

(S)education: a risky inquiry into pleasurable teaching.

Erica McWilliam

School of Cultural and Policy Studies, QUT

Paper prepared for AARE Conference, Newcastle, Nov 1994.  
Not for Citation.

Abstract:

Combining pleasure and teaching in an analysis of pedagogical work is very 'touchy' indeed, given current hegemonic constructions of the 'good' teacher. In the paper I am attempting to reclaim seduction as a legitimate metaphor for the sort of pedagogical work successful teachers do. I want to argue that such teachers appropriately mobilise forces of desire (the desire to teach and the desire to learn) both of which can be productive, rather than malevolent. Further, teachers often do so in ways that lie outside our cultural norms of legitimate pedagogical exchange.

Against this, I believe that teachers are increasingly called upon to deny what Chambers (1984) calls 'the claim to seductive power', and without the means of redress that seductive power makes possible. We have become 'no/bodies' in the discursive construction of educational practice. It is for this reason, I argue, that inquiry into the legitimate seductive power of the teacher is not mere scholarly indulgence, but pragmatic and overdue. By reclaiming 'seductiveness' it becomes possible to affirm as legitimate the duplicity of pedagogical power © that it conforms to the learner's desires while also having the function of satisfying other desires (eg, the desire to instruct) in the teacher.

(S)education: a risky inquiry into pleasurable teaching.

Whose love is given over  
Shall look on Helen's face in hell,  
Whilst they whose love is thin and wise  
May view John Knox in paradise.

Dorothy Parker.

Pleasure-seeking is always risky. So too is teaching. Combining the two as an academic project is very 'touchy' indeed, given current hegemonic constructions of the 'good' teacher. My work is improper because I am attempting to reclaim seduction and seductiveness as legitimate metaphors for the sort of pedagogical work successful teachers do.

[ The term 'pedagogy' is both useful and problematic in discussions of teaching and learning. I do not want to digress onto this subject here (despite my disquiet about the way that pedagogy appears to have been used by academics as a way not to talk about teaching). Pedagogy as I use it allows me to

distinguish the wider terrain of practices which are evoked by theorising and doing teaching and learning, from what teachers 'perform' individually (ie, teaching).]

I want to argue that successful teachers appropriately mobilise forces of desire (the desire to teach and the desire to learn) both of which can be productive, or @ but not only @ malevolent. Further, teachers often do so in ways that lie outside our cultural norms of legitimate pedagogical exchange. Against this, I believe that teachers are increasingly called upon to deny what Chambers (1984) calls 'the claim to seductive power':

The claim to seductive power is a claim of perlocutionary force, another kind of power. It is not self-directed but other-directed; and it is definable as the power to achieve authority and to produce involvement...within a situation from which power is itself absent. If such a power can be called seduction, it is because seduction is, by definition, a phenomenon of persuasion: it cannot rely on force or institutional authority ('power'), for it is, precisely, a means of achieving mastery in the absence of such means of control. It is the instrument available to the situationally weak against the situationally strong. (p.211-212)

In Chambers terms, I argue that teachers have become the 'situationally weak'. The power that institutional authority and social deference once made available to the schoolmaster, the guru or the philosopher is lost. Furthermore, teachers do not have the means of redress of this weakness that seductive power might make possible. In broad terms, teachers have increasingly been unable to 'occupy the symbolic position of subject supposed to know' (Deutscher, 1994:40). We have increasingly become functional 'no/bodies' in the discursive

construction of educational practice. It is for this reason that my insistence on the legitimacy of the seductive power in teaching is not mere scholarly indulgence, but pragmatic and overdue. Through reclaiming 'seductiveness' as a metaphor for teacher 'quality' it becomes possible to recognise and affirm the duplicity of pedagogical power @ that it conforms to the learner's desires while also having the function of satisfying other desires (eg, the desire to instruct) in the teacher.

