
Pedagogy, psychoanalysis, feminism:

Review of Jane Gallop Seminar Papers, Ed., Jill Julius Matthews, The Humanities Research Centre, The ANU Canberra, 1994.

Terry Threadgold
Monash University

Insofar as the question of postgraduate pedagogy has been addressed at all in Australian universities, it has been addressed in terms of contractual obligations between supervisor and supervisee (and by implication, between those two parties and the university as institution), and in terms of an increased panopticism, the need to discipline (control) the student's labours to categorise and improve levels of research output: so many words in such and such a genre in six months, so many more in twelve—and so on. There is a similar perceived need to quantify, categorise and give economic value to the kinds of staff time and energy that might be devoted to the project of supervision—appointments every three weeks of an hour or more, the need for academic staff loads to take account of this, the need again to behave in ways which increase student output or perhaps 'throughput'. That is, the need to keep them moving on the assembly line of knowledge production, because there are others waiting, and because successful 'throughput' means money for the institution. Postgraduate students are worth more in EFTSU dollars than undergraduates, and that matters as undergraduate loads are reduced by the technology of DEET and government intervention into higher education: but it matters only for the period allocated normatively for the successful completion of a higher degree. After that, the EFTSU dollar is lost and so is the economic value of that postgraduate student.

This kind of quality-speak, this 'commodification' and 'marketization' of public discourse as Fairclough called it in 1993, has been typical of the post-Dawkins era in Australian higher education. It has been both 'productive', in Foucault's or Hunter's (1994) sense of producing the things of which it speaks—greater surveillance and control, and a recognition of the need to think seriously about what postgraduate pedagogy is or should be—and at the same time amazingly negligent. What it neglects includes many things of importance: the fact that postgraduate supervision and research is part of a process of the *making*, not just the transmission of knowledge, the fact that that knowledge has both symbolic and cultural as well as economic value (to use Bourdieu's [1991] formulation), the fact that any making of knowledge that goes on involves people, people who have bodies, sexed bodies, and that that process is never free of desire or power, nor of class, race and gender struggles and inequalities. And even all of this does not yet address the question of just how "professional vision" (Goodwin, 1994), associated with disciplinary knowledges, is actually to be taught, or contested, in these fraught, collaborative and sometimes hostile encounters.

Knowledge cannot be produced without the making of texts and texts always carry the marks, the traces of the labouring subjects who produce them. That labour involves "work on and with signs, a collaborative (even if hostile) labour of reading and writing" (Grosz, 1995, p. 20). This feminist and semiotic formulation is one that should be central to our attempts to understand what we do when we engage in postgraduate pedagogy. Feminist psychoanalysis has been challenging for a long time now the public face of the 'marketization' discourse, insisting that relations which that discourse would relegate to the private sphere (the somewhere else of domestic or feminised space) actually permeate our educational and indeed governmental institutions as well, and that a feminist (or indeed any pedagogy) cannot ignore the sexuality, the unconscious desires, the will to power and the making of the relations of ruling (Smith, 1990) and thus of the

relations of sexual, class and racial difference, that are made on a daily basis in these very public spaces. What the marketization discourse never allows to be spoken is the fact—not the imaginary, but the fact—of these differences in supervisory relations.

Some time ago, John Frow (1988) bravely attempted to put some of these issues on the agenda, only to be challenged some time later (Giblett, 1992) for the things he had not said, had not managed to move beyond. His failure is itself instructive. What Frow attempted to do was to construct a transference model of postgraduate pedagogy. Giblett (1992) challenged the blindness to gender in Frow's construction, pointing out that he had effectively gendered the supervisory role as masculine, assuming that 'erotic' questions (of relations with male students, sexual harassment and so on) would be a problem for female supervisors occupying that 'masculine' role, but never addressing the question of his own sexuality in relation to male and female students. Giblett's critique was based in the fact that Frow had maintained a transmission model (from male knower to male apprentice) of pedagogy, ignoring the possibility of a counter-transference situation in which the student would know "that she/he knows but also for the analyst/supervisor to know that she/he does not know" (Giblett, 1992, p 139). Frow set out to use psychoanalysis to make a radical intervention into questions of postgraduate pedagogy, but actually allowed himself to be positioned by an Oedipal scenario—which reduced his story of the supervisory relationship to one of the "oppressive rituals of the patriarchal family" (Giblett, 1992, p 144). This failure is instructive because of what it tells us about the persistence of that Oedipal narrative as a way of life in Australian universities.

