N. W. Sobe, "Embodied Knowledge and the Nation: The School Field Trip" in Irving Epstein (Ed.) Recapturing the Personal: Education, Embodied Knowledge and Comparative Inquiry (Greenwich, Connecticut: Information Age Publishing, 2006) p. 143-162.

CHAPTER 7

EMBODIED KNOWLEDGE AND THE NATION

School Field Trips

Noah W. Sobe

The educational field trip challenges the model of the school as an enclosed space in a number of respects. Particularly noteworthy is the departure from the rectangular classroom that has historically been the chief feature of the modern school. The classroom is, after all, where the real and truly consequential business of schooling occurs. Regardless of current fads and design impulses, corridors, playgrounds, entrances, and even auditoriums are ultimately ancillary to a school's classrooms. In something of a contrast to the pedagogues of antiquity and the tutors of the renaissance and the early modern period, teachers in the modern school oversee enclosed spaces. Whereas it is not unusual to find the educational figures of these earlier eras visually represented and read about as leading their charges through public spaces and across terrain, the

Recapturing the Personal: Essays on Education and Embodied Knowledge in Comparative Perspective, 143–162

overwhelming majority of nineteenth- and twentieth-century school teachers have discharged their fundamental duties in their classrooms. In large part, modern educators have seen the idea of learning-as-a-journey expressed as no more than a metaphor (albeit as a guiding metaphor in many cases).

If the school field trip is an exception, then it serves to prove the rule. How else to explain the appeal of school journeys and excursions to self-styled progressive reformers, thoughtful and outlandish, for more than a century. What better way to inject something new into the old than to visit a dairy farm or to convene a high school in a VW microbus. Nonetheless, it can also be noted that beyond the ways that the school field trip challenges the model of the modern enclosed classroom in practical terms, these forms of student mobility also challenge the analytic or theoretical organization of schooling. The institutional organization of school spaces enables the exercise of what Michel Foucault would term disciplinary power. Modern schooling becomes a site of governing individuals and populations because its enclosures order and normalize. In the panoptic analytic, spatial visibilities reform individuals. In these spaces, secularized self-scrutiny and correction to a norm become internalized. The question stands as to whether educational travel outside of the classroom represents an extension of these dynamics or divergence from them.

Some recent scholarship on Foucault and education has turned to Foucault's phrase "dangerous coagulations" as an aid to thinking about the organization of analytic space around the use of Foucault in educational research (Baker & Heyning, 2004). Foucault speaks of disciplinary machinery working to effect precise distributions and the proper organization of individuals, which include the elimination of their "unusable, dangerous coagulations." It is in such governing strategies that Foucault can situate the "anti-desertion, anti-vagabondage, anti-concentration" tactics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Foucault, 1979). Seen in terms of individuals and human bodies, dangerous coagulations are the unsafe assemblies that clot social arteries and disrupt "proper" forms of circulation. This idea is useful for thinking about the disciplining of unruly bodies as well as the forms of resistance that such bodies generate. The instability and potential social and cultural "dangers" that field trips represent was pointed out to me in the mid-1990s on a Polish tram car. A troop of fifth graders returning from a field trip was well into turning the rear of the car into their own jungle gym. The supervising teacher, clearly reacting to the disproving glances being cast her way by other passengers, called forth her "teacher voice" and announced to all on the car, "please, ladies and gentlemen, note that these are not *my* children, but rather *your* children." This comment beautifully speaks to social anxieties about youth behavior, school decorum, and the social expectations for teachers

specific to Poland's immediate postcommunist period. Yet, it also signals a broader point about the dangerous massing of bodies that can occur when practices of teaching and learning are transferred from their institutional enclosures to more fluid public spaces that have their own (and potentially different) systems/technologies of governance and contestation.

In general terms, one objective of this chapter is to draw attention to the ways that discrete elements of educational practice can be usefully studied by comparative education scholars.[1] The research I discuss here focuses on school field trips and their relation to the construction of national identities. It is informed by what is now a well developed corpus of work on travel and travel texts crossing multiple fields (Bartkowski, 1995; Baranowski & Furlough, 2001; Clifford, 1997; Endy, 1998; Kaplan, 1996; Koshar, 2000; Leed, 1991; Pratt, 1992; Rojek & Urry, 1997; Urry, 1990) and increasingly crossing into educational scholarship (Barnett & Phipps, 2005; McCulloch & Lowe, 2003). An embodied knowledge perspective, as Irving Epstein discusses in the introduction to this volume, is a key dimension of this chapter, in that I look specifically at the material process of embodiment involved in the formation of national sensibilities through educational practice. A starting point of the analysis is the view that what is said and what is done are not in essence dichotomous: thought and action do not necessarily afford two usefully separable analytic tracks. In coming to understand national identities one cannot take a strictly cognitivist perspective and see national identity formation as exclusively a matter of the intellectual content that is transferred in school lessons and textbooks. Analytic concepts such as performativity and habitus must also be drawn upon, and in fact they become essential for illuminating the national ways of acting and thinking that educational practices inscribe on the bodies of schoolchildren. One avenue for looking at the embodiment of national knowledge can readily be found in the formal curricula, official textbooks, and other educational practices that occur in the classroom. While this route has considerable critical utility, the strategic approach of this chapter is to look at the national fashioning and positioning of bodies that occurs outside the classroom on school field trips. The advantage of this strategy is that the interactional and contested nature of embodied national knowledge quickly comes into high relief in public spaces and in conditions of mobility. This strategy also lets us direct attention to technologies of social governance present within and without institutional enclosures. Here, these technologies are the educational practices that help to enable sets of inclusions and exclusions, definitions of stasis and flow, discrimination between proper assemblies and dangerous coagulations, and, in conjunction, a knowledge of the nation and its others.

