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The 19th century in the West was characterised by tremendous enthusiasm for science and education: it saw the rise of a powerful movement for literacy and schooling; pressures for qualifications led to diversification in schools and a growing body of professionals; schooling gradually became an affair of State, each and every one considering that the nation’s future was at stake. In a century enamoured with progress, some regarded science as the tool that could solve the many problems of a society faced with a series of social, political and economic revolutions. Reformist fervour and positivist convictions led to the emergence of impressive modern school systems.

This profound change, which went on throughout the 19th century but became institutionalised mainly in the second half of the century, was not without tensions and contradictions. The spread of education and the building of the so-called teacher State (*Etat enseignant*) were both the object and the result of numerous confrontations between the many social groups involved. These confrontations mainly revolved around questions such as the purpose of education, the definition of content, curriculums and courses, and the choice of teachers and legitimate educational authorities; they had to do with the effectiveness of educational practices and systems and whether they were appropriate for what the public expected and the social and economic needs; they examined the
quality of the theoretical and professional training of the teaching profession and how it should be differentiated according to academic specialisations and systems. By challenging the educational system, these confrontations produced a transformation and called for better knowledge of teaching practices and of how educational systems functioned to ensure that they were pertinent. The construction of the education system was thus closely linked to reformist demands and created the need for internal scrutiny; it was accompanied by an increased demand to develop the theoretical framework of education, creating the need for bodies and institutions specifically mandated to contribute towards this introspection and improve educational practices and structures.

This set the scene for the emergence, at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, of the reformist movements and social institutions relevant to the disciplinary field and on which we focus our attention in this volume.

As the teacher State emerged and as its educational structures were consolidated, reformist pressures assumed new forms and made new demands, notably through a variety of social movements rallying behind a multitude of banners. Across this diversity, there was an analogous denunciation of the educational practices in the state school system as being unsuited to the specific needs of children. In this introduction, we use the generic term «New Education» to refer to this reformist wave, which its most prominent exponents, seeking to gain acceptance, themselves readily designated under this all-embracing term.¹

¹ We use «New Education» as a generic term to denote a complex, multiform movement for educational reform, which can be said to be an attribute of all efforts towards systematic education (Oelkers, 2004), but which took on a more tangible form after initial consolidation of national education systems in Europe and the USA in the last third of the 19th century. It is linked to such emblematic terms as, in French Education nouvelle (Haenggeli-Jenni, 2004; Ohayon, Ottavi & Savoye, 2004) and Ecole active (Hameline, Jornod & Belkaïd, 1995); in English, Progressive Education and also New Education (Cremin, 1961; Selleck, 1968; Norris, 2004); and in German, Reformpädagogik (Oelkers, 1989). For a perspective of the German and French movements (Hameline, Helmchen & Oelkers, 1995; Helmchen, 1995 and 1999) and the spread of the movement to other countries and continents (Röhrs & Lenhart, 1994). The movement came to an end, in its visible and conflictual form, shortly after the Second World War (Cremin, 1961; Savoye, 2004), but it is now the dominant doctrine, diluted admittedly, of all pedagogic thinking.
Simultaneously, there was an increase in initiatives to raise education to the status of a science endowed with social and institutional structures appropriate for a scientific discipline: courses, chairs, degrees, diplomas, communication networks. In this introduction, we use the generic term «Educational Sciences» to denote the nascent disciplinary field\(^2\), with its vague and shifting contours and its multidisciplinary references, hence the choice of the plural.

A CONCEPT FOR AN INVESTIGATION
OF THE COUPLE NEW EDUCATION – EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

Closely interwoven and sometimes confused, these two phenomena are also riven by tensions and contradictions, which were deliberately oversimplified in the initial plan for this volume\(^3\) to stimulate debate. Free to

\(^2\) The disciplinary field – we use this term with the backdrop of Bourdieu’s theory (2001) – has numerous other names, a mark of its changing, hybrid nature: educational sciences, educational studies, educational research, Erziehungswissenschaft, Pädagogika, onderwijswetenschappen, to which others with greater historical connotations could be added, such as paedology, child science, experimental pedagogy. It was based on Herbartianism but also, in opposition to this theory then dominant, took diverse forms at an international level (for a particularly discriminating discussion: Corian & Winkler, 1998). Its various forms are described in detail in monographs such as those by Brezinka (2000), Gautherin (2002), Tenorth (1989), Novoa (1987) or Lagemann (2000) for their respective countries. The exhaustive study by Depaepe (1993) and collaborative works (Zedler & König, 1989; Drewek & Lüth, 1998; Horn, Németh, Pukanszky & Tenorth, 2001; Hofstetter & Schneuwly, 2002) bring out the similarities and differences in the evolution of the disciplinary field in different cultural and historical contexts.

