

Mobilizing Meaning: Multimodality, Translocation, Technology and Heritage

Geert Thyssen & Karin Priem

Faculty of Language and Literature, Humanities, Arts and Education, Research Unit LCMI, University of Luxembourg, Luxembourg, Grand Duchy of Luxembourg

University of Luxembourg, Campus Walferdange, Route de Diekirch B.P.2, L-7202 Walferdange. E-mail addresses: geert.thyssen@uni.lu, karin.priem@uni.lu.

Geert Thyssen earned his doctoral degree at the University of Leuven and has worked on projects at the University of Maastricht and the University of Luxembourg, where he is presently conducting post-doctoral research with Prof. Dr. Karin Priem. In 2005, he was awarded the Essay Prize and in 2007 the Maurits De Vroede Prize by the British and Dutch History of Education Society, respectively. His interests are in the social-cultural history of education with a focus on the audio-visual and visual, the material, and the spatial, the senses and emotions, health and nutritional education, the 'new' education, and educational reforms in general.

Karin Priem is professor of History of Education. She has been president of the German History of Education Association (2007-2011) and is a member of the international advisory board of the *Educational Review* and the *Revue Suisse des Sciences de l'Éducation*. She is co-editor of the book series *Beiträge zur Historischen Bildungsforschung* (Böhlau, Cologne) and of the *Jahrbuch für Historische Bildungsforschung* (Klinkhardt, Bad Heilbrunn). Her research focuses on the history of educational theories and concepts, the social, visual and material history of education, and the history of curriculum and cultural practices.

Mobilizing Meaning: Multimodality, Translocation, Technology and Heritage

Introduction

This special issue explores how meaning is created, conveyed and transformed through multiple modes of communication, representation and interaction (the textual, the visual, the material, the spatial, the aural, the imaginary, etc.), through movement across spaces; through media and technologies, and, finally, through collective memory- and identity-making. In short, this issue is concerned with meaning mobilized through “multimodality”, “translocation”, “technology” and “heritage”. As such it closely connects to several core dimensions of education, which in the past few decades have undergone a revival of interest in histories of education: visibility, materiality, spatiality, transfer and circulation. Related to these key education dimensions are issues to do with the diffusion of knowledge, values, practices, and ways of seeing, perceiving and feeling across and beyond borders. Such issues were at the heart of a symposium organized at the 34th International Standing Conference for the History of Education (ISCHE), which took place in Geneva in June 2012 in cooperation with the Society for the History of Children and Youth (SHCY) and the Disability History Association (DHA) and addressed the theme of “internationalization in education”.¹

The specific topics addressed in this issue include (1) the promotion, circulation and reception of educational undertakings through annual reports with photographic material distributed by an internationally active charitable institution and through a reading group campaigning for textbook revisions by means of pamphlets and exhibitions (Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers); (2) the changes of meaning undergone through textual and visual representations of displaced children in educational colonies travelling from Republican Spain to Britain and from networks of humanitarian-pedagogical activism to the archives (Roberts); (3) imaginings of artists, educators and policy-makers materialized in school decoration and the latter’s relation to school buildings as well as the education of taste and consumption (Burke); the journey from Germany to The Netherlands of poetry written for children as part of the educational program of the

¹ See: http://www.unige.ch/ische34-shcy-dha/theme_en.html (accessed 28 August 2013).

Enlightenment, its remodelling in function of new perceptions of the child and of forms of citizenship, and its reception and use as illustrated textbooks (Parlevliet & Dekker); and, finally, the educational power of interacting images, material objects, spaces and emotions in different cultural settings as exemplified by the travelling photographic exhibition called *The Family of Man* (Priem & Thyssen).

All of the contributions, as diverse as they might seem at first sight, touch on common aspects of meaning-making, all of which relate to transfer and translation and to their materiality or physicality. These common aspects of mobilization of meaning will be discussed with reference to multimodality, translocation, technology and heritage.