The chief comparative exercise in this chapter is a diachronic comparison[2] of several school field trips of Serbian students to the Banat/Vojvodina region.[3] I will examine instances from 1920, 1925, and 2001 of multiday student travel to the north-eastern regions of the country known in the 1920s as the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, and as the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia 80 years later.[4] Archival research uncovered documentation of the first two field trips. The latter one I took part in as a firsthand participant-observer/researcher somewhat foolishly interested in experiencing an actual school excursion while spending a year conducting historical research on student and teacher travel in Yugoslavia of the 1920s and 1930s. In each of these instances, national belonging emerged as a major theme. The field trips can be seen as providing opportunities for constructing, performing, and reflecting upon national identities. Also making it significant to consider these three particular field trips alongside one another is that they occurred in the aftermath of (and shadow of) military conflict. The students traveling in the early 1920s were traversing a region that had only become Serbian territory in the border recalibrations that accompanied the end of World War I.[5] The 2001 travels were barely 2 years removed from the U.S.-led NATO bombings and having an American traveling with the group brought issues of national identity into high resolution on more than one occasion.

Yet, the comparative gesture here is more than to look at several cases separated by the passage of time. I would maintain that the national travels of students ought to be treated as one among many significant research issues in the field of comparative and international education (for both historical and present-day research). The traveling student who discovers a nation through his or her wanderings is a cultural commonplace across Europe in the late nineteenth and well across the twentieth century. A classic text in this area is the 1877 children's book *Le Tour de la France par Deux Enfants* which recounts the travels of two children orphaned during the Franco-Prussian war (Fouillée, 1976). Written under the pseudonym G. Bruno, this tale describes a journey around France; it can be seen as a story of mourning for France's loss of Alsace-Loraine and a narrative of the consolidation or closer integration of the remaining regions of the country. Following in a similar vein is Selma Lagerlöff's 1906-07 *Nils Holgerssons underbara resa genom Sverige* (translated into English as *The Wonderful Adventures of Nils*) which recounts the fantasy travels of a young boy who explores natural and industrial sites across Sweden (Rantatalo, 2002). Nils, like the French child travelers, was an orphan, an element that imbues the discovery of a national fatherland/motherland with a particularly strong sense of belonging. These two books are signature texts of a children's literature genre that appears with some frequency in classroom readers. Alongside such pedagogical texts, stand the actual school field trips that also have played (and continue to play) their part in inscribing national ways of acting and thinking on schoolchildren. And, it is to such travels and the instabilities, negotiations, and circuits of inclusion and exclusion that accompany them, that we now turn.

Vojvodina/Banat, 1920

> Before evening we were in Vršac. Already at the train station we enjoyed a pleasant surprise: an encounter with sympathetic brothers and sisters. What joy for us! Pupils from all the schools had come and brought a great number of tri-colored Serbian flags which they enthusiastically waved. The Director of the Serbian High School Mr. Ilija Marčetić offered us some warm words, to which our trip leader responded in turn.
> –You are our first guests following the heroic Serbian army which brought us freedom, said the Director
> –We came to get better acquainted with our brothers, who were and always will remain in one spirit [*duša*] with those of us from beleaguered mother Serbia, replied our leader. (see note 6, p. 30)[6]

The student essay in which this conversation was recounted was published in the 1920/21 report of the Belgrade Women's Normal School [*Ženska učiteljska škola*]. It was not unusual that such a travelogue would appear in the 20-40 page pamphlets that Yugoslav schools issued annually. And, the fact that this particular text received official imprimatur makes it all the more useful for identifying the normative principles and expectations that structured the school-organized travels of this group of teachers in training. The recent war and the changes to territorial sovereignty that had united the city of Vršac and the surrounding areas of the Banat/Vojvodina to the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes were a consistent concern throughout the student travelogue that is our chief source of information about this field trip. The three-page text began with a paragraph discussing the school's closure during the war and then noted that while in earlier times excursions had visited "unliberated Serbian lands," this group of Belgrade students was now able to go to a "wonderful region reunited to the Serbian motherland" (p. 30). Of particular note in this document is the recurrence of the notion of a lost child returning to its mother. By reading the text in terms of imagery and narratives such as this, it is possible to make sense of it as more than a report on the particular travels of 32 students and 7 teachers and instead to see it as a cultural document and educational artifact that owes its production and intelligibility to a broader set of socially normative expectations and regulative

principles. This narrative of familial reunification offers an initial suggestion of how notions of home and belonging were constructed and embodied in Serbia of the 1920s.

