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Abstract

This article considers the contribution that Jacques Derrida’s work Of Hospitality might make to higher music education as it unsettles the usual ascription of normative value to learning and teaching music at the university. Along these lines, what is most at issue in the encounter with Derrida’s thinking is the concomitant notion of forms of temporality—unpredictability, slowability, immeasurability, anticipation, serendipity, and surprise. Higher music education is seen as the practice of social transformation through the realization of the notion of unpredictability of the “oral” being-together with and through music educational interactions that are not sacrificed to economically driven performance indicators and measurable outcomes. Furthermore, the article draws on the learning and teaching practices of de-familiarization of educational spaces and pedagogical responsibility to the others as ways to disrupt students’ fixed expectations about what good music teaching and mastery are. Overall, this article is a call to see unpredictability as another framework through which higher music education can seek to re-invent theoretical concepts as well as codes and conventions of teaching and learning practices by inviting us to contemplate their own insufficiency, incompleteness, and discontent.
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Tell me a story.
In this century, and moment, of mania,
Tell me a story.
Make it a story of great distances, and starlight.
The name of the story will be Time,
But you must not pronounce its name.
Tell me a story of deep delight.

—Robert Penn Warren, *Tell Me a Story*¹

**INTRODUCTION**

This article challenges some of the taken-for-granted assumptions about the potential of openness to and dialogue with community through collaborative music learning in higher music education that characterize a current drive of music institution reforms and policy initiations. In this context, the study of music education in the university feeds back into the preparation of the next generation music teachers and the roles music institutions play in society and the enterprise economy. The article attempts to raise awareness that the current trend of music institution reforms and policy initiations that treat education as a “learning management system”² that is “ultimately about serving the needs of institutions, not individual students”³—disguised in the language of socially equitable ways of learning—is far more problematic than it appears. The emphasis on measurability, standardization, and homogenization these reforms incur may steer the music teaching profession further away from the long-standing goals of music education—that is, promoting educational occasions through music which can serve participant learners towards the discovery of trust and intimacy with and among each other.

Reflecting philosophically, the article considers the contribution that the work of Jacques Derrida might make to higher music education. Derrida’s contribution lies, I will argue, in the way in which his work *Of Hospitality*⁴ unsettles the usual ascription of normative values to learning and teaching music at the university. More specifically, the article addresses the need that higher music education in the neoliberal and (within Europe) the post-Bologna Agreement university should prepare students as well as professors towards overcoming their fixed expectations about mastery and knowledge in learning and teaching music.
Derrida’s reflections are concerned with the relationship between questions of the reception of strangers, foreigners, and Others with questions of hospitality. Hospitality appears at first sight to be a political and legal theme. The interpretation of hospitality is encouraged by the connections made by Derrida and others between this idea and current geopolitical and ethical discussions about migration, asylum, and global mobilities. In this article, however, I demonstrate the extent to which what is most at issue in the encounter with Derrida’s thinking about hospitality is the concomitant notion of the temporality of “intersubjective human relations,” which are “formed in a temporized relation of responsiveness to the surprise of otherness.”

While recent music education philosophy has reflected on hospitality in relation to community music and social justice, it has paid little attention to the significance of temporality in this line of thought. In this article forms of temporality, such as unpredictability, slowability, irregularity, immeasurability, anticipation, serendipity, and surprise are regarded as central in response to music interactions with others, especially in the context of higher music education. As will be argued, these forms of temporality, as directly related, shed new light on the issues of de-familiarization of educational spaces and pedagogical responsibility to the Other, which aim to offer music students and professors a new, uncharted section of knowledge and renew their expectations about music teaching and learning in higher music education. Touching upon Derrida’s concept of temporality in the context of hospitality, the article is divided into three interrelated sections that explore ways that continuously reshape and deconstruct educational expectations, interpretations, and thereby collaborative learning in the university.

First, I describe how reforms of higher education which focus disproportionately on economic and political goals—and not on academic and artistic purposes and educational agents—deform music teaching and learning itself. I do this in order to highlight broader assumptions about, and challenges to, higher music education, which is considered as “subject to the prevailing ideologies and power relations of a given place at a given time.” Along these lines, higher music education is seen as the practice of social transformation through the realization of the notion of unpredictability of the oral being-together with and through music educational interactions that are not sacrificed to economic imperatives.