In more than two decades of educational work, I have read a great deal about the nature of teaching and learning. My impetus to move away from the 'safe' terrain of quality, effectiveness and learner@centredness, and to talk instead about seduction, desire and pleasure, comes from three sources @ if you like, an unholy trinity of motivations. The first motivation is to some extent idiosyncratic: it is my irritation with the desiccated state of vocabularies currently used by educational policymakers and scholars alike to talk about the enabling (and disabling) condition of the teacher. The second is academic @ my interest in the valuable scholarly work being done to affirm 'desire' as 'disruptive truth...in a social universe governed by the order of codes and laws' (Chambers, 1984:11) and in the ways this work might restore seductive power as having a positive connotation for teaching and learning. The third motivation is of the confessional kind, and is thus more intimate and paradoxical: it is the 'problem' of my 14 years of enjoyable teaching as a 'lady

teacher' and feminist in a boys' secondary college. This paper examines the first two of these motivations in preparation for future application to the third.

I want to explore the enabling condition of the teacher more fully by inquiring into pedagogy as an erotic field. This is much more complex (and transgressive) than arguing that teacher authority in itself is seductive, or even acknowledging that pedagogical power involves a conflict of motives, recruiting the desires of potential learners in the interests of maintaining teacher pleasure/authority. It entails exploring pedagogy as a field in which the gendered bodies of teachers and learners are engaged in a range of oral and other performances in pedagogical spaces over time. These performances produce ongoing change inasmuch as they relate the gendered bodies of teacher and learner.

Fleshing out the teacher:

A teacher is some body who teaches some body. In recent years, however, teachers have been dis/fembodied by educational jargon

that is increasingly dominated by the mutually informing vocabularies of business and cognitive science, as well as the dictates of open learning. On the one hand, concerns to improve the 'quality' of teaching have meant a flurry of activity around notions of 'effectiveness' and 'efficiency'. This includes the development of 'performance indicators' which can appropriately demystify pedagogical work in order to give 'assurance' of 'quality' outcomes. The actual 'performance' to be indicated does not include the sort of scholastic and physical postures, poses and persuasions that are enacted by a teacher; rather, the quality of the entire 'performance' is assessed by ignoring the utterances and actions of a teacher altogether. What the student can individually 'perform' after/as a result of the pedagogical event @ 'learning outcomes' as observable skill @ separates by deferral the measure of the worth of any series of pedagogical events from the present embodied teacher.

Informing and supporting this has been a plethora of literature that theorises learning and learners. Cognitive science has re@presented the teacher as both transcendental and instrumental, a figure floating above the learning process and a facilitator or conduit through which the learning process is monitored and learning enriched. 'I taught them but they didn't learn' is the crux of the pedagogical problem. Remediation can occur when knowing itself (theorised always out of a mind@body dualism) is better understood. This in turn leads to understanding of the sort of learning contexts that are needed to enhance learning, to ensure 'lifelong learning', learning through self@reflection and so on, with teacher@as™facilitator one crucial resource out of many which are 'available' to the learner. Teachers may stake a claim to being 'desirous' (but never 'desirable') as a learner among learners. Thus, reflecting on a pedagogical event becomes elevated over @ and indeed, antithetical to @ the immediacy of pedagogical pleasure. As teachers we must learn about ourselves by looking back at past events in which we are no longer bodily present. We look behind in order to look ahead. Then we can better motivate others @ motivate, but never seduce. We must stimulate @ but never tantalise. We must

'get to know' the learner @ but never, of course, in the biblical sense. In short, we must empower others but not be materially present/potent ourselves.