In some ways, the attempt to open up these issues for discussion in the Gallop Seminar Papers founders around the same set of questions: the ubiquity of the Freudian family narrative as both the reality of institutional existence and the only alternative discourse we have for interrogating these relationships—the only major theoretical discourse which gives woman any place at all, even if it is still a place in *his* story. Is there no other position for women in higher education to occupy than that of the desexualised mother or the dangerous seductress? And what of relations between women in those public spaces? How do we theorise and deal with that? On the one hand, as Jessica Benjamin, among others, has argued convincingly: "The social separation of public and private spheres ... is patently linked to the split between the father of autonomy and the mother of dependency" (Benjamin, 1980, p 185); and John Frow is caught up still in that problematic. On the other, there is the question of a different model of the mother and of mother-daughter relationships, and of different kinds of performances of the relations of ruling among women in the academy:

What if your mother refuses her gaze, turns her attention elsewhere? Does not serve as your mirror, your nurturance, your ground of continuity of being or of the semiotic, fertile source of aesthetic meaning ungoverned by the Father's Law? If she is no longer outside, but inside, power? If she wields power not as care, nurturance, preservative love, but as assertion, need, desire of her own? Or if she is off playing, with other women or men? Or in her own head? Can daughters stand to be cut off, outside the dyadic circuit? (Flax, 1993, p. 67).

They are good questions, questions that are central to the dynamics of current postgraduate pedagogy in Australian universities, and questions that the essays written for the Gallop Seminar addressed, perhaps without resolutions, but at least in public and as a matter of institutional concern.

This collection of essays, written on and around the work of Jane Gallop and delivered at a seminar at the Humanities Research Centre in Canberra in June 1993, is a remarkably disparate collection, in which the textual traces of a number of tensions and elisions remain both legible and current. There is an uneasy alliance between the work of Australian feminists and their US counterparts, perhaps focussing around psychoanalysis as theoretical position or metaphor, there is a question of race insofar as psychoanalysis and indeed Gallop herself seem unable to deal with that question, and there is the issue of feminist pedagogy which Gallop's own paper, "The Teacher's Breasts", puts on the agenda—only, it must be said, to have it largely repressed or ignored as an issue in what follows.

Gallop's paper is a critique of a version of feminist pedagogy, a personal, nurturing, maternal pedagogy, which, if we are to believe Gallop, finds masculinity a problem in its classrooms, typically gendering the student as female and ignoring "the effects of gender in our pedagogical practice" (p. 12). This is the one breast pedagogy—"the maternal breast", "good-girl" pedagogy—as opposed to a two-breasted, sexed pedagogy—"bad-girl" pedagogy—which might ask some rather different questions of itself. While I find this good/bad binary facile and historically unfounded (Miller, 1992), there are some interesting questions here. As Gallop points out, the male student poses a sexual question: he does not fit the sexual harassment case (sexual advancement by male professors towards female students), and he cannot be "subsumed into the maternal desexualised erotic" of the feminist pedagogy she addresses. I will take the three responses to Gallop in turn.

Moirá Gatens re-reads Gallop's paper as the epitome itself of the psychoanalytic narrative - the family romance according to Freud—and therefore reads the disruptive male presence rather differently. What he disrupts, in Gatens' reading, is the functioning of the authoritative discourse of psychoanalysis itself, demonstrating that this is a very limited model for rethinking ethical relations between men and women. Vicki Kirby takes a different tack, telling of the experience of hearing Gallop give this paper in the presence of the woman whose work is the object of it, a woman who had just had a double mastectomy, and whose own justifications of her 'maternal' pedagogy, in that context, made 'unspeakable' the questions that Gallop was trying to address.

Kirby, like Gatens, rewrites Gallop, but this time in terms of the relationship between women and authority, and of the inadequacy of the maternal model to account for this relationship. She is right, of course, but I think it has to be said that the maternal has never been divorced from power, from the pleasures of power, any more than teaching has, and Kirby's account of Keyssar's performance of "the tyranny of the maternal" suggests a rich field for further research. Be that as it may, Kirby's most important point is that any kind of selfless feminist pedagogy is *impossible*, that knowledge is always involved with the "passion for power in learning" (p. 21), and that the exclusion of the "male student" in Gallop's paper must be replaced by the healthy discussion in feminist classrooms of even male authors who pathologise women. It is interesting to watch the way that a 'one-breasted' feminism becomes not only maternal but also anti-intellectual in Kirby's paper.

Meaghan Morris is the one to tackle the question of contexts, Australian and American contexts, directly, and the one to question Gallop's mode of 'symptomatic reading' as an adequate way of dealing with the complex institutional issues of power and pedagogy that her paper raises. There is some interesting discussion here around the question of the constitution of sexual harassment as an exclusively heterosexual scene, particularly in the context of Helen Garner's book *The First Stone* (something Morris does not mention). Perhaps more importantly, Morris takes up explicitly the "progressively infantilized

representation" of the graduate student in the Australian context of late (p. 24), suggesting that this is not and cannot be the same phenomenon as the "heavily transference relationships common in US graduate schools". There are good contextual reasons for this in the absence in Australia of the funds to sustain that kind of US graduate teaching corps and its disciples. The question of power relationships in graduate pedagogy, while explicitly not limited to sex or to the explanatory powers of the family narrative, is never far from the surface in this response.