The second part of the article draws on the learning and teaching practice of de-familiarization of music education settings in order to disrupt students’ fixed expectations about what good music teaching and mastery are. Providing a contextual background from my own teaching experience in the university I will demonstrate how de-familiarizing learning opportunities for music education
students might assist them to create new learning experiences by becoming lost and revelling in the unknown or unpredictable. To deprive learning experiences of the feeling of unpredictability is to deprive music of its immediacy and us of the occasion for a possible transformation, both personal and social.

In the last part, I describe ways of relating Derrida’s unconditional hospitality and the concomitant notion of temporality to the development of academic responsibility to the Other. By emphasizing the importance of pedagogical responsibility in academia that resonates with a way of learning and teaching through the constant creation of open social spaces of interactions, participations, and collaborations that always surprise participant learners, we can fight the mere development of skills that risk becoming a rational and repetitive mechanism or a “routine expertise” which leads to a dominance of mastery as the single possible truth. In other words, through teaching pedagogical responsibility higher music education gives music students the opportunity to learn by keeping themselves in a constant state of awareness of many realities and attentiveness to the others. As the late Seamus Heaney said when interviewed by Henri Cole, “You have to grow into an awareness of the others and attempt to find a way of imagining a whole thing.”

PREDICTABILITY AS A FORM OF CATERING IN HIGHER MUSIC EDUCATION

Higher arts education in the neoliberal and (within Europe) the post-Bologna Agreement University has increasingly become “a tightly controlled public spectacle orchestrated by political and business elites.” As a result reforms towards measurability and standardization of arts education that focus disproportionately on economic and political goals—and not on artistic and academic purposes and players—deform arts education in general and music education in particular. Measurability, among other things, affects forms of temporality—unpredictability, slowability, anticipation, and surprise—central to the academic teaching and learning of music, which run the risk of gradually vanishing. Music students want to know as much as possible about a course before they start to attend it. They do not want to be surprised. They want to feel they are moving into a known territory. They do not like to be taken off-guard or leave a course with questions. Instead they demand quick answers, most likely, their own answers.

As Pascal Gielen and Paul De Bruyne point out, nowadays the teaching of arts and humanities in the university has become

[A] form of catering, and just like catering, the client is well aware in advance of what to expect, which is never the sublime cuisine of a top-notch restaurant, but a well-calculated mediocrity. To the catering regime, after
all, quality first and foremost means not delivering outside the norm. This is one guarantee the client at least has.13

Furthermore, music departments are being treated as competing enterprises and music students as “individual entrepreneurs” or “self-capitalists”14 in view of their employability, so that they can be of use in the labor market.15 The legislation of “entrepreneurial qualities” to music curricula,16 the fragmentation of higher education into modules, common standards and assessments, and the promotion of “enterprise pedagogy”17 appear to further perpetuate an inorganic gap between theory and practice within music education,18 as neoliberalism—through management and business-modeled courses, among others—redefines the social field as an utterly productive space in which students work and live in a calculating and capitalizing way. As James Garnett elucidates, enterprise pedagogy “can be seen to claim its authority on the basis of its effectiveness” in contrast to a theory of music education which “claims its authority on the basis of its truth.”19

Nevertheless, music departments do not embody the same degree of critique of institutions as visual art departments do. As a result, this tendency appears to produce a type of criticism of music institutions that is rather unsophisticated in the politics of culture, especially concerning the problematic situation that music educational space and the acquired knowledge and mastery in the music academia shift from the domain of the community in the direction of the market. As Heinz-Dieter Meyer and Aaron Benavot rightly warn us concerning the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA), which is sponsored by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD):

PISA’s dominance in the global educational discourse runs the risk of engendering an unprecedented process of worldwide educational standardization for the sake of hitching schools more tightly to the bandwagon of economic efficiency, while sacrificing their role of preparing students.20

If we agree—paraphrasing the late Bennett Reimer21—that the nature and value of music education for all people is determined by the nature and value of their interactions with and through music, then music education—like people’s music interactions—cannot be catered, delivered or taught inside a norm. Among other things, music is a wonderful occasion, which can serve people towards the discovery of trust and intimacy with and among each other. Consequently, music education—like music interactions—involves a communicative practice, in which the meaning of communal practice becomes an issue. Hence, a lack of communal contexts amounts to something like a lack of the public sphere, which is to say that music education in higher institutions would somehow have
to exist without a relationship to the people next to them, or without “the ‘oral’ being-together of proximity and immediacy.”