\(^3\) The plan for this volume was proposed as a basis for discussion at a symposium organised by the coordinators of the present work as part of the 26th Conference of the International Association for the History of Education (ISCHE26) held in Geneva in July 2004 under the title New Education and Educational sciences. The tumultuous relations of an indissociable and irreconcilable couple (end of 19th-first half of 20th century). This collaborative work brings together several of the papers presented in a first version at that symposium, but also includes other investigations conducted by specialists in this subject from diverse geographical, cultural and disciplinary backgrounds.
choose contexts, sources and content, the authors were invited to focus their attention on the crucial period that saw these two first emergence as social movements and their first institutional organisation both outside and at the heart of official institutions (end of the 19th – first half of the 20th century).

The couple New Education and Educational Sciences seems to be both inseparable, intrinsically linked and of an amazing fecundity, yet irreconcilable, mutually contradictory in a number of their presuppositions and characteristics.

From the turn of the century and during the first decades of the 20th century, New Education was closely associated with the quest for a new understanding of children, or a new science of the child, arguing for better (re)cognition of children and the laws of their development. Preoccupied with the desire to change educational practices so that greater consideration could be given to the distinctive nature of childhood, the architects of New Education sought confirmation and enrichment in that science, seen as an authoritative source of proof of ancestral intuitions and of hope for renewed interest in education. Science was thus summoned to give legitimacy to the movement’s theories on a sound, objective, scientific basis. Simultaneously, the instigators of New Education maintained an ambivalent relationship with established learning (educational theories, scientific disciplines, school curriculums, etc.), or its representatives (in universities, school authorities), that could almost be described as a kind of anti-intellectualism.

Reciprocally, the disciplinary field of Educational Sciences – i.e. all disciplines and researchers whose subject is the study of the child and education – as it developed from the end of the 19th century drawing inspiration from empirical or even experimental paradigms, also had a vested interest in New Education. A number of its protagonists were decisive figures who upheld the principles of radical school reform and considered New Education as their field of practical experimentation, where colleagues in daily contact with children could test and support their theories. These educationalists seemed to find in New Education a social legitimacy for the science they were attempting to build. Sometimes the scientific intention gave way to the reforming intention, these builders of a new pedagogy seeming themselves carried away by their fervour, albeit positivist.

The articles in this volume can be read as a series of investigations – with sometimes similar, sometimes complementary approaches and concepts – explaining the nature of the relations between New Education and Educational Sciences. The purpose of this introduction is to discuss them in outline. It focuses on three dimensions that emerge in all of
the articles in this volume and that are especially conducive to a new understanding of the remarkable relations at work between New Education and Educational Sciences. Firstly we are interested in the key individuals and groups mentioned in the contributions, and in finding out more about their profiles, where they belong, what they were committed to and the institutional contexts in which they developed and which they helped to create and transform. We then focus our attention on the key contents or notions at the core of the relationship between New Education and Educational Sciences. On the basis of the texts collected here and as an overture to other researches, we then sketch out an international map of the prototypical relations between the two entities under study: a map of projects and institutionalisations, but also of disappointments and even acts of destruction.

**Profiles and Missions of the Protagonists and Institutions: Convergences and Divergences**

This story has numerous protagonists – individuals, groups, institutions. What are their profiles and mandates? How are they integrated socially and institutionally? What relations do they maintain? What bodies and institutions give life and substance to the Educational Sciences and New Education and in which areas do the relations of this couple work for or against them? With an abundance of great figures, this history – which its protagonists constructed and deconstructed over the years – is told intentionally in the singular. The contributions in this volume shed light on the pioneering role played by the different protagonists or groups. Although a first reading may initially give the impression that these diverse protagonists were united in their commitment to the cause of both the new science of the child and educational reform, a closer look reveals obvious contradictions between individuals, between groups of protagonists, and between movements. The encounter, or romance, to use the expression of Labarre, was not without its tensions and even divorces.