Despite their many disciplinary disagreements with sociology, a number of psychologists have come to share critical sociologists' fascination for the notion of student

'empowerment'. For sociologists, unlike most psychologists, this notion has involved an extra dimension of political activism to the performance of the teacher. They have continued to demand that teachers reinvent themselves as radical redeemers of the educationally oppressed or marginalised. Their 'progressive' vision of teaching parallels that found in many nineteenth century novels, where teaching (as preaching) apparently leads to 'the reversal of the movement toward corruption and to the eventual redemption of...an initially corrupting force' (De Jean, 1986:100). That is, the State Ideological Apparatus must turn Saviour. In requiring teachers to be agents of social revolution, however, critical scholars have obscured the notion that 'all pedagogy is a form of activism; and the radical teacher's activism is therefore second degree' (Ryan, 1986:p.58). Nevertheless, their redemptive project has been undertaken with all the zeal of the early Calvinists, and continues to be enacted, unfortunately, with about as much of their allure.

Whatever the benefits of demystification, learner™centredness and radical action, I argue that new pedagogical vocabularies have neutered teachers, rendering them functionaries without self-interest, without desire, without any 'body' to teach (with). My problem with all this is not that we are left with a very unromantic idea of teaching. On the contrary, the humanistic view of teaching offered up as resistance to these agendas can be just as problematic as the sterile worlds of quality assurance and interdisciplinary debate. Restoring the romance by insisting on the 'human face' of teacher and learner does not deal with the body to which the face is attached via the neck and head. A teacher's own desires can still be rendered invisible. In damning as authoritarian and oppressive the old pedagogical world of teacher-centredness © 'I want every eye on me' © educationists across the disciplines have rendered the teacher's body increasingly (necessarily) impotent in the pedagogical act. The possibility of an erotic intersubjectivity of teacher and student has been disallowed.

This has occurred despite (because of?) the fact that both teachers and those who observe the pedagogical act are very aware of its seductive potential. De Jean (1986) draws attention to the fact that, in a number of literary texts, 'teaching serves almost exclusively as a metaphor for seduction' (p99). She reminds us of the 'classical' erotic relationship in the pedagogical act (p101), and thus, of the difficulty of prising pedagogical work away from the notion of 'diversion' or 'deviation' that is at the root of 'seduction' as 'leading away'. De Jean reminds us that 'bricolage', so

often now claimed to be characteristic of the work of teaching, has its roots in both deviation and surprise (p105). This has been lost to the modern@day teacher@as@bricoleur, whose technique is not informed by 'natural deviation (madness)...(as) a prelude to creation' (p115), but by

conscious choice informed by educational discourses

[See for example, Hatton's (1989; 1991) work on teachers as bricoleurs.]

Control, not the loss of it, becomes the code that governs choices about the technical arsenal (p.105). Conventional understandings of linear@cumulative and progressive temporality of learning have displaced 'breakthroughs, leaps, discontinuities, regressions, and deferred action' as the means by which students move from ignorance to knowledge (Felman, 1986: 27). Thus the eccentric of old, the mercurial tyrant who cajoled, berated, teased, provoked, and fulminated, who was maddening, elitist, fascinating, sentimental and bullying, increasingly gives way to the clinician with the charisma by@pass. At least we can now be assured that there is nothing here that will distract us from focussing on the learner.

No Sex, please, we're Teachers:

The phenomenon of the 'controlled@as@neutered' teacher is actively abetted by anti@discrimination legislation which dramatically increases the surveillance of pedagogical work. Pedagogy must not deviate into the domain of the sexual. If, as many critical feminists insist,

[Feminists have attempted to undo the distinction (eg, erotica the porn of elites. See for example, Andrea Dworkin: Pornography: Men Possessing Women (1981), or Anna Snitow, Mass Market Romance: Pornography for Women is Different(1983).]

the 'erotic arts' are to be equated with the pornographic as sexually exploitative, then any work seeking to inquire into pedagogy as an appropriately erotic field becomes enormously problematic. The teacher is responsible for ensuring the state of (non)affairs, given the power relationship of teacher over student. The idea that the relationship is eminently reversible @ that a student may be more powerful (seductive) is denied by infantilising and feminising representations of all students in the pedagogical relationship (including postgraduates). As Meaghan Morris (1994) argues:

'Fuck me or I'll fail you' is the brute message of abusive pedagogy. Whatever happened to the other story? the one I remember so well from my own days as a student in the 1970s @ 'pass me or I'll tell...' (p.24)