More specifically, the idea of the “oral” being-together with and through music interactions is based on a more recent discourse towards the re-examination and de-construction of musical experience that places it within the context of issues of meaning, practice, freedom, and the ways political power gives advantages to some people while failing others. Although educational practice and research suggest that the purpose of educational institutions is to socialize and integrate students into society, “it is necessary to note that this purpose is mostly being applied unjustly by imposing on, or colonizing non-dominant cultures.”

Access to and experience of this oral being-together require slowability, incalculability, serendipity, and unpredictability, which are important qualities not only for music interactions but also for the biotope of music learning and teaching, qualities which the neoliberal system doesn’t know how to deal with. This presupposes that we understand the above-mentioned temporal qualities in education as part of equal and reciprocal communal actions characterized by the *aporia* (uncertainty or paradox) and frailty of human affairs rather than solely by the economically driven paradigm of measurable and predictable outcomes-oriented or mastery-based learning. As Trevor Gale and Kathleen Mary Densmore rightly point out,

> With increasing aspects of teaching and learning translated into performance indicators and measurable outcomes, it becomes easy to assume that that which is or can be measured is important while what cannot be measured appears to be of less value.

The insistence on the importance of unpredictability and unexpected outcomes of human interactions is a matter of reconstructing the homogenous, normative, and economically-motivated thinking, teaching, learning, creating, and/or assessing in light of recent and anticipated reforms in how music institutions function and communicate with each other. It is also “an opportunity to freely imagine what should be done, unhindered by administrative worries about what cannot possibly be done (Stark).”

Along these lines, in his essay “The University without Condition,” Derrida argues for the necessity of thinking beyond the category of acts that are possible for an academic subject. He claims that thought must engage with the impossible, that is, the order of the unforeseeable event, the absolute future still to come. Derrida’s notion of unpredictability is linked to the nature of an event, which—like the oral being together with and through music interactions—“is what comes and, in coming, comes to surprise me, to surprise and to suspend comprehension.”
In this light, in his remarkable review of the concept of the “gift” as a paradigm of equality of human “transactions,” “which interrupts economy,” Derrida makes an additional central intervention about the importance of the issue of time connected to our discussion thus far toward restructuring the biotope of music teaching and learning—without promoting neo-liberal and capitalist inequality agendas. In the second chapter of Given Time, entitled “The Madness of Economic Reason,” Derrida expounds that equality in the reciprocity of human interactions can be solely established through “time as rhythm, a rhythm that does not befall a homogenous time but that structures it originally.” Taken together, unpredictability, anticipation, slowability, and irregularity are inseparable temporal characteristics of an event, in Derrida’s sense, since the full meaning and outcome of an event is unknown to the people who initiate it.

The rest of the article is about finding ways to embrace these temporal characteristics as an essential and inseparable condition of teaching and learning music in higher education. Trying to bypass or standardize them would actually spell the demise of education in general, and higher music education in particular—the arena within which students and professors can never predict and control the scope, meaning, and consequences of the oral being together with and through music, in the same way that catering companies control on-time and on-demand delivery.

UNPREDICTABILITY AND THE CREATION OF DE-FAMILIARIZING MUSIC EDUCATIONAL PRACTICE

Although music education philosophy and research address responsiveness and flexibility as characteristics of music creativity, improvisation, and music making in music teacher preparation, there is still a dearth of scrutiny about the issue of de-familiarization as the music teaching and learning practice to “make the familiar strange” in academia. De-familiarization is defined here as the educational practice that goes beyond awareness building to spur social action through repositioning participant learners and teachers in an educational setting that appears familiar to them.

We take as a starting point for discussing this idea Derrida’s assumption of hospitality. As the French-Algerian philosopher points out, “If I welcome only what I welcome, what I am ready to welcome, and that I recognize in advance because I expect the coming of the hôte [guest] as invited, there is no hospitality.” This implies that the experience of this form of hospitality is open towards the unbounded prospect of social connection, which inspires us to put our delimited institutionalized attitudes and practices into question. Along these lines, academic teaching and learning become “a practice of active engagement with
Based on this perspective, the practice of active engagement with the world in unfamiliar music educational situations presents itself as a natural point of departure because it enables us to radically enlarge the scope of experiencing what is musically and, in turn, music educationally possible. Here, Howard Becker’s observation about his teaching experience as a professor can be of some use:

I think, instead, that it is first and foremost a matter of it all being so familiar that it becomes impossible to single out events that occur in the classroom as things that have occurred, even when they happen right in front of you. I have not had the experience of observing in elementary and high school classrooms myself, but I have in college classrooms and it takes a tremendous effort of will and imagination to stop seeing only the things that are conventionally “there” to be seen.