Nationalizing processes were also powerfully exhibited in this travelogue's construction of discursive space—in Henri Lefebvre's terms this is to see the "Banat" in the text as both a representation of space and a representational space. In April, 1920 these travelers left Belgrade, crossed the Danube by boat, and disembarked in the adjacent city of Pančevo, formerly in the Austro-Hungarian empire. "Pančevo is free. The Banat is free, and we rush across it to better know it," the travelogue declared. A favorable initial impression came quickly as the party traveled by train from Pančevo. "Oh, how beautiful! How wonderful" the text enthused. The "beautiful villages" that the train passed were evidently worthy of mention, and several of their names were recorded. As if to suggest that any uncertainties should be put to rest, the text added "these are our villages on the road to Vršac" (p. 30). In equal measure as it was a narrative of discovery, this student travel text was a narrative of possession and appropriation of that which had been found. The description of the city of Vršac (following in the text after the welcoming ceremony related above) left no doubt as to what was meant by "our" villages. With a striking reiterative insistence, the travelogue noted:

> Vršac is a wonderful, Serbian place—clean, beautiful, healthy, and cultured.... The people of Vršac are wonderful Serbs. In front of the Serbian library there is now nothing of the Hungarian monument which was there until the liberation. One dark night it was taken down. The Hungarian High School is now the Serbian High School. The Hungarian library is now the Serbian library. (p. 31)

The emphasis on the institutions that have been renamed and claimed as "Serbian," and the declarations that take on the tenor of judgments show the extent to which this travelogue was enmeshed in the construction and demarcation of a discursive space of Serbian national identity and meaning. In these negations and through the erasure/rewriting of "Hungarian" objects, a politics of memory and forgetting was being discussed quite overtly, even as one key act of forgetting took place in the dead of night. These demarcations were also being performed and embodied by the traveling Belgrade students themselves in the welcoming rituals, waving of flags, and offering of speeches—a legitimate assembly that created a spectacle and, as it would appear from the report, saturated public space with things Serbian.

Norms of hospitality seem to have been met to everyone's satisfaction on this 1920 student field trip. The expectations for what was proper when greeting and being greeted were reciprocally fulfilled in the

exchange of "warm words" between the two school directors quoted above. The text also reported that the "hospitable *Vrščani* [people of Vršac] received us with unusual warmth, in a truly brotherly fashion" (p. 31). We can again note the pervasiveness of kinship terms, as indicative of a prominent cultural pattern for conceptualizing affinity and the mutuality of collective belonging.[7]

It becomes clear that in their travels and from what we learn of their interactions with the people in the Banat, the Belgrade students actively participated in the construction of "home"—something I am treating here not as a previously existing, entrenched cultural formation but as an assemblage subject to constant forming and reforming. "And what we felt, we expressed in song," the travelogue reports. Accordingly, the students put together a small concert in Vršac the day after their arrival, singing, it is noted, "songs from all the Serbian regions" (p. 31). The following day, in the city of Veliki Bečkerek,[8] in a theater where a great group had gathered and "wanted to hear songs from the various Serbian regions," (p. 32) the students again sang. Such performances made these traveling students into nationalizing agents, the purveyors of a cultural knowledge that would bind together the parts of Serbia. Singing regional songs could naturalize the propriety of a collective, shared Serbian identity. And, in fact we learn that the future teachers from Belgrade sang the Banat into Serbia, as it were, by pointedly singing works from Đure Jakši and Josif Marinković, the first a poet and the second a composer, both "sons of the wonderful Banat" (p. 31).

Though at times they appear superficial and saccharine, the aesthetic principles that generated this relentless onslaught of wonders and beauties do in fact have a depth of meaning that helps to illuminate how inclusions and exclusions were structured and self-other relations established. Imagery of purity is a striking feature of this 1920 Serbian student travelogue. The demarcation in this instance was of purity contra "mixture" or what could anachronously be called "diversity." In the description of the group's travels enroute from Vršac to Veliki Bečkerek, the significance of the text's aesthetic register becomes quite clear:

> we excused ourselves from our sympathetic brothers and sisters and found ourselves traveling farther through the flat Banat region. We went through pretty villages with strange mixtures of inhabitants – this because the enemy did everything they could so that our wonderful Banat would lose its beautiful Serbian characteristics. (p. 31)

This vilification of the mixture of peoples seems to fit to a particular set of aesthetic principles for fixing merit. In stark contrast to the transcendent language that in other times and places sometimes surrounds ideas of cultural pluralism, in this text the "strangeness" of mixture is *not* the

wondrous astonishment of a sublime where amazement gives way to deeper beauty or truer truth. The admixture of peoples is portrayed as self-alienating and in need of correction. Present in the text is the idea that aesthetic value and truth claims inhere in the "Serbian" itself.[9] In a reverse parallel to an earlier passage, the travelers encountered "ugly village names" as they journeyed to Veliki Bečkerek. Some of these names were mentioned, with the text noting, "these villages haven't yet received Serbian names!" (p. 32).

The claiming of the Banat that we see in this travel text shows the mechanics and technologies that made it possible to construct—at least to attempt to construct—a discursive space of cultural purity in the early 1920s. It also shows how a national identity can be fabricated through the physical travels and activities of students and, at the same time, inscribed on their bodies via performance, aesthetic sensibility, experiences of hospitality. It would be a mistake, however, to assume automatically that the blow against ethnic and national cohabitation appearing in this travelogue was a strike against all forms of "multiculturalism." A Serbian Banat salvaged from the Austro-Hungarian empire potentially fit quite easily into a multiethnic Yugoslavia, as the conceptualization of the country as the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes suggests. Moreover, as the name suggests, this was an entity of mutual, collective belonging from which certain others (internally and externally) had been stricken. The Hungarian minority, along with Roma and Albanians among others, can be usefully understood as "internal others" in Yugoslavia of the 1920s and 1930s, providing the "mainstream" collective belonging with a territorially internal degree of difference that it could establish itself against. The key point is that not all features of a nationalism are necessarily formed in contradistinction to the Other people who loom on the country's borders (see e.g., Marx, 2003). Hungarians in the Banat appear to have served the purpose of allowing for a clarification of Serbian identity, however the area's German minority received slightly different treatment in this text—at least in aesthetic terms. Mention was made of Vršac's German library in the same building as the municipal museum. This library was "attractively put together and well equipped," after which it is noted that "there are quite a few [*dosta*] German immigrants here" (p. 31). The ambiguity of where Germans fit into Yugoslavia was better settled in the next school field trip to be examined. On this visit to the same region 5 years later, students from the Pedagogical Academy of Belgrade [*Viša pedagoška škola*] similarly moved through national territory becoming acquainted with their nation at the same time as they were themselves presented as model national subjects.