Jane Gallop sounds a cautionary note about this depiction of pedagogy as a one way flow of power. She expresses her concern that sex@as@weapon can all too easily be conflated with sex™as@pleasure and thus become a tyranny in pedagogical work:

When sexual harassment sounds just like sex, then what you get is a situation where everybody officially says it's bad, but everybody does it, which is what you have in a society that thinks sex is bad. Societies that have very strong strictures against sex are not made up of people who don't have sex, they're made up of a kind of vast discrepancy between official discourse and practice @ which is what I think we're getting with sexual

harassment policy. (Gallop, cited in Talbot, 1994: 39)

On the anecdotal evidence of student teachers, it is clear to me that many high school students and teachers continue to be involved in 'ticklish' physical relationships with each other despite all the pleas about professionalism and all the frenzied warnings about the penalty for misconduct. I have developed this theme in a pedagogical device, the hypothetical, entitled 'Miss Demeanour', which interrogates the students' attitudes to this phenomenon more closely. A large number of students claim to know of some teacher (usually male) who was 'guilty of suspicion' of a relationship with a student (usually female) in their school. These same pre@service teachers almost invariably have unshakeable faith that their own professional persona will be more than an adequate defence against temptations of this sort in their teaching careers. As professionals, they will transcend the personal. They will become im/material to the learner by being im/material to themselves.

In challenging the ease with which student teachers exclude their bodies from their pedagogical work, I am nevertheless uneasy about the problems inherent in psychoanalytic feminism's insistence on a pedagogy which sexualises the student/teacher relationship in terms of the familial. Gatens (1994) warns that psychoanalytically inspired analyses of pedagogy like 'The Teacher's Breasts' (Gallop, 1994) 'tend to blind us with erotics at the same time as they foreclose the question of the ethics of pedagogy' (Gatens,

1994: 13). For this reason I want to map an erotics of pedagogy which is not dependent on psychoanalytic theory or Lacanian models of teacher-as-analyst. Instead I want to use literary theory to explore pedagogical work as an erotic field of utterance, bodies, desire, space and time. This means moving the discussion away from the realm of the Imaginary or Symbolic (oedipality), where desire is perceived as a 'lack', to insisting on desire as a 'positive material investment' located in the realm of the Real (Fox, 1993: 78-79)

[ The work of Deleuze and Guattari (1988) is very helpful here. Their work *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1984) theorises 'desire' as a duality, constituted in discourse. Their insistence on the desire as not simply the result of the body being acted upon, but an active flow which is the power of becoming of the body is very useful for my attempts to speak in terms of 'desire' and pedagogical possibility.]

Through this mapping, I hope to respond to Stephen Unger's provocative question: 'What kind of knowledge might be gained from professing desire in the classroom?' (1986: 82).

Theorising pedagogy as an erogenous zone:

First there is a need to acknowledge that 'there is something flirtatious about teaching' (Hertz, 1986: 63), that teaching means 'entering into a mildly erotic intersubjective relation' (Unger, 1986: 71) with other gendered bodies in limited pedagogical spaces. This acknowledges 'effective' powerful pedagogical work as very often seductive & pleasurable and pleasuring, intimate and personal. It acknowledges the classroom as 'a privileged space where eros and knowledge

converge', a space in which teachers are reminded of 'the troublesome presence of subtle desires, mobile desires' (Unger, 1986: 81). No longer can we sustain the idea that the teacher's body is immaterial. It becomes the pedagogical 'body of evidence' in disciplinary instruction (Angel, 1994:62). As Unger argues:

Teaching is not only very personal, it is also very physical... (p82)... A teacher who confesses or professes desire can no longer be scandalous except to those who still believe that the so-called life of the mind has nothing to do with the rest of the body (1986:pp.81-82).