It is also the fixed, predictable, and self-perpetuating—because of the use of repetition—gaze on the Other in a familiar space, according to the poststructuralist thinker Homi Bhabha, that engenders the formation of stereotypes in educational processes. For Bhabha, stereotype is “a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always ‘in place,’ already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated.” Along these lines, it is worth noting George Lewis’ cautionary argument that the stereotype’s “repeatability is often precisely what is desired.” In this respect, embedded in the aforementioned statements is the invisibility of the Other in conventional or known educational spaces or situations, which has implications for higher education in general and music education in particular.

What does the notion of practice in unfamiliar communal music educational spaces look like? According to Sara Delamont, Paul Atkinson, and Lesley Pugsley, to fight familiarity in education is to take “the viewpoint of actors other than the commonest types of ‘teachers’ and ‘students’ in ordinary state schools (This can mean focusing on unusual settings in the school system).” In this way, unfamiliarity helps us avoid situations that validate or extend existing hierarchical power structures in deceptive ways. Most importantly, however, unfamiliarity builds an educational context towards our attempt to explore the question of “how we might know what we don’t yet know how to know,” as Irit Rogoff formulated it.

To this end, I will concentrate on a students-teaching-students approach as a paradigm of creating de-familiarizing educational situations. Using my course “Music Education” as contextual background, which incorporates the interdisciplinary widening-participation program Community Action in Learning
Music (CALM) in its syllabus, this approach is realized when all final-year university music students (not student teachers or preservice teachers) who have never taught music at a school and who are not yet members of the institutionalized group of music teachers, on the one hand, and school children at high risk schools who are excluded from access to public music education (for example, mostly children of economic immigrants, Roma children, children of disadvantaged urban and rural backgrounds), on the other, teach each other. In this context, the “familiarity problem” in higher music education is addressed through the placement of trust on, or the empowerment of, students both in the university and the disadvantaged schools. Thus, the proposed unfamiliar educational setting becomes manifest as a fruitful, if properly cultivated, pedagogical action as it moves us to fight existing mechanisms of distrust for students and consider approaches to teaching that can open up the academic community as a whole and “develop new styles of subject promotion in schools and communities.”

Moreover, this students-teaching-students approach that aims to explore existentially and theoretically the premise that music education is for all people utilizing unfamiliar participatory structures of actual music educational space, gives university music students the opportunity to learn by placing themselves in the experience of the excluded or at-risk school children in order not just to teach music but to “experience and formulate a civil society.” In other words, music students are enabled to grasp, feel, and radically question “the power of conventional academic normative thinking for which those lives are ‘other,’ different, non-normative,” using Griselda Pollock’s words about the aim of her teaching feminism in a visual arts department.

At this point, it should be noted that the process of students-teaching-students in the framework of my course is taken to its precarious limits because university music students are not confined by mentor teachers’ practices. The disadvantaged schools that they themselves choose to teach at in groups of two to four students do not have music teachers and are not associated with the music department under any official educational partnership. I agree with Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, Emily Smith, and Kevin Basmadjian who wrote: “For our part, we viewed the mentors as limiting interns’ learning-to-teach opportunities and promoting ineffective practices.”

Under these conditions, when students are not expected or compelled to conform to stereotypical teacher and student behavior, there is an absence of a durable, fixed, and predictable situation, which actually appears to be a prerequisite for new intimacies, closeness, circumspections, intersections, and interfoldings through music educational interactions, since the unfamiliar spaces are to be creatively (re-)appropriated in the effort of all participants to arrange them with
each other. Thus, it is the realization of mutual accessibility in unconventional educational contexts of proximity, the development of solidarity among participants through collective action, and the unleashing of students’ latent potential that can re-create new sets of music educational meanings and practices in music institutions.

It is worth mentioning that even during the current terrible pressures and worries of economic survival due to the current financial and social crisis, Greek music students continue to search for new, more insightful meanings instead of solely looking for utilitarian pedagogical recipes that would help them make it in the labor arena. Offering de-familiarizing learning opportunities for music students to be lost and to learn in the unknown and unpredictable appears as the next step for music departments in generating knowledge that is not limited by the scope of the visible, knowable, and canonistic in the same way that music is not limited by the effable, visible, and rational.