Multimodality

Meaning-making and the modes employed to bring it about refer to cultural practices like seeing, reading and writing, which in turn involve the handling of things and artefacts. In a discipline like the history of books, this focus on materiality has implied a move away from seeing text as a purely linguistic matter to understanding it as something embedded in a physical-material carrier of which both the structure and the organisation affect the meanings readers bestow on it.² Similarly, in visual studies and the history of science, it has been emphasised that images need to be analysed as three-dimensional objects since their physical body and sensorial quality differ in function of the techniques of image-making, the size and format, the levels of abstraction, colour schemes and so on, all of which affect the meanings spectators ascribe to them.³ From such diverse disciplinary perspectives, different ways of conveyance, perception, practice and handling become issues that are intrinsically bound up with what has been termed “multimodality”. Indeed, in all the spheres of social and cultural practice, a multiplicity of communication,

² Roger Chartier and Guglielmo Cavallo, *A History of Reading in the West* (London: Polity Press, 1999). See also: Lynn Fendler and Karin Priem, “Material Contexts and Creation of Meaning in Virtual Places: Web 2.0 as a Space of Educational Research,” in *Educational Research. The Importance and Effects of Institutional Spaces*, eds. P. Smeyers, M. Depaepe and E. Keiner (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013), 177-91.

³ Lorraine J. Daston and Peter L. Galison, *Objectivity* (New York: Zone Books 2007); Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983); Jacques Rancière, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*; Raymond Williams, *The Long Revolution* (on the senses; there is an emotional and sensorial quality if you refer to modality: meaning is produced through different channels the body is able to use).

representation and interaction modes converge to generate meaning. In promoting educational visions, pursuing educational effects, objectifying results of educational programmes, among other things, the role and dynamics of interacting modes of meaning-making (including such modes as the textual, the visual, the material, the spatial, the sensorial, and the bodily) are crucial. For example, from the ways that texts, words, images, spaces, and so on are mobilised in education as catalysts of meaning, intended and unintended learning effects result in that which is mediated and perceived in specific temporal-spatial contexts, through these very processes, is transformed.

The multimodality of teaching, upbringing and learning and its far-reaching implications have yet to be given sufficient attention in the history of education. The research on this subject in the past two decades or so under the umbrella of multimodal studies is still largely confined to the realm of language didactics and linguistics or social semiotics.⁴ To date, little of the work conducted in these disciplines has found its way into the history of education, some exceptions not withstanding.⁵ Even though multimodality research is a fairly recent and still developing field of study,⁶ it has relevance for educational studies in general and for the histories of education in particular,⁷ especially in view of its awareness that modes of meaning-making are “shaped through their cultural, historical and social uses”.⁸ The heightened interest in multimodality across disciplines is at least partly due to increasing dissatisfaction with

⁴ For a brief overview of parallel developments in language didactics and linguistics, see, for instance, Ingrid de Saint-Georges, “La multimodalité et ses ressources pour l’enseignement-apprentissage”, in *“Vos mains sont intelligentes!”: interactions en formation professionnelle initiale*. eds. L. Filliettaz, I. de Saint-Georges and B. Duc (Université de Genève: Cahiers de la section des sciences de l’éducation, 117, 2008), 117-58.

⁵ See, for instance, Carey Jewitt and Ken Jones, “Managing Time and Space in the New English Classroom,” in *Materialities of Schooling: Design, Technology, Objects, Routines*, eds. M. Lawn and I. Grosvenor (Oxford: Symposium, 2005), 201-14.

⁶ The consolidation of this research field is demonstrated by a handbook by Carey Jewitt: Carey Jewitt, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis* (London & New York: Routledge, 2009). Other work surveying this emerging field of inquiry includes Kay L. O’Halloran and Bradley A. Smith, “Multimodal Studies,” in *Multimodal Studies: Exploring Issues and Domains*, eds. K. L. O’Halloran and B. A. Smith (London & New York: Routledge, 2011), 1-3; and Gunther Kress, *Multimodality: A Social Semiotic Approach to Contemporary Communication* (London & New York: Routledge, 2010).

⁷ A recent example demonstrating this is Ingrid de Saint-Georges and Jean-Jacques Weber, eds., *Multilingualism and Multimodality: Current Challenges for Educational Studies* (Series: The Future of Educational Research, vol. 2) (Rotterdam et al.: Sense, 2012).