In expressing my desire to move to analysis informed out of an erotics of pedagogy, I have refused many of the



normalising discourses of education, including psychoanalytical and critical feminist theory. I draw on literary criticism not in spite of but because it is subversive @ 'something of a wild card in the serious game of the theoretical disciplines' (De Man, 1986: 8). Its focus on modalities of production and reception of meaning are useful in interrogating pedagogy because of their very potential to disrupt mainstream educational theories and to disturb the disciplinary boundaries which now make so problematic a teacher's claim to power, seductive or otherwise. It is literary theory, for example, that reminds us of the etymological link between a love of knowledge and a knowledge of love. In Socratic dialogues, as *philia* and *eros*, these overlap, but are '(always already) internally divided into a play of difference along the lines of those between *plaisir* and *jouissance*' (Unger, 1986: pp82@83). Literary criticism allows the reclaiming of this tradition of instruction by refusing the binary formulation of teaching for pleasure and teaching as pleasure. As Cryle argues:

If we can (re)@conceive of eroticism without being overwhelmed by the thematics of desire in its radically subjective forms, then we may be better placed to understand the discursive authority at work in transmitting received notions of refined pleasure. (1994: viii)

This means, firstly, insisting on the separation of the erotic not from the corporeal but from the explicitly sexual. The project is not about 'understanding', much less 'forgiving' the sexual peccadillos of school teachers or university lecturers. Just as classical erotica 'have remarkably little to do with such standardly modern notions as 'climax' or 'the sex act', so too must an erotics of pedagogy be rescued from its precarious position as indicative of sexual deviance and/or abusive pedagogy. Instead, I want to explore pedagogy as a 'lived relation of power and knowledge' (Unger, 1986: 85) by focussing on the teacher as 'performing' what it means to know things. In his work *Geometry in the Boudoir: Configurations of a French Erotic Narrative* (1994), Cryle provides the metaphor of the instructor in the erotic arts 'display(ing) the bodily discipline at work in an erotic culture' (p.3) by generally rehears[ing], and thereby enact[ing], the teaching and learning of erotic "attitudes" as a set of venereal positions (p.viii).

In classrooms, teachers display their disciplines at work in the culture by rehearsing and enacting particular poses or

'positions' in relation to knowledge. As teachers, we struggle

against not so much a lack of knowledge but resistance to knowledge © what Lacan calls the passion for ignorance (Lacan, cited in Felman, 1986: p30). Because ignorance is not passive but an active and radical condition © 'a desire to ignore' (Felman, 1986: 30) © an active dynamic is needed to counter its power. This dynamic is manifest in the performative dimension of teaching, whether as text, utterance or bodily gesture. Through 'performances' as teachers, we indicate a range of positions in relation to a 'body' of disciplinary knowledge. We model knowing by striking a range of scholastic poses through which the learner is mobilised to desire to learn, to reject the seductive power of ignorance. This takes us back, metaphorically, to a world of theatre, of actor and audience © with the teacher performing for the pleasure of hearing the learner's 'encore!'.

Such a metaphorical construction is not without its problems. It risks recuperation into an old agenda of elitist authoritarian practice in which the student is always 'in the dark'. Thus it flies in the face of the contemporary concerns to theorise the learner as more than passive watcher/absorber' in pedagogical events. Cognitive learning theorists in particular insist on the activity of the learner. I also insist on the active 'embodied' learner, but through erotising the relationship of student and teacher in terms of the mutual pleasure of the gaze.