Vojvodina/Banat, 1925

The itinerary that 20 students and two teachers from the Pedagogical Academy of Belgrade followed in April, 1925 was nearly identical to that traveled on the 1920 field trip just discussed.[10] In this instance a student report on the excursion was published in the leading Yugoslav pedagogical journal *Učitelj*.[11] This seven page travelogue took a more welcoming approach to the ethnic diversity found in the region, though at the same time fabricated a "Serbian" representational space that properly fit this region within Yugoslavia. As previously, this excursion is usefully seen in terms of the embodiment of national identity. "Of all our regions, the Banat was the one I knew the least" (p. 737), the text opened, signaling the national pedagogical purpose that in some degree informed this student field trip.[12]

As in the 1920 text, this second travelogue also found the "national mixtures" in the villages worthy of considerable mention. Towns were, "in one moment Serbian, in another moment German, Romanian, or Hungarian." Additionally, "one saw this also in the names" (p. 738). Yet, these were not, in the view of this travelogue, dangerous arrangements of people. The dominant motif was instead of antagonism giving way to comfort and contentment, such as on the road to Vršac, where:

> It looked as though different nationalities had competed and laid claims in order to settle this flat land which for them safeguarded all happiness and welfare. Everywhere one encounters people, plump from neck to belly, with a pipe between the teeth—the entirety of their appearance seeming as if they wanted to express satisfaction. (p. 738)

For this writer, all of this suggested a positive optimism about the possibilities for cohabitation. "I don't know if it is correct but I got the impression that among these inhabitants of the Banat and amidst all these tribal differences there exists tolerance, even love," he wrote (p. 738). This is a far cry from the attitude taken in the previous text. One possible explanation is that this change points to the success of reconstruction efforts since the war and a certain level of material improvement. And, in fact, one sees here a narrative of determined struggle for survival giving way to comfortable belonging and recovered habitation.

While the variety and mixture of different peoples did not necessarily appear as a sublime, supreme transcendental object to the 1925 travelers, this diversity was something that could be appreciated and ordered according to correct aesthetic principles. The travelogue discussed the art of Paja Jovanović, a Serbian painter whose work was featured in the museum of his native Vršac. The text noted that Jovanović's art presented Serbs, Germans, Romanians, and Jews alongside one another, for exam-

ple, harvesting grapes and working in the market. The paintings stood as evidence of the "solidarity of several nations" that the residents of Vršac had found, which the artist had only wanted to "commend." On this point the travelogue opined, "great artists are never narrow-minded nor chauvinists and Jovanović's paintings are a nice example of this" (p. 739). These images of harmony contrast with the 1920 travelogue's aesthetic valorization of purity, suggesting that in this instance the Banat served as a space for reasoning about a significantly more expansive multicultural collective belonging.

Demarcations of the Serbian, however, were by no means absent from the text. In fact, they were invoked in several instances as the ultimate authority in defining what was proper and improper in the Banat. This emerged with clarity, for example, in a description of the vineyards around Vršac. The student-teachers visited the Helvetia winery which, the report carefully mentioned, was owned by a large Swiss concern. The extensive cellars and landholdings made Helvetia one of the largest wine producing enterprises in the Banat and its name seems to have stood out to the travelers from Belgrade. In an appraisal, the travelogue stated:

> And here in Vršac, in the Serbian Banat, far from Switzerland, only because of capitalism does this vineyard bear the name Helvetia,[13] when its name ought to carry patriotic colors. (p. 740)

This preoccupation with names returns us to a manner of claiming place and space that ran throughout the 1920 Banat travelogue. The logic of this excerpt from the 1925 travel text is that capitalism has disturbed the proper order by introducing a Swiss name to the landscape. Yet, even as the text seems to concede this point, it forcibly reestablished Serbian title by situating Helvetia "in the Serbian Banat."

The German presence in the Banat, though more welcomed, was understood ultimately not to undermine Serbian title to the region. At one key moment in the travelogue, notwithstanding the fact that a certain coevalness had been established between the area's Serbian and German inhabitants, the propriety of things "Serbian" decidedly won the upper hand. The text praised the German teachers at one of the schools in Vršac for their proficiency with Serbian language, noting:

> It was pleasant for us to hear that the German teachers had mastered the Serbian language and that they knew our literature and that they happily paraphrased our songs. (p. 739)

With the approving nod toward the behavior of the non-Serb peoples of the Banat, the travel text helped to fabricate a discursive space within which peaceful coexistence could be secured through deference. We see

here a good example of how an internal other through its difference and mimicry plays a role in consolidating a mainstream national identity, in this instance by assenting to the establishment of canonical cultural knowledge.