⁸ Jewitt, ed., *Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis*, 15.

analyses that reduce communication and other forms of meaning-making to the domain of language and discourse. Indeed, multimodality as a concept in itself, “understands communication and representation to be more than about language”.⁹ It instead comprises a “full repertoire of meaning-making resources” used to represent and to create meaning within a set of social and spatial conditions that, in turn (on the side of receivers, consumers or learners), encounter individual selection and “configurations of modes” according to motivation, interest and emotions.¹⁰

While multimodality is not always explicitly addressed in the contributions to this special issue, it manifests itself as an unspoken concern. Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers, for instance, analyse how communities of interpretation are formed around interacting texts, images, objects and spaces across borders in two contexts: in the framework of a Birmingham-based charitable institution (The Children’s Emigration Homes) that sent poor children to receiving homes and families in Canada and Australia, and in the framework of a public education and campaigning body (the Liverpool Community Relations Council) devoted to “educating away ‘prejudice’” against the black community of Liverpool while counteracting “a powerful national master narrative” that silenced key aspects of the city’s migration history. Their article touches on different material conditions or “materialities” of texts and images gathered in reports, books (particularly textbooks), pamphlets and an exhibition, each bearing the imprint of their social contexts of production. Thus, for example, within reports of various lengths (and, therefore, of different material make-up), texts – and “statistics” – were juxtaposed in particular ways with before- and after-photographs. The images are generally of poor quality, but, in the case of the after-photographs produced by a more refined form of bourgeois studio photography cleverly using material props, they supported rhetoric of transformation or progress. Different modes of display thus produced what counted as evidence. Interestingly, texts, numbers or images alone never sufficed to determine constituted “facts”. Indeed, the preferred assembly of modes of representation reveals implicit

⁹ Carey Jewitt, “Multimodality and Digital Technologies in the Classroom,” in *Multilingualism and Multimodality: Current Challenges for Educational Studies*, eds. I. de Saint-Georges and J.-J. Weber, 141. See also, for instance, Carys Jones and Eija Ventola, eds., *From Language to Multimodality. New Developments in the Study of Ideational Meaning* (London & Oakville: Equinox, 2008).

¹⁰ Jewitt, “Multimodality and Digital Technologies”, 142.

assumptions about the power of combined modes of meaning-making and the inability of a single media form to convey “truth”.¹¹

Parlevliet & Dekker, while focussing on children’s poems by Hieronijmus van Alphen and the illustrations by Jacob Buijs that soon accompanied them similarly find that precisely the combination of texts and images within certain material carriers was thought to better convey the pedagogical intentions behind the poems. Bundled images and texts were vehicles employed to display closeness to children’s family environments and their modes of perception. The putting to music of the children’s poems in turn facilitated their interiorisation. Likewise, the spaces in which Van Alphen’s poems were consumed – mainly the family home initially but later on gradually above all the school – added different meanings to the poems. Roberts also alludes to the importance and power of spaces – both literal and “performative” ones – where she investigates documentary photographs (as well as post cards and lantern slides) in a context of humanitarian aid and political activism in which various organizations and actors in Birmingham, Spain and other countries were involved. The images and texts she analyses became part not only of overlapping spheres of propaganda, documentation and memory-making but also of different material constellations, which include archival files, photo binders, reports and pamphlets, each of which affording different possible meanings. Burke shifts attention to architecture, design and decoration. In her contribution, she describes murals and other permanent features of decoration (statues, pillars, etc.) as part of the school fabric in the UK and other countries. As extra-curricular school elements, they were supposed to connect with the world of play of children (in ways similar to Van Alphen’s consideration of children’s senses as readers/viewers) and, at the same time, to cultivate the taste of these primary “spectators as future consumers”. Elements of “The Decorated School”, particularly murals, were sometimes purposely integrated in school buildings, and may have produced powerful effects because of their interaction with them as material in terms of size and colour schemes. Finally, Priem & Thyssen explore a travelling photographic exhibition, *The Family of Man*, as a carefully designed multimodal “theatre of display” that combined exhibition-design elements, texts, lighting,

¹¹ Cf. Geert Thyssen, “Visualizing Discipline of the Body in a German Open-Air School (1923-1939): Retrospection and Introspection”, *History of Education* 36, 2, 2007, 243-60.

spaces, buildings, pace, etc. in an attempt to convey a homogenized, universal view of mankind. The contribution of the intended spectators as consumers and learners is explicitly considered. Their agency is highlighted, as is that of the exhibition-design objects, with reference to the symmetrical anthropology developed by Bruno Latour.¹² In relation to this, it is stressed that meaning-making is always subject to uncertain conditions that can be understood also from a multimodal perspective: indeed learners/spectators/viewers apply different and unexpected modes of meaning-making.