In performing knowledge acts for the student gaze, we can sometimes experience what Deutscher (1994:36) calls 'the elating sensation of a physical carnation of one's body as teacher...the overt pleasure produced by the possibility of one's own performance as empowered subject of knowledge, the seductive effect of instantaneity between teaching and learning body '. As Deutscher goes on to say:

Pedagogy is the site of the densest cluster of intersubjective incorporations. The teacher appropriates the body of the student in the occupation of the position of the subject supposed to know...and the student appropriates the body of the teacher in taking up an invested position in relation to the discipline © incorporating the teacher's...internalisation of certain conventions of method, content, style and technique...all of which [constitutes] the animation of the text by the teacher's body. (1994:pp.36©37)

It is through these performances that we are forced to confront the limits of our own material body as well as our 'bodies' of knowledge. Barthes (1978) writes of this

recognition of bodily limits as a crucial one for academics:

I can do everything with my language but not with my body. What I hide by my language, my body utters. I can deliberately mould my message, not my voice. By my voice, whatever it says, that other will recognise that 'something is wrong with me'. ...My body is a stubborn child, my language is a very civilised adult. (p.45)

Nevertheless, the 'animation of the teacher's body' through pedagogical events can endow it with special abilities. As

Lacan (1988, cited in Deutscher, 1994: 35) puts it, 'You never see anyone dumb@struck, once he's taken up the position of being he who knows.' This animation, in turn, animates both the body of the student and the text. Deutscher (1994) is almost stating the obvious in her observation that:

Even where the teacher's role is understood on the most rigid model of purity of transmission, the pedagogical relationship between student, teacher and text is very different to the relationship between teacher and text @ the teacher adds something, animating the text. To be taught the Ethics or the Critique of Pure reason by an inspired teacher is not the same thing as to go to the library and labour one's way through Kant and Spinoza.... (p.36)

There are clearly implications here for Open Learning as a particular sort of disembodied textual performance which needs to be mastered by the university teacher in the 1990s. These do not seem to be addressed in the flurry of activity around packaging up pedagogy for dissemination across vast geographical and cultural spaces @ and what the repercussions of this pedagogical onanism might be in terms of the fertility or otherwise of undergraduate and postgraduate scholarship. For those of us who understand and have come to depend on our body's performative skill in teaching, this challenge is not insignificant. Feminists in particular are under pressure to respond creatively while refusing the predictable culturally constructed reactions that have aided and abetted the techno™paranoia industry (Goodall, 1994).

Refusing the authority/nurture split:

This is not the only issue pedagogy@as@seduction raises for feminists. The very notion of claiming our own seductiveness in pedagogical work remains problematic. Naming and owning the elation of this pedagogical moment can appear to fly in the

face of the feminist teacher as benevolent and self™sacrificial nurturer. If we as feminists are to carry the burden of 'the maternal guise of benign innocence, purity of purpose and desire, natural devotion and selflessness' (Kirby, 1994: 18), we must not acknowledge 'our passion for power in learning, our delight in the flirtatiousness of intellectual debate, in the game of competing, in the sexiness of winning' (Kirby, 1994: 19).

Psychoanalytic feminists' concerns are more focussed on the problems implicit in the very claim to authority that a teacher makes. In interrogating teachers as 'knowing subjects', they argue that pedagogy is an economy in which the student is prey, with teaching a form of student capture which is also, simultaneously, self@capture (Deutscher, 1994; Irigaray, 1992). The counter@project which Gallop (1985), and le Doeuff (1980) insist on is an 'ethics of interruption', an undoing of authority from within the very position of authority. My problem with their problem is that examples are almost always drawn from teaching in higher education, (mainly male, usually postgraduate, often French), and appear to be aimed at academics whose scholastic 'poses' are well@rehearsed and very successful. The postgraduate 'supervisor/guru' may well be a suitable case for counter 'treatment' of this disruptive sort. However, many Australian teachers in

secondary and primary schools experience little of the kudos or the 'love of teaching self' that characterises authoritative teaching. They would no doubt love to have some authority to 'undo'. A more pressing problem might be literally to be noticed as a material or vocal presence in the classroom.