Important to emphasize in this 1925 text are the human embodiments of what were seen as the most promising and proper forms of national living. A concern with human happiness and bodily satisfaction ran through the travelogue, including in some of the sections of text quoted above. We have seen German teachers "happily" singing Serbian songs, people "plump from neck to belly" with their appearances expressing satisfaction, Jews crushing grapes alongside Romanians, and so forth. Proper bodily habitus was the locus of desired social norms. The proper ordering of individuals, specifically their complacent, tolerant mixture, held the promise of social stability—a conclusion that is entirely unsurprising given the intentional ethnic synthesis that inter-war Yugoslavia aimed to achieve. The travelogue additionally suggests that the Belgrade student-teachers ought to embody and enact these principles in their professional work. It is recorded that among the 450 students of the Vršac Normal School [*Vršačke učiteljske škole*] one could find students "from all the regions of our country" (SPPB, p. 738). A similar phenomenon was noted in Pančevo where the field trip visited a Domestic Arts School [*domaćička škola*] that "had gathered twenty children from all the sides of our land with the hope of fashioning them into worthy housewives" (p. 742). The text appraised both schools highly, quite clearly linking their quality as educational exemplars with the nation-building spirit that was reflected in the composition of their student bodies.

Schooling was smoothly joined to the Yugoslav national project in a "Serbian and German" village not far from Veliki Bećkerek, where the travelers visited a primary school located in a park that before the war had been the property of "some sort of Hungarian count" and "only for his personal enjoyment." The travelogue noted that with the war, "which has democratized so much, this park too was democratized." The property was turned over to the local government which deeded it to the school, and now the park was being cared for by teachers and students who had turned it into "a paradise" (p. 742). Further explorations of the town, the travelogue went on to say, revealed that Germans and Serbs did not, in fact, differ much from one another in their daily ways of living. This happy setting and the recovered park stood, as evidence of the inhabitants' support for education and—these images all suggest—as evidence of the melioristic role that schooling could play in reconstruction and the forging of social stability.

As earlier, the official imprimatur that this travelogue received suggests that the Belgrade students' (apparent) ability to appreciate such efforts

showed them also to be capable of acting and thinking in ways that advanced these Yugoslav national imaginaries. Though it is but a partial picture of several days of student travel, this 1925 travelogue usefully points to ways that national identities are in crucial respects reliant on embodied knowledge that pulls together modes of socializing, aesthetic sensibilities, didactic performances, and bodily habitus to establish the social norms and regulative principles that govern individuals' ways of acting and thinking.

Vojvodina, 2001

As a researcher I am struck by some of the uncanny similarities that I found between these two travel accounts and what I saw as I tagged along on a late September, 2001 school field trip with students from a High School [*gymnasium*] in a small city in central Serbia, 3 or so hours by bus southwest of Belgrade.[14] Over the course of 3 days we spent approximately 20 hours on beat-up motor coaches, first traveling east to Vršac, then northwest to Novi Sad, where we spent 2 nights. The intervening day was taken up by an excursion to Subotica and the northern-most parts of the Vojvodina. Outside Vršac we visited a Slovak art museum that seemed designed to speak to the lingering multiethnic composition of the Vojvodina. Economic success framed our visit to Vršac proper, as students and teachers took it upon themselves to explain to me the *Vojvođani* [people of the Vojvodina] and what made for their prosperity. We visited an aristocratic home that had been converted to the "democratic" use of the people during the Tito era. And, I also find that midway through the trip, my notes comment on how I was constantly hearing how "beautiful"[15] certain things were.

My notes additionally record some of the meals we ate; the considerable arguments that occurred over what kind of music would be played on the bus; the dramatic posing that sometimes occurred when photographs were taken at some site or in a hotel room; and, the to me confusing politics of whether drinking alcohol was permitted or not. Contrasting with the polished, well-ordered narratives constructed in the previously examined travelogues, it is hastily scribbled field notes and the pages I wrote after the field trip that are my sources in this section. These writings capture my personal attempts to bring some intelligibility to the excursion—in this instance, significantly, the source is not a student travelogue and is an outside as opposed to inside account. I am not an anthropologist and, while I firmly believe that excellent anthropological work can be done on school field trips, this particular participant-observer study was not intended to capture rigorously an internal perspective on the lived experience of any of the students or teachers traveling. Instead, I aimed to use it to help advance my own theorizing about field trips and what specifically I might find it useful to look for if I am interested in how the massing, dispersion, arranging and mobility of bodies helps to form particular kinds of people. Accordingly, I think of it as an exploration that has assisted me in figuring out what to pay attention to and what questions to ask. Though here I have situated the 2001 field trip as the third in a series, in actuality I embarked on it before I came across the other two. In a sense, it was the prelude to the historical examples. I order it as the final school field trip to be analyzed because I deliberately want to bring this chapter up to the present day and close with a discussion of how comparative education researchers can use historical continuities and discontinuities to study embodied knowledge and national identity.

The stop that we made at a museum of Slovak folk art on the first day of the excursion shows one way in which it was possible in 2001 to organize and render intelligible the ethnic diversity that, as we have seen, earlier student travelers had also encountered. As was common in much of the former Yugoslavia in the early 2000s, a faded luster in the form of peeling paint and the poor upkeep of buildings that pretended to some sort of grandeur, suggested that this public institution had once enjoyed significantly more financial support than at the present moment. Folk paintings of rural life that clearly attempted depicted Slovak customs lined the walls of several rooms. The aged attendant was quite eager to get the travel agency voucher that would admit this group of approximately 90 students and 4 teachers—by no means the only time that my notes hint at the economic role school excursions play. In the end, equal numbers of students loitered outside in the shade as explored the galleries. No tour was given, no opening or closing words were spoken by the teachers, and after 30 minutes mostly spent using the bathrooms and purchasing soft drinks, our group's two busses departed, leaving me to wonder whether this field trip would be any different than a textbook page skipped or ignored out of boredom or indifference. Surely, the educational researcher in me felt, the museumizing of cultural difference that these students were being exposed to is laden with meaning! However, as the trip developed, and upon multiple readings of my notes, I did begin to notice a pattern that encouraged me to pay attention to the performances that students mounted in the locales we visited. At the Slovak folk art museum, except for these general displays of apathy, the only performative gesture that my field notes captured was of two girls strutting through the museum arm-in-arm, carefully turning to examine each painting, in parody of a certain kind of formal museum etiquette that the atmosphere of the place and the behavior of others in it did not generate.

