017, 2018 and 2019). He has published in journals as *Paedagogica Historica*, *History of Education*, *Gender and Education*, *Revista de Educación*, *Bordón*, *Educación XX1*, *Ayer*, *Historia Social* and *Historia Contemporánea*. He is co-leader of the National Research Project *The boundary between science and politics and science in the boundary: Spanish science, 1907-1975* (FFI2015-64529-P). He is member of the Executives Committees of ISCHE and the Spanish Society of History of Education (SEDHE), and the chief editor of its journal *Historia y Memoria de la Educación*.

## REFERENCES

- Álvarez González, Yasmina. "La pedagogía española bajo el primer franquismo, 1939-1959. Reorientación disciplinar e institucionalización". PhD diss., Universidad de La Laguna, 2019.
- Becher, Tony. *Academic Tribes and Territories: intellectual enquiry and the cultures of disciplines*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press, 1989.
- Canales, Antonio Fco. "From soul to matter: the new Spanish Francoist pedagogy's plunge into experimental pedagogy and the influence of Raymond Buyse". *Paedagogica Historica* 55, no. 3 (2019): 451-469.
- Canales, Antonio Fco. "La política científica de posguerra". In *Ciencia y fascismos: la ciencia española de posguerra*, edited by Amparo Gómez and Antonio Fco. Canales, 105-135. Barcelona, Laertes, 2009.
- Drewer, Peter and Christoph Lüth (eds.). *History of Educational Studies*. Gent: Universiteit, 1998. *Paedagogica Historica* Supplementary 3.
- Gómez Rodríguez, Amparo and Brian Balmer. "Ciencia y política: una cuestión de fronteras". In *Estudios políticos de la ciencia. Políticas y desarrollo científico en el siglo XX*, edited by Amparo Gómez and Antonio Fco. Canales., 15-34. Madrid: Plaza y Valdés, 2013.
- Gómez Rodríguez, Amparo, Antonio Fco. Canales and Brian Balmer. "Science Policy under Democracy and Dictatorship: An Introductory Essay". In *Science Policies and Twentieth-Century Dictatorships. Spain, Italy and Argentina*, edited by Amparo Gómez, Brian Balmer and Antonio Fco. Canales, 1-26. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Gómez Rodríguez, Amparo. "Ciencia y pseudociencia en los regímenes fascistas". In *Ciencia y fascismos: la ciencia española de posguerra*, edited by Amparo Gómez and Antonio Fco. Canales, 13-47. Barcelona, Laertes, 2009.
- Gómez Rodríguez, Amparo. "The 'Social Contract' for Spanish Science before the Civil War". In *Science Policies and Twentieth-Century Dictatorships. Spain, Italy and Argentina*, edited by Amparo Gómez, Brian Balmer and Antonio Fco. Canales, 27-58. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Hofstetter, Rita and Bernand Schneuwly (eds.). *Emergence des sciences de l'éducation en Suisse à la croisée de traditions académiques contrastées. Fin du 19e - première moitié du 20e siècle*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Kudláčová, Blanka and Andrej Rajský (eds.). *Education and "Pädagogik": hilsophical and historical reflections (Central, Southern and South-Eastern Europe)*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2019.
- Stichweh, Rudolf. *Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1994.