Technology

The modes of meaning-making referred to, of course, depend on technologies and media, which, as Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers suggest, still largely constitute under-researched subjects in the history of education.¹³ Writing, drawing, painting, print and photography among such technologies, take shape materially in media like books, computer files and images. Involving certain epistemic features that organise reading, viewing, listening, and other techniques or practices (employed individually or in public spaces), such media in themselves “contaminate” what they convey.¹⁴ Media, technologies and cultural techniques alike have been studied in ethnography and anthropology as key elements of human culture and have sometimes been associated with the evolution of the human body, the development of skills, and intellectual capacity.¹⁵ Norbert Elias, in his history of the civilisation process¹⁶ and elsewhere, has analysed the transformation of table manners and speech forms as a history of increasing self-control, which needed refined

¹² Bruno Latour, *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

¹³ Cf. Lawn and Grosvenor, eds., *Materialities of Schooling*.

¹⁴ Cf. Marshall McLuhan and Quentin Fiore, *The Medium is the Message* (New York: Random House, 1967).

¹⁵ André Leroi-Gourhan, *Le geste et la parole: Techniques et Langage* (Paris: Albin Michel), 1964.

¹⁶ Norbert Elias, *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen, Erster Band: Wandlungen des Verhaltens in den weltlichen Oberschichten des Abendlandes* (Basel: Verlag Haus zum Falken, 1939); Ibid. *Über den Prozeß der Zivilisation. Soziogenetische und psychogenetische Untersuchungen, Zweiter Band. Wandlungen der Gesellschaft. Entwurf einer Theorie der Zivilisation* (Basel: Verlag Haus zum Falken, 1939). Elias' work is published in English as *The Civilizing Process, Vol. I: The History of Manners* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1969) and *The Civilizing Process, Vol. II: State Formation and Civilization* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1982).

tools and technologies. Technologies are also a central issue in Friedrich Kittsteiner's "*Aufschreibesysteme*",¹⁷ a media history that has associated the invention of new technologies with the notion of a growing web of tools and techniques collecting and inscribing data onto material carriers. In addition, with Peter Burke,¹⁸ one could add that one medium reinforces the other, together with the cultural techniques and practices accompanying them. Finally, Roger Chartier and Guglielmo Cavallo in their history of books have outlined how different forms of textual media, technologies of text design and writing and printing techniques have added substantial meaning to textual messages.¹⁹ All these histories, if not all written by historians, stress the importance of technologies for modes of human action and interaction as well as of the creation of knowledge and meaning.

Every contribution of this special issue connects to issues of technology, media and techniques in one way or another. Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers deal explicitly with them by contrasting different technologies and media of production and display: in their article they reflect upon how the combined technologies of print and photography produced knowledge in two eras: one in which "production and publication were labour intensive, required specialist knowledge and training and so were relatively expensive" and one in which could be witnessed "the ability ... to reproduce text [and images] quickly and cheaply through mimeograph technology". It could be argued that, while the technologies from both of the eras discussed in their article led to the production of media of low quality, this does not automatically imply that these media were less powerful vehicles of meaning-making. However, mimeograph technology as a more "democratic" means of production and display, through editing, enabled more collective authorship and thus broader participation. Roberts, in her account, points to photography (to a minor extent also post-card production and lantern-slide projection) as a communication, surveillance and recording technology. In addition, she points to an important overlooked technology in a figurative sense, namely that of collecting and archiving, which involves processes of selection, ordering and cataloguing. Burke more implicitly touches upon

¹⁷ Friedrich A. Kittler, *Aufschreibesysteme, 1800-1900* (Munich: Fink, 1985).