Nevertheless, it has been useful that many feminists (psychoanalytic and otherwise) are refusing to position themselves as 'disembodied spirit' in their own teaching. Jane Gallop has, of course, achieved notoriety in her attempts to 'eroticise graduate students' (Talbot, 1993: 31). In her discussion of pedagogy in higher education, *Eros, Eroticism and the Pedagogical Process* (1993), bell hooks describes mutually loving and passionate encounters with her students, male and female. Another dynamic African@American teacher, Pam Knight, disturbs pre@conceptions of critical sociologist George Noblit (1993) by conducting what appears to him to be a 'teacher@centred' classroom in a primary school. The display of her personal power, her humour and the collective rituals around her pleasure as a teacher seemed to Noblit to be both very effective in terms of student pleasure in learning and at odds with the notions of learner@centredness which academics

have touted as appropriate to the pedagogical 'empowerment' of minorities. What seems to me to have been denied by critical pedagogy here is the desire of the learner to be taught by a teacher.

Esther Faye's research on Australian women's experience of education in the 1950s is pertinent here. In expressing her sense of 'missing out' in her schooling, one woman says: 'Sometimes I have this incredible desire to always have had someone there that will teach me' (Faye, 1994: 55), and later: 'There was just a mass of stuff that wouldn't go in...all this mass of information I couldn't take in' (p57). What this does is reclaim the notion of the embodied teacher as fulfilling a desire on the part of the student for a teacher as quite specifically an instructor in what it means to know 'a mass of stuff'.

A teacher's desire to instruct and its duplicity with the student desire to be instructed has become problematic in modern times but this was not always so. Inquiry into traditions of instruction in the erotic arts by way of literary criticism reveals the importance of women as giving quite specific instruction about female bodily pleasure to other women. In this tradition, knowledge was transmitted typically through a strict procedure whereby the disciple followed step by step a woman who was 'keeper of the secrets' (Cryle, 1994: 77). Cryle cites the work of Nicolas Chorier who, writing in 1655 about ancient representations of the figures of Venus, depicted erotic art as a set of tableaux, setting out a range of venereal positions in such a way as to allow them to be taught to women of inferior status. Cryle (1994) elaborates:

They set out all they knew, and conceivably all there was to know, so that it could be understood and followed by others...the nature and number of those skills appeared quite finite (pp12013)...the set of postures is likely to be numerically precise © as is the space of effort available to the learner...(pp.12013)

[T]he examples...to be imitated... continue[d] to be made present by the on@going practice of postural modeling as erotic learning. Later when the originals [were] lost, this procedure... continue[d] of itself'. (p18)

This is hardly 'sexy' stuff. It speaks of the imposition of an ordered and disciplined classification of knowledge about desire through the body. The attempt to impose order on desire

is observed by both Cryle (1994) and Gallop (1986) in De Sade's attempts to 'teach someone a lesson' (Gallop, 1986: 117) through immoral instruction. In terms of contemporary pedagogical contexts, Gallop (1986) remarks cryptically:

[I]t does not seem inappropriate that an arithmetic perversion should arise in a discussion of pedagogy. School presents us with a world of numbers: grades, curves, credit hours, course numbers, class hours, and room numbers. I suppose not all teachers experience as I do a diffuse yet unmistakable pleasure when calculating grades at the end of the term. (p.128).

Whatever about Gallop's playful and ironic 'confession' as a challenge, something important is accomplished here. Desire in pedagogy is prised apart from any romantic understanding of progressive teaching as 'letting it all hang out'. Arguing for seduction as the mobilisation of the desire to teach and to learn cannot be conflated with advocacy of self-indulgence on the part of teachers or learners. It is clear that initiation into the fullness of one's own pleasure requires time, patience and repetitive practice. I am reminded here of a pedagogical joke that is trying hard to be off-colour. It concerns a brothel in which teachers are the most successful prostitutes. When a potential client listens in at the keyhole to discover their secret of their allure, he hears a very no-nonsense instruction: 'I don't care how often we have to do this. You're going to stay here until you get it right!' The joke serves as an irreverent reminder of the importance of authority and order to pedagogical pleasure as well as, of course, the inseparability of the love of knowledge from the knowledge of love.

#### Bibliography:

Angel, M. (1994) *Pedagogies of the Obscene: The Specular Body and Demonstration*, in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) *Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts'*, June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp.61-72.