---

4 Although our introduction is intended as an overview of the contributions here, we do not quote them systematically for ease of reading. When a particular expression, idea or thought is mentioned, we occasionally refer to the article simply by the name of its author in italics, considering that the reader will have no difficulty finding the article concerned.
In the first place, we will comment on those who worked to build this new science of the child, with its variety of terms and its complex fluctuating boundaries: Blonski, Bovet, Ch. Bühler, Claparède, Dewey, Fischer Hall, Katzarov, Kenyères, Meumann, Piaget, Thorndike, to mention those given dominant roles in the contributions here. With diverse disciplinary backgrounds – philosophers, doctors, psychologists, teachers – these protagonists belonged to learned and academic networks and conducted many researches in education using experimental and/or experiential methodologies. But at the same time, all were also engaged in field work, setting up places for experiments in education, helping to train professionals (teachers, educators, administrators), supporting the administration for improving the system. Their scientific work thus feeds on their practical work and experiments and vice versa. Indeed the scientific work and the commitment to the «educational cause» was, for them, two sides of the same coin. Thoroughly convinced that a new science was to be built, nearly all of the protagonists helped create institutions that give substance to the disciplinary field, generally in the form of institutes of research and university or quasi-university education, scientific reviews and associations. In this, they were often supported by the teaching profession, the training of which they undertook (Criblez; Hofstetter, Schneuwly, Lussi & Haenggeli-Jenni; Nemeth; Stefanov & Terziyska), and by school administrations (Brehony; Goodchild; Labaree), all sharing the idea that the scientific approach was the only path to effective progress and action. However, behind this apparent joint commitment to a single cause lay diverging points of view and expectations occasioning as many tensions and conflicts, which are examined in several of the contributions. The people mentioned above clearly favoured the psychological approach to educational phenomena, the educational and sociopolitical presuppositions of which represented one of the major stumbling blocks, if only with the representatives of state education, battling as they were with social questions calling for other approaches and points of view as well. And although the men of science readily maintained that their analysis of teaching practices and systems was objective and rational, the descriptive approach usually tended to become prescriptive; facts could be set up as norms and norms presented as deduced from facts, combining science and militancy, both at the heart of their educational commitment.

Outstanding among the other protagonists of this history are those Savoye called the «specialists of education»: senior officials, those responsible for state educational institutions, even teachers (notably Châtelet...
and Gal, Messmer and Schneider, Parker and Whitney, Rouma). They could be considered as mediators between the disciplinary field and the educational field, both of which had a part to play in the reforms of state schooling and professional training institutions. Their functions led them to base their discourse on progressive pedagogic thought, the new science of the child in particular, the orientations of which defined their own pedagogic action. Thus, it was not unusual for a synergy to exist between the official school structures themselves and the institutions of the disciplinary field; or for a specialist in education to be given a mandate at the head of the latter, if only to ensure that the research would serve state schools or school administrations better. Certainly there was a risk at times of conditioning the orientations of the research and of evaluating it by its practical efficiency, or even its conformity with social, professional and political biases; there was also a risk of not meeting the expectations aroused by expertise based on the disciplinary field; even a risk that science would «suck the lifeblood» (Savoye) from New Education.

Also encountered in the texts in this volume are those working for educational reform within multiple movements and networks, who present themselves as the avant-garde of New Education (which Goodchild called European New Education): among numerous others, the initiators of the classic English experiments at Abbotsholme and elsewhere; those of the German Landerziehungsheime, then the Odenwaldschule; Desmolins, Cousinet and the leaders of the Groupe Français d’Education Nouvelle; and of course the trio Ensor, Ferrière and Rotten of the New Education Fellowship, zealous propagators of the new schools. For them, the reference to the disciplinary field could seem more ideological than factual; certainly, they used the reference theories and scientific investigations to confirm their pedagogic intuitions; and found the institutions of the disciplinary field – research and training institutes, reviews, associations – receptive to their reflections, discussions and debates. However, the institutions they created and promoted were vested as objects of reflection and even as fields of experimentation and represented above all places of exchange and forums of propaganda for all the other protagonists. Several contributors shed light on the special work done by the educational psychoanalysts or psychoanalytic educators (among those working with children, Adler, Bernfeld, A. Freud, Isaacs, V. Schmid, but also, working with educators themselves, Allendy and Berge). While uniting behind a clearly identified disciplinary approach, but without the benefit of full academic recognition, they also helped to build new
pedagogic theories and experiences on the fringe of the state school system, in children’s clinics or even parents’ associations (Becchi; Ohayon). Although these institutions undeniably constituted laboratories of educational revival, if only because of their originality and belief in progress, in their hour of success, when their instigators were the focus of attention and attracting a growing following, it was not unusual for progressivism to become doctrinaire and for these figureheads, in their effort to gain acceptance, to indulge in ruthless intestine battles, some of which would be the death knell of their achievements.