UNPREDICTABILITY AND THE PRACTICE OF PEDAGOGICAL RESPONSIBILITY

The above-discussed proposition of unpredictability as source of music learning and teaching in higher education through de-familiarizing educational situations intersects with the particular philosophical way Jacques Derrida is taking to the limits the concept of responsibility to the Other, the unfamiliar, the stranger within the framework of “unconditional hospitality.” Derrida’s concept of unconditional hospitality posits that we have an “infinite responsibility” to the Other. According to Derrida, without responsibility

\[
\text{\ldots \ldots [Y]ou would not have moral and political problems. \ldots \ldots And everything that follows from this. As a consequence, whatever choice I might make, I cannot say with good conscience that I have made a good choice or that I have assumed my responsibilities. Every time that I hear someone say that “I have taken a decision,” or “I have assumed my responsibilities,” I am suspicious because if there is responsibility or decision one cannot determine them as such or have certainty or good conscience with regard to them. That is the infinitude that inscribes itself within responsibility.}^{50}
\]

Along these lines, when focusing on education, responsibility to the Other can be considered as the ability to reflect and respond to socio-cultural, socio-economic, and political contexts of action “over the virtue of one’s own intentions.” This kind of pedagogical responsibility becomes the main purpose and vehicle of higher music education only when educational actors in new and unpredictable educational environments are geared up to take risks reflecting on whether academic knowledge—succumbing to the usual one-size-fits-all standardization and
ascription of normative values—might “lead to a silencing of open alternatives and therefore also a turning away from the Other.”

Indeed pedagogical responsibility surpasses educational opportunities for reinvigorating music students’ humanity, inspiring empathy with the less fortunate, or even motivating students to work to help support free access to music education. Actually, such opportunities can make students experience a sense of superiority with regard to their music educational assumptions and mastery of music skills, if they do not consider pedagogical responsibility as a vehicle that enables the most marginalized people to mobilize their most abundant resource: their creative power, solidarity, and self-realization. In other words, one might say that the practice of pedagogical responsibility can flourish in academic collaborations, collectivities, and/or partnerships when the act of welcoming becomes “free from the distortion in which the helper dominates the helped.”

What happens if academic institutions embrace pedagogical responsibility as a theoretical stance and as a day-to-day politico-ethical action—one, of course, that goes beyond the containing pragmatism of the rewarded and “knowledgeable” master who asks the poor and “ignorant” Other to “feel welcome” but really means “access free of charge”?

With regard to music education there is a growing body of recent research that tends to link the abstract philosophical debate and perspective surrounding hospitality with more mundane and tangible conceptions of “community music,” which mostly takes place outside of institutional settings, such as community-initiated choruses, orchestras, and other music-making groups all over the world. In most of these settings, the primary emphasis is placed on the generosity of the welcome by the so-called “community musicians,” who usually lead these music groups. Higgins concludes, “If community musicians can think beyond comfortable understandings of what usually constitutes community, then they may be more successful in providing increased and richer opportunities for the ‘voices’ of the participants to be heard.”

If we use pedagogical responsibility as a paradigm for politico-ethical activity in music institutions, then higher music education can become the paradoxical—too often uncomfortable—preparation for the “voices” of the participants not merely to be heard, as Higgins wrote, but to be interrupted or silenced by the unpredictable Other that is always to come as an event which exceeds calculation, rules, norms, methods, programs, anticipations. It is a kind of higher music education that incorporates serendipity in its didactic approach. More specifically, this approach requires from music students, on the one hand, to try to disrupt the process of musically acting according to what they think they know or master or according to what they believe “good” music teaching is, and from music education professors, on the other hand, to question the truth that we aspire to infuse in our students.
When read through the lens of Derrida’s concept of unconditional hospitality, higher music education seeks not only to produce academic knowledge and skills, but also to acquire political relevance through and as equally mutual music learning interactions. When students from diverse educational backgrounds (for example, university music students and students in disadvantaged schools) learn from, and teach, each other, as discussed above, indeterminate practices and open connections questioning theoretical concepts are likely to be pursued. In turn, these diverse socio-musical backgrounds and positions of the participant music learners-teachers are capable of generating wider social, cultural, and musical transformations.57