¹⁸ Peter Burke, *A Social History of Knowledge: from Gutenberg to Diderot* (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2000)

¹⁹ Cf. Chartier and Cavallo, *A History of Reading*.

technologies of production like sculpting and painting, which can be connected to the arts and crafts movement and its discourse on educating aesthetic taste. Related to aesthetics and their conveyance of pedagogical rhetoric, the contribution of Parlevliet & Dekker brings to mind studies pointing out that drawings and prints, when reproduced in black and white, are abstractions of “real” family life.²⁰ Last but not least, Priem & Thyssen bring to the fore the easily overseen but powerful web of exhibition technologies: technologies of display (enlarging, cropping, etc.), montage, lighting and photo reproduction.

Translocation

All such technologies and media relied on the travel and circulation of knowledge in material and immaterial forms for their development, spread and adaptation. Whether they concern educational concepts, textbooks, exhibition sites, photo documentaries of children, ideas, visions and models of school decoration, children’s poems, or charitable reports, as they circulate and cross borders – if only imagined ones²¹ – their meaning changes.²² The very times and spaces in which they appear and move add meanings that exceed any original intent or ontological nature. Production, diffusion and consumption (however fluid the boundaries between these processes may be) and the transforming of meaning that went along with any transfer involved, are, therefore, issues central to all of the contributions to this special issue. The concept of translocation as a meaning-influencing factor, is here intended to blur the boundaries between (naturalized) national borders, origins or belongings, essence and features, etc.²³ Put simply, it points to any kind of moving of texts, images, objects, etc., separately or together, from space to space and time to time and to the changes of meaning that can go along with that moving. Centring on what happens when works of art in visual, textual and material form travel,

²⁰ See, for example, the first chapter in Daston and Galison, *Objectivity*.

²¹ Cf. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London: Verso, 1983).

²² Cf. David Livingstone, “Keeping Knowledge in Site,” *History of Education* 39, no. 6, 783.

²³ See Martin Lawn, “Awkward Knowledge: The Historian of Education and Cross-Border Circulations,” in *Zirkulation und Transformation: Pädagogische Grenzüberschreitungen in historischer Perspektive*, eds. M. Caruso, T. Koinzer, C. Mayer and K. Priem (Cologne: Böhlau, forthcoming). See also Martin Lawn, ed., *An Atlantic Crossing? The Work of the International Examination Inquiry, its Researchers, Methods and Influence* (Oxford: Symposium, 2008).

Rancière offers inspiration for the analysis of *how* processes of transfer affect such “travellers”, *how* reception takes shape, and *how* they form, question and undo existing ways of perceiving, judging and acting.²⁴ The traveling of knowledge, information and facts, objects, images, etc. may be thought of from this perspective as something that creates “dissensus”,²⁵ thereby affecting bodies, minds and souls.

In the article by Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers, which focusses on travelling images, testimonies and descriptions worked rather to suppress any dissensus concerning the displacement of children from one country to another. The authors explicitly mention that this travelling went together with gaps that could have affected the integrity of what travelled and thus the truth or knowledge resulting from it. These gaps gave a convincing form and ethic of aid and humanitarianism to charitable activities, and it could be argued that protagonists of charitable organisations found in converging texts, numbers and photographs appropriate tools not to avoid silences but precisely to sustain them. In this case, the transfer with lack of integrity on the receiving side rather supported existing educational norms and practices imposed upon children of the poor, including transformations of their bodies and minds. By contrast, in the case of reading groups involving Liverpool black communities, gaps in the travel of facts were purposely and productively masked to create new conventions that moved “frontiers of the national imagination”. As is mentioned by the authors, inspiration and resources were thereby drawn from people, ideas and sentiments crossing national and ideological borders. Roberts’ contribution also explores paths of travel of different kinds of charitable reports and photographs, which acquire symbolic meaning across and in close association with the various “performative” spaces created by their production, collection and consumption. Among such spaces, she investigates contexts of propaganda, conservation sites (including memorial archives and libraries as well as files and binders connected in a network of other documents and images), which inevitably influence each other’s interpretation. Importantly, Roberts’ article also shows that space, circulation and transfer become inscribed in visual images through their reference to iconic models that transcend national or ideological boundaries. Parlevliet & Dekker similarly address issues of travel

²⁴ Jacques Rancière, *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics* (London/New York: Continuum, 2011).