The museum was not one of the places that this group of students deemed "beautiful." Unlike the 1920 travelogue which took a favorable view of the German library in Vršac, the Slovak folk art museum was decidedly not "attractively put together and well equipped." This is not to say, however, that this feeble showing of Slovak presence in the Vojvodina was considered an aesthetic blight. It simply wasn't worth taking seriously.

On the 2001 field trip, the highlight of Vršac was the New Millenium indoor soccer stadium. We spent an hour outside its locked doors as everyone milled around and some tried to establish whether we could tour the empty arena. Coffee could be had in one of the several cafes in the area and many students set out to restock their provisions of chips and drinks. This stadium was "beautiful" many judged. It was also"done correctly" [*kako treba*] and indeed when one of the students had talked a maintenance worker into admitting a small group of 10—in which I was obligingly included—one did have the sense of stepping into a qualitatively different environment that starkly contrasted with the trash strewn streets fronting dilapidated buildings on the outside. "The *Vojvodani* are good businessmen," one student instructed me, "they know how to succeed with projects like this." A teacher pressed me for what I knew about Rotary organizations, something he knew little about but had heard that it was because of them that the Vojvodina was so rich.[16] As we drove in the vicinity of Vršac the attractive arrangement of the vineyards was pointed out to me and the richness of the land and its people noted.

The following day we had lunch near the town of Bečej at the Bogdan Dundjerski castle, an aristocratic estate constructed in the 1920s and turned into an industrial farm during the post-World War II communist period. One of the students had been here before and gasped with horror as we turned into the entrance, "oh my God, the food is terrible here, there are no bathrooms and the place is a wreck." She was right on all counts. The faded grandeur of the Slovak folk art museum was no match for the peeling paint, stained carpets and moldy stench of these battered and shabby buildings. The food was terrible yet a voucher certificate was handed over. Teachers said that school excursions had always come to this place, adding with evident sarcasm that this was "to show us how beautiful the People's Republic was." On the grounds we were able to admire an ostrich, several wild boar and a number of horses (all suitably aristocratic trappings, now offered to the people) but were prevented from exploring farther by a groundskeeper who insisted that we needed to have an additional voucher. The decay and quite unconvincing democratization of privilege generated a remarkable number of irreverent performances in the complex's formal reception rooms. I spent 20 minutes watching nearly the entire group of students come through and occupy the faux-antique chairs, posing for countless photos with the girls hamming up

glamour and the boys aping ease and authority. The teachers took no mind of any of this, and it was unclear if it was transgressive, though I cannot but imagine that banging on the keys of the piano in the adjacent room was not officially condoned.

Several of the parks of Novi Sad impressed the students considerably. They had no escorted visits to any sites but were freed for a morning to rove the city. A number of groups ended up in a city park which featured green grass, preening swans and teams of smartly uniformed workers planting flowers and installing crisp white fences. Once more, something was "beautiful" and being "done correctly" people said. Countless photographs were taken in front of particularly appealing vistas; the posing was far removed from the frantic, yet ironic and aloof, performances at the Dundjerski castle. Similarly serious, appreciative photographs were taken of (and in front of) one of the bridges that had been elegantly rebuilt after being destroyed in the 1999 U.S./NATO bombing.

These instances of patterned, performative public behavior on the 2001 field trip help to reveal something of the active role that students and their bodies play in constructing, resisting and reconfiguring the itineraries and "curricula" of school-related travel. The aesthetic register that generated appellations of "beautiful" crossed with principles for evaluating proper ways of productively organizing and contributing to society, thus helping to generate and reinforce a set of shared sensibilities. These are sensibilities that can be seen as national not because they embed a flag or an anthem in the student mind, but because they point to a collective way of organizing a desired and ideal home. This longing did not appear to be backed by the hope and optimism that was apparent in the travelogues from the 1920s. The juxtaposition of an ethnographically studied field trip with a field trip studied from a historian's perspective may help account for my sense that in 2001 national ways of acting and thinking were considerably more in flux. All the same, the stark contrasts between what was satisfying and dissatisfying to students in 2001 suggest a national identity at a moment of uncertainty and vagueness, an ambiguity that was embodied by these students.

By no means have I been able to render intelligible all of what I saw and recorded about this 3-day trip with high school students to the Vojvodina. In fact, the most striking student performance of the field trip is one that I find particularly perplexing, and perhaps indicative of the complexity of making sense of human interactions. After visiting the city of Vršac we drove to a hill that overlooked the town, from which one had a view out over the city and the surrounding agricultural lands (which were indeed more-or-less flat to the horizon save for this one prominence). We were next to several bombed out buildings that had been part of a military installation. They were guarded by two soldiers only several years

older than these high school students. Some girls persuaded the soldiers to pose for photos with them. A soldier handed over his semiautomatic weapon to one of the girls. She strapped it on and proceeded to wave it around in the air. I am not making this up.