Morris' other major trajectory is the business of 'symptomatic reading' and the different histories that produce feminist reading practices in the US and Australia. Her very pertinent and useful conclusion is that Australian feminism began by "pondering the difference" between New Criticism and Western European readings of Formalism (p. 29), a distinction she believes US French feminism has rarely noticed. Gallop's work is of course implicated in this criticism. Morris' careful historical account produces good reasons why, in trying to deal with the intrinsic/extrinsic (text/context) problematic addressed in Gallop's work, US "French feminism" has concentrated on *experience* while Australian French Feminism has been more strongly inflected by the concept of *intertextuality* (p. 29). For Morris, and I think she is right, the US New Critical intrinsic versus extrinsic model is probably one of the least well equipped models for helping us to think about institutional politics, power and feminist pedagogy. And it remains far too literary in its preoccupations. Morris' final call is for a much more complex account of the heterogeneity of our experience of academic life than anything the Freudian romance can offer. I am reminded here of a very recent comment by Elizabeth Grosz, speaking of Teresa de Lauretis' attempts to rewrite psychoanalysis to include Lesbianism. The limits of psychoanalysis for thinking this issue are similar to its limits in the area of feminist pedagogy, institutions and power. I think we have to ask, with Grosz, whether attempts to make psychoanalysis do this kind of work only "serve to prolong the agonies of this dying discourse, giving it hope for remission, when in fact it should be buried?" (Grosz, 1995, p. 159).

The two final papers in the collection pick up a number of threads from the Morris response to Gallop, Susan Sheridan developing the history of the difference of feminist literary studies in Australia and Anne Freadman taking up the textual questions, pointing to the disappearance of genre as an analytical category in feminist literary theory, specifically in relation to feminist accounts of autobiography, and arguing that this loss of understanding of rhetoric and textuality has serious implications for work on ethics, gender, aesthetics and politics, and thus for feminist pedagogies. The issues she raises are central to the issues being debated around pedagogy in this collection: "How to 'get' the ear of the other might be one question a text has to address: where the other is, and what structures it is inserted in as its ear is got, is a problem that the text cannot control, but that control is certainly a rhetorical desire" (p. 177). Rhetorical desire, the traces of corporeality in the text, making texts to do feminist work, and understanding how they do it are crucial issues for feminist pedagogy.

These are questions that are taken up in other papers in the collection in radically different ways. Penelope Deutscher attempts to rethink the intersubjective relations of pedagogy through Le Doeuff and Irigaray, suggesting "the notion of participation in a 'collectivity' as an alternative to the cannibalism of the other" (p. 44). Esther Faye explores the construction of the adolescent and of desire in discourses about pedagogy, and contrasts the textual traces of the desires of the educational experts with the desires and fantasies of a woman remembering her own unsatisfactory adolescent education. Maria Angel looks at the body in scenarios of authorisation and demonstration. Kay Torney's paper is on motherhood and western obstetrics. Zoe Sofoulis' paper returns explicitly to the psychoanalytic narrative, this time in the context of the world of the electronic arts and feminist interventions into this world, explicitly not arguing for the subversive nature of feminist art forms per se, but suggesting that what is most subversive about the artworks she discusses is "the fact that they exist as collaborative efforts", thus making possible a passing reference back to

Deutscher.

The other two papers in the collection both come back to the critique of psychoanalysis, specifically in relation to race, and, insofar as it is entrenched within that tradition, to a trenchant criticism of Gallop's own theoretical positioning. Rosanne Kennedy's is a complex and carefully argued paper which makes clear the way in which the heterosexual family metaphors of psychoanalysis, as used by white feminists, depend on the repression of black men and women and on the exclusion of the interracial nuclear family. Kennedy is clear that she is making an explicit intervention into American feminism (p. 107), and explores the ways in which the work of both bell hooks and Spivak unsettle and question Gallop's own feminist project, producing Gallop's anxiety about "the other woman". Kennedy reads feminist psychoanalytic theory as a hegemonic text which continues, despite its own best efforts, "to reproduce dominant cultural discourses and their master narratives" (p. 113). To justify these criticisms, she too engages in some clever history writing, looking at the relationship between French and American feminism around 1980, but she continues to use psychoanalysis metaphorically to take us back to the problem Gallop had raised at the beginning of the book: "white feminist anxiety about race stems from the inability to recognise oneself as having the phallus, of occupying a site of domination" (p. 127)—the problem of feminisms and power, of pedagogies and authority.