²⁵ Ibid.

and reception while investigating processes of patterning, which involved the importation but also the adaptation of children's poems to fit children's everyday environments and their presumed age-specific interests within a context of patriotism. Burke's contribution, in turn, raises questions as to how educational ideals related to the democratisation of art, as it travelled and materialised across countries from commissioning reports to permanent features of school decoration and ex-pupils' spaces of biography. Travelling is also at the centre of the contribution by Priem & Thyssen: the constituents of the exhibition it explores, although coming from various cultural backgrounds, were orchestrated in a theatre of display that fit into the framework of a universalising project of American cultural diplomacy. However, the universal message of the show became disrupted by the local contexts in which it was transposed. Indeed, the show did not so much disrupt local contexts as it was challenged and undone by them. Evidence of this kind undermines common assumptions underlying globalisation theories: all that travels generates dissensus as it becomes anchored in receiving contexts.

Heritage

Another important border is that between history and heritage, the crossing of which results in significant but so far neglected shifts in meaning. When texts, images, artefacts, sites, buildings, design and decoration features, or other remnants of the past enter the realm of heritage from the realm of history, there occur important transformations of meaning. Heritage, rather than being "something" (be it a text, image, object, building, space or particular constellation of such elements), by definition, is an "intangible" process or "performance"²⁶ through which certain aspects of the past, in order to become and remain recognized as such, need to be valued and re-valued in the light of what communities in the present (including scholars in the history of education) find important enough to pass on. While scholars like David Lowenthal have done much to delineate the boundaries between history and heritage, denouncing the perceived present "cult" of

²⁶ Laurajane Smith, *All Heritage is Intangible: Critical Studies and Museums* (Kelpen-Oler: Reinwardt Academy, 2011), 9; Laurajane Smith, "The 'Doing' of Heritage: Heritage as Performance," in *Performing Heritage: Research, Practice and Innovation in Museum Theatre and Live Interpretation*, eds. A. Jackson and J. Kidd (Manchester/New York: Manchester University Press, 2011), 69-81; Marilena Alivizatou, "Intangible Heritage and the Performance of Identity," in *Performing Heritage*, eds. Jackson and Kidd, 82-93.

heritage and its supposedly “nostalgic” devotion to remnants of the past as a form of “false history”,²⁷ heritage processes are by no means outside the domain of historians of education. Not only are they inextricably bound up with archival and museum practices, they are also connected to historiographical selection.

Historians of education themselves contribute to the valuing and revaluing of specific facets of the past, for example, by keeping attention focussed on children’s poems that moved from the sphere of the bourgeois homes of the Enlightenment to the didactic canon of the school up to the present (Parlevliet & Dekker). *Mutatis mutandis*, while disturbing what Eric Hobsbawn has called “invented traditions”²⁸ reiterated in textbooks omitting references to the slave trade and obscuring “rapacious British colonialism abroad [...] and [...] extensive domestic racism” (Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers), historians of education also expose and co-construct “difficult” heritage.²⁹ Nevertheless, although in this domain, as in other disciplines, it is clear that “as social, political, and ideological conditions change, the meanings of the past can also change”,³⁰ to date it has been less reflected upon how also material and epistemic conditions alter the meanings of the past. Such key material and epistemic conditions are involved in archive and museum practices and their curating technologies (collecting, selecting, cataloguing, displaying of exhibitions, etc.), many of which remain hidden³¹ but still add to the formation of the collective memory and identity. The heritage construction accompanying these processes does not always remain excluded from view but is sometimes quite evident from institutions’ names, as Roberts demonstrates in her account of charitable reports and photographs conserved at the International Brigade Memorial Archive and Marx Memorial Library in London. A remnant of the past that has

²⁷ David Lowenthal, *The Heritage Crusade and the Spoils of History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

²⁸ Eric Hobsbawn, “Inventing Traditions”, in *The Invention of Tradition*, eds. E. Hobsbawn and T. Ranger (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 1-2.

²⁹ William S. Logan and Keir Reeves, *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with Difficult Heritage* (London: Routledge, 2008).

³⁰ Paul A. Shackel, foreword to *Ethnographies and Archaeologies: Iterations of the Past* (Series: Cultural Heritage Studies) by Lena Mortensen and Julie Hollowell, eds. (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 2009).