But the resolute commitment of these protagonists with countless others waiting in the wings also had an influence on the great educational experiments carried out in socialist progressive political contexts in Europe and reported in the publications of the New Education Fellowship: Hamburg, Moscow and Vienna were among the leading lights (Brehony). And in the USA, during the intensive reforms of the school system, notably in secondary education, they became the principal reference for curricula and systems administration if not the basic ideology for the system itself. Was it mainly a question of rhetoric, since practices in fact developed relatively little (Labaree)? Or was it a more subtle change, all the more potent because it was more widespread, tending to subject all social and educational concepts and practices to the diktat of rationality (Popkewitz)?

«THE CHILD AT THE CENTRE»:
A NETWORK OF IDEOLOGICALLY CONSISTENT CONCEPTS

In the decades at the centre of these investigations there was a paradigm shift. While the 19th century in the West carried the imprint of Herbartianism (Goodchild; Németh; Oelkers; Stefanov & Terziyska), an educational doctrine orientated towards knowledge serving education, we see at the turn of the century the gradual emergence of a functional or pragmatic model. This appears as a series of interrelated tendencies that do not form a coherent whole but can be treated as a group of theories with converg-

---

5 The contradictions between Dewey and Thorndike are clear (Labaree); and one could not place Claparède (Hofstetter and al.) and Meumann (Criblez) on one hand, and the psychoanalysts (Ohayon; Becchi) or Rouma (Ottavi) on the other, all under the same banner.
ing themes and basic concepts. Two expressions, quoted in the contributions, describe it particularly well. The first advocates «placing the child at the centre» of education and the school. Not that this had been lacking previously, as its exponents claimed, since all teaching and school systems are of course defined with «pupils» in mind. But this postulation suggests the possibility and the necessity of perceiving teaching as being conditioned and defined essentially by «the child» – a significant change in vocabulary – adapted to its development, its needs, even its wishes. Thus stated, it was perhaps effectively a «Copernican revolution» (Claparède). It follows – and this is also the presupposition – that there was a need to construct both a science of teaching (and education) and «a science of the learner» (and learning, memory, motivation, etc.), such as Cribléz formulated in synthesis on paraphrasing Meumann’s theory.

This paradigm shift⁶ constitutes the shared ideological and conceptual basis of the nascent disciplinary field and New Education, a pair whose «marriage» thus becomes firmly rooted in a solid foundation. It materialises and develops in a number of central themes that can be traced through the present texts.

A first theme is skilfully unveiled by Hall, then taken up, clarified and reinvented in different forms by authors as varied as Baldwin, Ch. Bühler, Claparède, Katzarov and Piaget, to mention some of those referred to in the contributions. In essence it is the description or explanation of the development of the child. Considered as natural and individual, driven by functional mechanisms, this development must be the reference point of all educational activity. There appears here what could be called a «functionalist» view of education, making up the core of the pragmatic approaches now predominant: learning can happen in significant situations that respond to a basic function of the child, notably play, and, in a wider sense, the daily situations of life; a functionalist view that can also take the more radical form of utilitarianism.

A second theme has to do with what Meumann defined as analysis of the «work of the pupil»: fatigue, memory, forms of learning. While the first theme has a principal underlying methodology of observation and description, this second one relies more on experimental processes and measurements, forming the core of what could be called experimental

⁶ This change has been analysed often. We note among numerous others: Charbonnel (1988); Oelkers (1995); Cremin (1961). Goodchild shows here, through the courses given, how this change took place in teacher training institutions.
education as Meumann understood it, but also Claparède, Katzarov and others.

The third theme is centred on the definition and determination of aptitudes, understood as the natural potential of each child. It is closely associated with the presupposition of adapting education to the needs and capacities of the child and also regulating the flow of pupils in school systems. It is from this point of view an essential element in enabling school planning; it is also supposed to propose instruments for adapting teaching, a principle dear to New Education and closely related to the differentiation of the school system it supports while making that differentiation possible.

Closely related, by its concept of the child as a being developing naturally, yet set apart by its conceptual apparatus and processes, our final theme, psychoanalysis, offers a theoretical framework which is structured mainly around questions of moral education and educational standards (Ohayon), an area in which the Educational Sciences also have an interest, that can be empirical (Bovet, Piaget notably), theoretical (all the protagonists at one time or another) and more practical (see the experience with new schools) (Becchi).