Conclusion

The three school field trips examined in this chapter point. In different ways, to the construction of national styles of organizing action and thought. We have seen in the 1920s converging and diverging variants on how homes ought properly to be organized in relation to notions of cultural purity and cultural mixture. Moreover, the instantiation of chauvinistic forms of Serbian nationalism puts lie to any claims for the endurance across centuries of indelible, primordial national sentiment and ethnic hatreds. In place of finding the spectral presence of "balkan ghosts" in the travelogues, there was instead evidence of the construction of forms of belonging (more active than received) that, while they certainly inscribed inclusions and exclusions, did not point to any necessary, determined end. In the 2001 field trip we saw a significant uncertainty over whether a satisfactory home was being and/or could be constructed. In all of these instances I have argued that the bodies of students allow us first to discern, and second to see the propagation and spread of, national ways of thinking and acting.

For purposes of studying school field trips and their relation to the construction of national identities, I propose that it is not entirely productive to theorize them as controlled interventions that can be subjected to pre and postevaluations. However, their exceptionality as literal departures from the everyday practices of schooling does mean that field trips can be usefully studied as discrete instances where social norms and technologies of social governance come into high resolution. This is to consider student travel as a moment for reinforcing and renegotiating of national sensibilities. Such pedagogic travels into public spaces outside the enclosures of the school mean that the mobility of students—both in terms of fluidity and stoppages—can generate "sticking points" around which social ideals and regulative principles congeal and cross a threshold of visibility.

The dangerous coagulations of student bodies (armed and dangerous only in rare instances, of course) also have the potential to reveal imprecise distributions within disciplinary mechanisms. It may be the case that the departure from the stable architecture of panoptic surveillance engenders less social risk at the outset of the twenty-first century than at the beginning of the twentieth. If nothing else, the historical juxtaposition in this chapter invites us to pay attention to shifting systems of control (Deleuze, 1992) and shifting regulations that effect new technologies for governing human bodies (Rose, 2001). It might be a mistake to assume that indeterminacy and ambiguity in discriminating between proper assemblies and dangerous coagulations or between the nation and its others is necessarily unusable. These questions call for more comparative inquiry into the different ways that students are expected to and expect to cultivate an embodied knowledge of the nation.

NOTES

1. In this vein (see Gvirtz , 2006; and Dussel, 2001).
2. See the ideas related to this methodological approach developed in (Kazamias, 2001)
3. The Serbian Banat is a subregion that along with Srem and Baka forms the province known as the Vojvodina. Parts of the Banat are also located in present-day Romania, including the city of Timişoara.
4. Though both formally and informally referred to as Yugoslavia in the early 1920s, the name of the country was only officially changed to the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in 1929. By the late 1990s the only republics remaining in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia were Serbia and Montenegro, a fact that was recognized in 2003 when the country was renamed the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro. Serbia-Montenegro ceased to exist in 2006 when Serbia and Montenegro were divided into two sovereign states.
5. To designate this as "Serbian" instead of "Yugoslav" territory is a move that could be seen as an intervention into historiographic debates on the nature of interwar Yugoslavia, and to some extent this is unavoidable; nonetheless, I intend it here as a gesture toward capturing how this region was viewed from Belgrade, which prior to the war had been the capital of the independent Kingdom of Serbia, itself the predecessor state of the expanded Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. However, the juxtaposition of the 1920 and 1925 travelogues discussed below indicates that such demarcations were in flux and contestable in the 1920s. The aim of the analysis in this chapter is not to adjudicate any competing claims, but to examine the cultural processes by which spatial and national demarcations in general were advanced.
6. ("Kroz Banat," 1921) All translations in this chapter are the author's. The parenthetical page number citations in this section are to this text.
7. For discussion of the fabrication of mutual belonging in the Pan-Slavic context, see (Sobe, 2006)
8. Known at present as the city of Zrenjanin (though named Petrovgrad from 1935 to 1946).
9. David Noble (2002) proposes the "aesthetic authority of cultural pluralism" and "aesthetic authority of national unity" to describe two radically different systems of reasoning that have been present in historiographical approaches to writing about the United States. It is similar diverging paradigms that I am playing with by mentioning alternate thinking about

"diversity" as sublime. The contrast, I believe, helps us understand the historical reasoning and the authority that inheres in the "purity" of things "Serbian."

10. An advance announcement appeared in the journal *Učitelj* that four groups from the Pedagogical Academy were to go on excursions to different parts of the country, two to Zagreb, a third to Osek and Sombor and the fourth group on the journey discussed here ("Hronika," 1925)
11. (A. D., 1925) The parenthetical pae number citations in this section are to this text.
12. The imperative to demonstrate proper national citizenship by traveling through the regions of one's country is a common theme in early-twentieth-century travel (see e.g., Löfgren, 2001)
13. The foreignness of the name was typographically accentuated, for in accordance with one convention for handling non-Serbo-Croatian names, "Helvetia" was rendered in Roman/Latin type while the rest of the travel report was printed in Cyrillic.
14. To respect confidentiality, I am avoiding the use of any identifying information in this section.
15. The exclamation "*lepo*," which also appeared in the 1920 and 1925 travelogues, could find a possible English correlate in the way that the expression "nice" is commonly used, however I have elected to go with a literal translation of "*lepo*" as "beautiful" in order to capture the aesthetic register that I see at work here.
16. The role of Rotary organizations in this region at present and historically would, in fact, be a rich research topic for the insights that could be generated from study of the cultural reshapings that accompany the spread of this midwestern U.S. organization across the globe, as Victoria diGrazia's recent work (di Grazia, 2005) has shown.