In other words, pedagogical responsibility seeks to enable students not only to shape their own music learning experiences and thus their own music education philosophies, but—most importantly—to transform their relationships to contemporary existence and public life. Especially, pedagogical responsibility that compels music students to go beyond their “narcissism”58 can also fight the sheer development of skills that risk to become a rational and repetitive mechanism—a “routine expertise”59 or a “repetitive banking method of teaching”60—which leads to a dominance of knowledge as the only possible truth. As the distinguished Greek violinist and Berliner Philharmoniker Artist-in-Residence Leonidas Kavakos put it, bluntly, when interviewed by Matthew McDonald, the first principal bass of the orchestra:

A true artist for me should be ready, let’s say, to cancel all his knowledge any moment. The experience you cannot cancel, but the knowledge you can. So, I feel, an artist is ready, prepared, and strong enough—because it takes enormous strength—to cancel all his knowledge in one moment that something else will appear and maybe will open another channel to, for his way of interpretation and so on. One should be absolutely ready to do so. And that’s the way. I feel that it is something that applies to everyday life also because one can never say that one knows it all or has seen it all. And the beauty of life is that there is this unpredictable element that changes without logic or without reason sometimes or definitely without expectation, changes everything.61

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Some of the ideas generated in this article align with findings of recent research on music making, improvisation, and creativity that suggest applying embodied, inclusive, and/or integrative approaches to teaching and learning music,62 meeting uncertainty with flexibility,63 and generating socio-musical responses to communal needs.64 In this line of thought, the article calls for a new attention to the significance of forms of temporality, such as unpredictability,
slowability, anticipation, and surprise, that can affect current policies of learning, teaching or assessing in higher music education which promote measurability, repeatability, homogeneity, and standardization of academic practices.

What makes Derrida’s philosophical thinking about hospitality and its concomitant precondition of unpredictability relevant for philosophical reflection in music education is that all music educational forms of social engagement require an acceptance of the possibility of being changed by the Other. In this context, unpredictability is proposed as a framework through which higher music education can seek to unsettle the usual ascription and standardization of normative values to learning and teaching music by preparing students to move towards disrupting the process of musically and music educationally acting according to what they assume good and creative music teaching is or according to what they think they know. Unpredictability discloses that any attempt to completely open the door to new possibilities requires intellectual contemplation, criticism, and re-invention. After all, music education is about more than “music making”—it is also about “reflective thinking skills” that must be continuously and critically deconstructed.

Nevertheless, this kind of deconstructive critical reflection—this thinking out of their comfort zone—has a tense, time-consuming, and disconcerting effect on university students’ learning through practice of pedagogical responsibility to the Other in new and de-familiarizing communal educational environments. Susan Deeley’s observation of students’ perceptions about academic learning that combines coursework with service in a community illuminates the drawback of unpredictability with razor-like accuracy:

Elements of the ‘downside’ of service learning, and its unpredictability, soon became apparent as a result of critical reflection. One student exclaimed, ‘it turns your world upside down’ and another described it as ‘daunting . . . frightening.’ There were two main reasons for this. Firstly, some students were challenging their own values and beliefs, which caused them discomfort. Secondly, some could not control their newly acquired skill and found that they were continually reflecting critically on many aspects of their life. Consequently, they felt this was very time consuming. Moreover, it had an immobilizing effect. A student said, ‘I just need my mind to stop . . . it scares you, it kind of throws you off balance.’

In this light, unpredictability challenges us to deconstruct theoretical concepts as well as codes and conventions of music education practice by inviting us to contemplate their own insufficiency, incompleteness, and discontent through a reflective experience of not knowing. A deconstruction can be extremely instructive, though sometimes devastating, painful, and time-consuming, but is never conclusive since it does not attempt to demystify a taken-for granted concept or
belief by setting rigid boundaries to its scope or disclosing it as simply false. On the contrary, such a perspective recognizes “a power that produces discourses, knowledge, pleasures,” as Yannis Stavrakakis wrote.

This kind of deconstruction never results in happy-end music educational goals and motivational pep talk about the social benefits of music education without—needless to say—discounting the importance of hope. It is an attitude of pedagogical responsibility to the Other and a way to create spaces of orally being together with and through music educational interactions that are exposed to emergent interpretations and social actions. It makes us re-invent ourselves with inquiring whether every time we have done enough to render trust and intimacy that can last.
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