In a way, these four themes form a whole by their common reference to psychological methodologies and theories and by the orientation of their ideas towards the individual. The psychological paradigm – we have seen it emerge institutionally wherever the Educational Sciences were developing – undoubtedly represented the ideological core of the approach. Popkewitz proposes a broader social interpretation, constructing a society based on science and education which, while being more democratic, includes a dimension of control over what the child and the family should be, effectively rejecting diversity in social and cultural affiliations in favour of a unifying cosmopolitanism, which does not avoid mechanisms of exclusion, even among teachers. And it is without doubt precisely the individual and a-historical approach of the child as being essentially psychological that enables this transformation, marginalising approaches such as that of Rouma, which attempts to root the subject in his or her social place (Ottavi).

This powerful fundamental idea constructed around the child-individual was systematically tested in experimental educational institutions under the aegis of representatives of the Educational Sciences themselves: the Laboratory School in Chicago, the Maison des petits in Geneva, the Experimental School in Sofia, the Referendenschule in
Budapest, not to mention the great educational experiments in the Soviet Union and Vienna. These experiences followed in the wake of the processes and values advanced by the reformist movements, and helped to enrich and conceptualise them, making it possible, at least potentially, to transpose and extend them: learning by activity, working in groups, participation by pupils, self-government, individualisation of learning, physical and creative activities. These institutions were also characterised by a concept of research that included the practitioners, carried out in the field by practical experimentation and its systematic observation.\(^7\)

The paradigm shift that we have just outlined as it appears in the contributions also contained a certain concept of knowledge. Broadly speaking, knowledge must firstly correspond and respond to the needs of the child; it must be useful socially; defined by the negative also, it is supposed to generate fatigue and surmenage. Bookish knowledge is replaced by a preference for specific activities, notably corporeal, physical and manual activities, and organised leisure activities: the skholē – studious leisure, leisure of studies – would it become otium – leisure of play and activities orientated by need and desire? A deliberately provocative interpretation of course; but it would really seem that pedagogic reflection from the point of view of knowledge, at the centre of the Herbartian approach, gave way to a reflection focusing on actual forms of learning and teaching and on defining the content of teaching from the point of view of the needs of the child and, for older learners, from the point of view of social utility. The educational value of knowledge as a theme disappears. A certain ambivalence to, even distrust of formal scholarly and cultural knowledge can even be detected. This can be interpreted as a paradox for professionals of the science and of education living by books and teaching; also as a reaction to the intensive formalism of the school system criticised; equally as an effect of a romantic view of childhood that does not deny the common precursor and is commonly accepted by protagonists of both the disciplinary field and educational reforms: Rousseau.

---

\(^7\) Dewey proposed a model of the most representative ones, citing it in his assessment of the Soviet experience and with Shatsky (*Brehony*) in particular.
ELEMENTS OF A MAP: LASTING ACQUIRED KNOWLEDGE, BEYOND THE PROMISES, INSTITUTIONALISATIONS AND ACTS OF DESTRUCTION

The contributions collected here also make up an interesting geographical and historical map. We sketch it, leaving aside local or marginal experiences that nevertheless nurtured the general movement, as we have seen. The USA stands out for the strong development of both progressive education and educational research. Teacher training was established at university level in response to the drive for qualifications and «cosmopolitanism», furthering substantial development in educational research. The university research configurations described by Goodchild are evidence of this, and also show the predominance of psychological approaches over others, notably history and pedagogic thinking. This development had a powerful influence on the revision of study programmes and school organisation. According to the contributions, it did not seem to have teachers as a central social base, although the protagonists were united by a common romantic ideology apropos of what schools and teaching could and should be.

The development of research in Europe seems to have interacted much more closely with teachers, notably primary teachers, who milti-tated for improvement in their status and for school reform inspired by the principles of New Education. The movement began in most countries at the turn of the century and before the First World War. The outcome of this conflict had different repercussions in different contexts; in German speaking regions, reforming and empirical tendencies faded or disappeared, the German defeat seemed to generate a return to more traditional values: «the strange German case» (Oelkers; and for the German-speaking Swiss Criblez), although there were local experiments, sustained by teachers and accompanied by educational research (Hamburg; Vienna). Elsewhere, however, the inter-war period gave rise to an unprecedented explosion of activity in education, it being seen as the instrument of international solidarity and intellectual co-operation. This was the case notably in Austria, Bulgaria, Hungary, French-speaking Switzerland, the Soviet Union, and even, in a slightly different form, in France. Again in the early thirties, we see further institutionalisation of both reforms and empirical research; this movement now results less from initiatives by practitioners, whose professional and educational
ambitions were stifled by the crisis of the 30s, than from those by admin-
istrations or even experts who in a way established reform as a perma-
nent institution. The result, as we know, was tragic: the Ständestaat in
Vienna, Stalinism in Moscow, and regime change in Hungary and Bul-
garia put a sudden end to numerous experiments in New Education and
institutions of the disciplinary field.