Barthes, Roland (1978) *A Lover's Discourse: Fragments* (trans. Richard Hurley) New York: Hill and Wang.

Chambers, Ross (1984) *√/Story and Situation: Narrative Seduction and the Power of Fiction*. Minneapolis: Manchester University Press.

Cryle, P. (1994) *Geometry in the Boudoir: Configurations of a French Erotic Narrative*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

De Jean, Joan (1986) *La Nouvelle Heloise, or the Case for Pedagogical Deviation, The Pedagogical Imperative:*

*Teaching as a Literary Genre, Yale French Studies, No.63, 98-116*

De Man, Paul (1986) *The Resistance to Theory, The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre, Yale French Studies, No. 63, 30-20.*

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1984) *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia.* London: Athlone.

Deutscher, Penelope (1994) *Eating the Words of the Other © Ethics Erotics and Cannibalism in Pedagogy*, in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) (1994) *Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts'*, June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp. 31-46.

Dworkin, Andrea (1981) *Pornography: Men Possessing Women.* London: Women's Press.

Faye, Esther (1994) *'I have this incredible desire to always have someone there that will teach me': the Psychology™Education Expert and the 'Adolescent Child' in Early Post World War Two Australia*, in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) *Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts'*, June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp.47-60.

Felman, Shoshana (1986) *Psychoanalysis and Education: Teaching Terminable and Interminable, The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre, Yale French Studies, No.63, 21-44.*

Fox, Nicholas (1993) *Postmodernism, Sociology and Health.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Gallop, Jane (1985) *Reading Lacan.* Ithaca and London: Cornell University press.

Gallop, Jane (1986) *The Immoral Teachers, The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre, Yale French Studies, No. 63, 117 - 128.*

Gallop, Jane (1994) *The Teachers Breasts*, in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) *Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts'*, June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp.1-12.

Gatens, M. (1994) Responding to Gallop: Feminist Pedagogy and the 'Family Romance' in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts', June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp 13-16.

Goodall, Jane (1994) Turning the Vicious Turtle. Paper presented at the 'Performing Sexualities/Knowing the Sensorium Seminar, Institute of Modern Art, Brisbane, 25 June.

Hatton, E. (1989) Levi-Strauss' Bricolage and theorising teachers' work, *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 20, (2), 74-96.

Hatton, E. (1991) Teachers' Work and Teacher Education, *Discourse*, 12, (1), 124-139.

Hertz, Neil. Two Extravagant Teachings, *The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre*, *Yale French Studies*, No. 63, 59-71

Irigaray, Luce (1992) *J'aime a toi*. Paris: Grasset.

Kirby, Vicki. (1994) Response to Jane Gallop's 'The Teacher's Breasts', in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts', June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, 17-22.

Le Doeuff, Michele (1980) *The Philosophical Imaginary*, trans. C. Gordon, Stanford University Press.

Morris, M. (1994) Discussion: Jane Gallop, 'The Teacher's Breasts', in Jill J. Matthews (ed.) Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Proceedings of the Jane Gallop Seminar and Public Lecture 'The Teachers Breasts', June, 1993. Canberra: The Humanities Research Centre, pp. 23-30.

Noblit, George W. (1993) Power and Caring, *American Education Research Journal*, 30, (1), 23-38.

Ryan, M. (1986) Deconstruction and Radical Teaching, *The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre*, *Yale French Studies*, No. 63, 45-58.

Snitow, A. (1983) Mass Market Romance: Pornography for Women is Different, in A. Sitnow, C. Stansell and S. Thompson



(eds) Powers of Desire. New York: Monthly Review Press, 268.

Talbot, Margaret (1994) A Most Dangerous Method, *Lingua Franca*, Jan Feb, 23-40.

Ungar, Stephen (1986) The Professor of Desire, *The Pedagogical Imperative: Teaching as a Literary Genre*, *Yale French Studies*, No. 63, 81-97.