REFERENCES

A. D. (1925). Ekskurzija slušalica više pedagoške škole u Beogradu—s puta po Banatu [Excursion of students from the Pedagogical Academy in Belgrade—frequent travels around the Banat]. *Učitelj, 5*(9 and 10), 737-743.

Baker, B. M., & Heyning, K. E. (2004). Introduction: Dangerous coagulations? Research, education, and a traveling Foucault. In *Dangerous coagulations? The uses of Foucault in the Study of Education* (pp. 1-84). New York: Peter Lang.

Baranowski, S., & Furlough, E. (Eds.). (2001). *Being elsewhere: Tourism, consumer culture, and identity in modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Barnett, R., & Phipps, A. (2005). Academic travel: Modes and directions. *The Review of Education, Pedagogy & Cultural Studies, 27*(1), 3-16.

Bartkowski, F. (1995). *Travelers, immigrants, inmates: Essays in estrangement*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes: Travel and translation in the late twentieth century*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October, 59*, 3-7.

di Grazia, V. (2005). *Irresistible empire: America's advance through twentieth-century Europe*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Dussel, I. (2001). School uniforms and the disciplining of appearances: Towards a history of the regulation of bodies in modern educational systems. In T. S. Popkewitz, B. M. Franklin, & M. Pereyra (Eds.), *Cultural history and education* (pp. 207-242). New York: RoutledgeFalmer.

Endy, C. (1998). Travel and world power: Americans in Europe, 1890-1917. *Diplomatic History, 22*(4), 565-594.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Vintage Books.

Fouillée, A. J. É. (1976). *Le tour de la France par deux enfants; Devoir et patrie; livre de lecture courante avec 212 gravures instructives pour leçons de choses 19 cartes géographiques*. Paris: Librairie classique d'E. Belin.

Gvirtz, S. (2006). Micro-Politics and the examination of curricular practices: the Case of School Notebooks. In A. Benavot & C. Braslavsky (Eds.), *School knowledge in comparative and historical perspective: Changing curricula in primary and secondary education* (Vol. 18, pp. 155-172). Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.

Hronika: Ekskurzija slušalica više pedagoške škole [Chronicle: Excursion of students from the Pedagogical Academy In Belgrade]. (1925). *Učitelj, 5*(8), 609-610.

Kaplan, C. (1996). *Questions of travel: Postmodern discourses of displacement*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Kazamias, A. M. (2001). Re-inventing the historical in comparative education: Reflections on a protean episteme by a contemporary player. *Comparative Education, 37*(4), 439-449.

Koshar, R. (2000). *German travel cultures*. Oxford, England: Berg.

Kroz Banat: Beleške s ekskurzije o Uskrsu 1920 [Across the Banat: Notes from an easter 1970 excursion]. (1921). In Ženska učiteljska škola u Beogradu (Ed.), *Izveštaj za 1920-1921 godine* (pp. 30-32). Beograd.

Leed, E. (1991). *The mind of the traveler: From Gilgamesh to global tourism*. New York: Basic Books.

Löfgren, O. (2001). Know your country: A comparative perspective on tourism and nation building in Sweden. In S. Baranowski & E. Furlough (Eds.), *Being elsewhere: Tourism, consumer culture, and identity in modern Europe and North America*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.

Marx, A. W. (2003). *Faith in nation: Exclusionary origins of nationalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.

McCulloch, G., & Lowe, R. (2003). Introduction: Centre and periphery—networks, space and geography in the history of education. *History of Education, 32*(5), 457-460.

Noble, D. W. (2002). *Death of a nation: American culture and the end of American exceptionalism*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.

Pratt, M. L. (1992). *Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation*. New York: Routledge.

Rantatalo, P. (2002). *Den resande eleven: Folkskolans skolreserörelse 1890-1940*. Umea: Institutionnen för historiska studier.

Rojek, C., & Urry, J. (1997). *Touring cultures: Transformations of travel and theory.* New York: Routledge.

Rose, N. S. (2001). The politics of life itself. *Theory, Culture & Society, 18*(6), 1-30.

Sobe, N. W. (2006). Slavic Emotion and Vernacular Cosmopolitanism: Yugoslav Travels to Czechoslovakia in the 1920s and 1930s. In A. E. Gorsuch & D. P. Koenker (Eds.), *Turizm: The Russian and East European Tourist under Capitalism and Socialism* (pp. 82-96). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Urry, J. (1990). *The tourist gaze: Leisure and travel in contemporary societies*. London: Sage.

CHAPTER 8

(RE)READING CUBAN EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Schooling and the Third Revolution

Sheryl L. Lutjens

Schooling is in many ways a national priority in Cuba, a country where the state budget for education equaled 9% of GDP in 2002 (Álvarez & Máttar, 2004, p. 37) and the September opening of the school year is traditionally the occasion for a major speech by President Fidel Castro. The inauguration of the 2002-03 school year was held on September 16, 2002 in the Havana Convention Center; as always, Castro provided facts and figures about the achievements of education in Cuba. In September 2002, however, Castro spoke about a "Third Educational Revolution."

> We are officially inaugurating the school year and strongly proclaiming the need to carry forward to its final consequences the profound and unprecedented educational revolution we are undertaking. It is not only our people's basic duty for humanity and social justice, but also an imperative of our

Recapturing the Personal: Essays on Education and Embodied Knowledge in Comparative Perspective, 163–194