But beyond these interruptions, acquired knowledge endured. After
the Second World War, marginal experiences and educational networks
gained new impetus (Becchi; Ohayon), educational systems reformed,
incorporating many ideas from New Education (Savoye), although they
did resist «re-education» (Oelkers). Scientific institutions endured
through the century (Goodchild; Hofstetter and al.) and new ones were cre-
ated following the path traced out between the wars. A new era began
that saw the psycho-pedagogic paradigm and concentration on the
learner become entrenched in educational reform and the Educational
Sciences. As its basic principles became established in the surrounding
discourse, if not in the educational practices and systems, New Educa-
tion became, in a sense, part of the official system; mixed with the very
system it strived to transform. Meanwhile, of course, the Educational
Sciences had perhaps found their own new partner: the administration.
A new relationship was established, the subject of a new field of
research, briefly outlined in some contributions.

The present work is divided into two parts. The first contains contribu-
tions that explore the relationship between Educational Sciences and
New Education, with emphasis on the former. The institutions, the prin-
cipal protagonists, the processes and key ideas of the scientific
approaches to education are examined from the viewpoint of their rela-
tionship with New Education: foundation, support, confusion, tension...
Focusing on German-speaking Switzerland, Criblez shows how the
alliance between the scientific field and professional field was built
around school reform, only to unravel after the First World War. Good-
child traces the origins of educational research in North American
teacher training curricula, shaped increasingly by progressivism. 
Hofstetter, Schnewly, Lussi & Haenggeli-Jenni describe the development
of one of the oldest Educational Science institutions in Europe, stressing
that the scientific then militant commitment to New Education was the
condition for the emergence of the field, then, in an about-turn, the
abandoning of militancy conditioning the permanent institutionalisation
of the disciplinary field. At a more general level, Popkewitz describes the progressivism dominant in the scientific approaches to education and in education itself as a plan for both democratisation and control in the USA. Németh follows the development in Hungary of the Educational Sciences as they distanced themselves from traditional education, initially outside academia, in close association with New Education, then within it, oddly as a result of a conservative initiative. Oelkers analyses the strange development in Germany in which experimental pedagogy and its allies, notably teachers agitating for reform, just managed, after the First World War, to institutionalise on a large scale, only to succumb to a pedagogy inspired by traditional and anti-empirical values. Stefanov & Terziyska finally show how educational research in Bulgaria was opened up to lasting institutional development, closely linked to what was happening in Switzerland, Germany and France, contributing actively there, in a social context long favourable to educational reform.

The contributions in the second part explore more closely the reforming or progressive educational context that permitted, sustained, even conditioned, in both senses of the word, the emergence of the Educational Sciences. These responded to demands, were reflected in the discourse for change, and became directly involved in practices, experiences and reforms that constituted true laboratories of educational research and theorisation. Thus, Becchi enumerates the many experiences of new schools in Europe where psychoanalysis was in some way practised and discusses the principles governing them. Brehony analyses how the New Education movement was interpreted by the grand socialist inspired educational experiments in the USSR, Hamburg and Vienna, and their relations with the Educational Sciences. Labaree recounts the history of the romance between educational progressivism and teacher training institutions, dominating the discourse, and their tragic impotence when faced with the administrative progressivism associated with the great quantitative researches, dominating the management of schools and study programmes. Centred on the French debates on moral education in the 1930s, Ohayon shows that psychoanalysis was heavily involved, indeed in a highly contradictory manner, more or less open to new experiments in education. Through the example of Georges Rouma, Ottavi reveals an approach to education, inspired by experiences in non-European educational contexts, that stresses the cultural integration of the individual and the consequences of this bias for scholastic institutions. Analysing the important school reforms begun in France by the Popular
Front, Savoye goes back to the sources that made them possible, these being, on one hand, the experiences of new schools and the New Education movement and, on the other, the work of educational specialists.
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