It is these same issues that Peng Cheah takes up in a rather different register. Again he takes Gallop's work as exemplary of the "dominant feminist paradigm" of psychoanalytic feminism, exploring the question of whether a psychoanalytic cultural critique, which begins by placing the body outside history, can be adequate to "cultural critique in a neo-colonial globe" (p. 132). Again (see Grosz above) we are asked to consider whether this renders Lacanian theory "unworkable". I will not pursue the details of his argument here, but I do want to take up one crucial point. Peng's "tedious question" (p. 138) is important. He argues that, following Gallop, the most influential model for feminist political agency today is that of body-inscription and the body-image. His insistent question is this: "is such a model of agency responsible to woman-in-difference in a neo-colonial globe?" (p. 138). He wants in fact to undo the undoing of Cartesianism that has been so central to feminism, arguing that to admit that our bodies, "as they exist in nature, might have been constructed against our political will", would "threaten the autonomous will of the Lacanian feminist cultural critic" (p. 138). He is critical—and I think rightly—of the limits of discussions of sexual preference and cross-dressing, pointing to the need to consider embodiment at the level of food-production, consumption and exploitation, and suggesting that oppression occurs "in the very crafting of the materiality of our bodies". He uses the work of Franz Fanon, and later of Derrida, to arrive at the claim that there is a responsibility to remember "the trace of the other in us", and "the irreducible violence of our recognition of difference as identity" (p. 141).

There is much here then to unsettle many recent versions of feminist pedagogy and theory, and not just the personal US variety with which Gallop began. The issues of power and authority in relation to knowledge, teaching and learning that are raised at the outset of this collection are anything but answered. The questions of sexuality and the eroticism, of the one-breasted, double-breasted or phallic (does the breast equal the penis, as Zoe Sofoulis argues?) versions of the teacher or the classroom economy are, by the conclusion of this book, deeply embedded in a series of still more profound tensions and anxieties. Many of these questions need much more debate and some serious empirical, as well as metaphoric and textual, research if we are to make them connect with some of the current gendered anxieties around postgraduate supervision that are surfacing in the Humanities in this country at the present time. This collection, problematic and oddly positioned around the figure of one feminist critic as it is, nevertheless puts many of these important and timely questions on the future feminist and pedagogic agenda.

References

- Benjamin, Jessica (1990) *The bonds of Love: psychoanalysis, feminism and the problem of domination*, London, Virago.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1991) *Language and Symbolic Power*, Cambridge, Polity Press.
- Fairclough, Norman (1993) 'Critical Discourse Analysis and the Marketisation of Public Discourse', *Discourse and Society*, Vol 4, No 2, pp 133-168.
- Frow, John (1988) 'Discipline and Discipleship', *Textual Practice*, Vol 2, No 3, pp 307-323.
- Giblett, John (1992) 'The Desire for Disciples', *Paragraph* Vol 1, pp 136-155.
- Goodwin, Charles (1994) 'Professional Vision', *American Anthropologist*, Vol 96, No 3, pp 606-633.
- Grosz, Elizabeth (1995) *Space, Time and Perversion*, Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Flax, Jane (1993) *Disputed Subjects: essays on psychoanalysis, politics and philosophy*, New York & London, Routledge.
- Hunter, Ian (1994) *Rethinking the School: Subjectivity, Bureaucracy, Criticism*, Sydney, Allen & Unwin.
- Miller, Jane (1992) *More Has Meant Women: The Feminisation of Schooling*, University of London Institute of Education, The Tufnell Press.
- Smith, Dorothy (1990) *Texts, Facts, and Femininity: exploring the relations of ruling*, London & New York, Routledge.

Feature contributors

Marie Brennan is Associate Professor and Head of Postgraduate Education in the Faculty of Education, Central Queensland University, Rockhampton, Queensland.

Terry Evans is Associate Professor and Head of the Graduate School, Faculty of Education, Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria.

Bill Green is a senior lecturer in the School of Social and Cultural Studies, Faculty of Education Deakin University, Geelong, Victoria.

Bob Hodge is Foundation Professor of Humanities at the University of Western Sydney, Hawkesbury, Richmond, New South Wales.

Sue Johnston is Associate Professor in the Centre for the Enhancement of Learning, Teaching and Scholarship, University of Canberra, ACT.

Gilah C. Leder is Professor of Education at LaTrobe University, Bundoora, Victoria.

Alison Lee is a lecturer in the School of Adult Education, University of Technology, Sydney, Broadway, New South Wales.

Erica McWilliam is a senior lecturer in the School of Cultural and Policy Studies, Faculty of Education, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, Queensland.

Patrick Palmer is a course and curriculum developer at the Tertiary Education Institute at the University of Queensland.

Peter Taylor is a lecturer in the Griffith Institute for Higher Education, Griffith University, Brisbane, Queensland.

Terry Threadgold is Professor of English at Monash University, Clayton, Victoria.

Anna Yeatman is Professor of Sociology at Macquarie University, North Ryde, New South Wales.