³¹ Ann L. Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton University Press, 2010).

developed from a “theatre of display” to a “theatre of memory”³² is *The Family of Man* exhibition (Priem & Thyssen). Upon this transition from display to collective memory, the exhibit moved from a sphere of US cultural diplomacy and a flexible and modern set of exhibition design to the realm of Luxembourg’s “*lieux de mémoires*”³³ and a high-brow artistic sphere.

Discussion: mobilizing meaning-making

Interactions of text, imagery, material, etc. and what is mediated through them over time in different places are at the heart of education and its didactical strategies of evidence, presentation and representation. Jointly constituting assemblies of representation within culturally loaded temporal-spatial settings, the words, pictures, things, places, etc. assume meaning as they interact multimodally. As constellations, from a didactic-pedagogical perspective, they follow certain epistemologies directing how knowledge and “reality” should be perceived. On the one hand, the ideas, images, materials, sites, etc. put on display in an educational framework already produce meaning by themselves, based as they are on a symbolic order of society. On the other hand, their arrangement and presentation also contribute to, and stimulate, meaning-making on the part of viewers or learners. Multimodality as such provides a research perspective that helps one to understand and analyse the complexities of meaning-making in educational settings.

Multiple modes mobilised in space and time require technologies and tools that, in turn, are contingent on cultural practices and techniques. The latter imply skills relevant for meaning-making and thus for societal participation, as the better they are learned the more indicative they are of competence. This epistemological issue bound up with power thus far remains a neglected domain in the history of education. This is surprising, since the school historically has assumed and (and still assumes) an important role in the teaching/learning of skills needed for the proliferation of technologies and facts that enable participation in the knowledge society’s growing web of meaning-making. Technologies, requiring knowledge and offering different forms of access and agency in

³² Raphael Samuel, *Theatres of Memory: Past and Present in Contemporary Culture* (London & New York: Verso, 1994).

³³ Pierre Nora, ed., *Les lieux de mémoire*, vol. 1-7 (Paris: Gallimard), 1984-1992.

themselves, would need to be researched more profoundly along with the processes of travel connected to them. Indeed, the development and spread of technologies – and thus of cultural practices and techniques – depend on travel, but, inversely, travel also involves technologies in the most physical form. Translocation in the most material forms of travelling goes together with changes and losses of information, which, in the long run, effect archival conditions. Gaps in the archive may, indeed, point to silences surrounding the human and non-human “networks” involved in travel and, through montage, may creatively be given meaning.³⁴ Necessary to consider, however, is the question of whether the silences occurred coincidentally or intentionally. Indeed, the transfer of knowledge and information has sometimes purposely lacked integrity across various education contexts (cf. Macnab, Grosvenor & Myers), which complicates participation in meaning-making (for instance, in the construction of curricula). In each case, further analysis on *how* technologies and travel both mobilise meaning through different modes across spaces and realms could offer new perspectives for histories of education.

In sum, the mobilizing of meaning assumes different qualities, which need to be reflected upon in the history of education in particular and education research in general. How does knowledge travel? In what ways is knowledge that travels and settles down in time and space capable of creating or suppressing dissensus affecting bodies, minds and souls? What technologies allow for participation by undoing hierarchies of meaning-making? These are just some of the questions this issue raises and offers for further inquiry.

Acknowledgments

This special issue, which is the result of collaboration in the most profound sense of the word, owes its existence to the contributors, discussant and participants at a symposium that we, as guest editors, organized at ISCHE 2012. We thank them all and, most explicitly, Ian Grosvenor and Marc Depaepe for their helpful comments. Our gratitude extends also to Louise Jelf for her excellent editorial support and to the assigned reviewers of *Paedagogica Historica* for their careful reading of all contributions. Finally, we would like to thank Edward Haasl for his careful

³⁴ Catherine Burke and Ian Grosvenor, “The ‘Body Parts’ of the Victorian School Architect E.R. Robson or an Exploration of the Writing and Reading of a Life,” in *Rethinking the History of Education: Transnational Perspectives on its Questions, Methods, and Knowledge*, ed. T. Popkewitz (New York: Palgrave, 2013), 201-20.

subediting and the LCMI research unit of the University of Luxembourg for funding the subediting.