EURASIAN JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

<http://www.eurasianpublications.com/>

POST-STRUCTURAL RELATIONAL ETHICS OF TEACHER-STUDENT: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS OF JACQUES DERRIDA AND LUCE IRIGARAY

Soo Bin Jang

Michigan State University, USA. E-mail: jangsoo1@msu.edu

Abstract

This paper explores the ethics of difference and becomingness as the foundation of teacher-student relationship in contemporary school context. Based on the conception of difference of the French post-structural philosopher, Jacques Derrida, and the Belgian psychoanalytic thinker and feminist, Luce Irigaray, I suggest the relational ethics, which does not efface each student's uniqueness as a mean to arrive at more inclusive and potentiality-embracing education practice. I problematize the binary discursive structure within the Western philosophical tradition and the resulting closure of potentiality in education. In order to overcome the closure of potentiality, I reviewed the deconstructive strategies of Derrida and Irigaray by examining how they conceptualized difference and the essence of being. Based on their theory, I suggest that teacher and student relationship need to embrace post-structural relational ethics. I conclude by posing the idea of educative space as dwelling for difference and becomingness.

Keywords: Derrida, Irigaray, Différance, Sexual Difference, Teacher-Student Relationship, Post-structural Relational Ethics

1. Introduction

What is the ethics of teacher-student relationship? It is not simply about teaching and learning practice; a teacher and a student build relationship in educative space. What should be the relationship like and the ethics play within education, which is about the growth of human with potentiality?

I argue that the ethics of difference and becomingness should be the foundation of teacher-student relationship in contemporary school context. Based on the conception of difference of the French post-structural philosopher, Jacques Derrida, and the Belgian psychoanalytic thinker and feminist, Luce Irigaray, I suggest the relational ethics, which does not efface each student's uniqueness as a mean to arrive at more inclusive and potentiality-embracing education practice.

I begin by discussing the binary discursive structure within the Western philosophical tradition and the resulting closure of potentiality in education. The subsequent two sections analyze the deconstructive strategies of Jacques Derrida and Luce Irigaray by examining how they conceptualized difference and the essence of being. In the fourth section, based on the literature review of Derrida and Irigaray, I argue that teacher and student relationship need to embrace post-structural relational ethics. The final section concludes by posing the idea of educative space as dwelling for difference and becomingness.

2. Dualism of Western Philosophy

As John Dewey (1938) said, education is the growth and expansion of experience, which means continual establishment of relationships. However, too often, individual growth and expansion of experience take place under a limited binary discursive structure, which divides particular values into superior or inferior, rather than in the space of infinite potentiality. The socialization of individuals happens within schools and society which superiorize the values of laborious to laziness, reasonable to impulsive, and orderliness to randomness. Especially, recent schooling-related discourses, including teaching, administration, and policy, are divided into what it is efficient and productive and what it is not. Productive value is considered as a value-free universal common good. Attempting to increase efficiency in education appears as the desire to control the future to drive educative subjects in a particular direction. In this process, potentiality, which should be infinitely opened to individuals for their growth, should not be closed and limited. In education, a discursive structure based upon dualistic thought continually collapses when confronted by the ideal of human growth.

Derrida described metaphysics as a binary conceptual system. A binary contradictory structure assume a power hierarchy, such as good/evil, right/wrong, superior/inferior, and domination/subordination, and it prioritizes the originary values and automatically derogates other values derived from the original values. As Derrida (1974) wrote in *Of Grammatology*, Western philosophical history has prioritized speech over writings, i.e., logocentrism. Similarly, Western metaphysics has been referred to as phonocentrism, phallogentrism, and West-centralism, all of which particularly favor values such as reason, essence, truth, conscious, and Subjectivity over other values (Derrida, 1974).

The Western dualistic tradition has excluded particular values or has located them in inferior positions; thus the subject-other issue overlaps with power relation issues. Historically, the distribution of values was unjust, limiting human imagination and repressing individuals. For this reason, Derrida's deconstruction has significance in not going back to the problematic Origin.

As Derrida saw power relations in the dualism of logocentrism, Irigaray (1974) claimed that phallogentrism separates mind and body; relates mind with masculinity and body with femininity; prioritizes mind as pure presence and exteriorizes body as remainder; and formulates a normative femininity. According to Irigaray (1974), male subjectivity is a strange self who has removed his original relationship from his mother, from women, and thus is responsible for his own birth as if he had been there from the beginning of the world (Irigaray 1974, 182). Male subjectivity needs chains of mirrored values to secure his sameness. However, this subjectivity is a mere ideal format that lacks a relationship with the body. A cogito, who cannot secure his being in the moments of unthinkingness, needs God or some other exterior Origin to assure his existence.

Unlike normative femininity, which is the mirrored-self of masculinity, women who reflect on sexual difference can disclose the remainder of normative femininity, which are symbolized as non-existent, nothingness, absent, lack, hole, darkness, and dark continent (Irigaray 1974). The presumption that the phallus, the monopolized symbol, is the only original lack for both sexes becomes real through illusive ideas such as neutrality and objectivity. However, under monopolized neural phallus discourse, "the value of woman always escapes" (Irigaray 1985, p.176).

The binary system of metaphysics does not only exclude particular values through power relations but also fails to address undecidability, which is impossible to be reduced to a dichotomous logic. Moment to moment, individuals exist as undecidability, and the becoming future cannot be clearly spoken. Along with the individual undecidability of student and teacher, their complex relations make the future more unpredictable. Therefore, Derrida adopted *difference* and *supplement* to explain the im/possibility of binary paired values, whereas Irigaray chose the *sexual difference*.

3. Derrida's Strategy: *Différance*, Supplements, and Becomingness

3.1. Logocentrism and Deconstruction

The Cartesian cogito of the Western philosophical tradition seeks self-evident certainty through the notion that one can know oneself through self-reflective thinking. The purity and self-evidentiality of "cogito ergo sum" becomes more lucid via the self's auto-affective voice. One's own voice is a pure auto-affectation that needs no medium between one's representation and perception. The repetition of voice directly and persistently assures the definiteness of cogito.

However, to Derrida (1974), the self-evident characteristic of the Cartesian cogito is a fantasy because the language never allows us to enter the truth, or logos, which affects individual minds, body, and culture. The consciousness that cogito assumes is pure is under the influence of the Western metaphysical enclosures, which controls human language and reason. This Western truth, or logos, is characterized by the ideal, the substantiality, and the objectivity, apart from right or wrong and good or evil issues, and thus reinforces the infinite assurance and absolute independence of cogito.

Derrida disclosed that the desire of pure presence lies under the Western philosophical tradition (Derrida, 1974). When cogito seeks to draw back to its own consciousness that state that exists even before the lingual activity, it is assuming the ontological existence of the Origin. This is somewhat similar to the solitary state of God before the Creation, Plato's Idea, and the mythology of Paradise Lost. In other words, Western metaphysics hypothesizes the Origin and makes continually regressive movements, looking back obsessively. This is well reflected in the exemplary text of Rousseau (1978) his idea of pure Nature is described as an ultimate good, which civilization has to revisit forever.

The Western philosophical tradition, which Derrida often referred to as logocentrism, and Irigaray referred to as phallogocentrism, is very strong, so it is almost impossible for individuals to think, to write, and to speak out of this context. This Western philosophical system, an almost-unitary mode of thinking, has the same control and limitations as language. Therefore, criticizing metaphysics means to stand on the logical nothingness, the ultimate silence outside language. This is why Derrida (1974) said, "Il n'y a pas de hors de texte [*There is nothing outside the text*]," and chose deconstructive strategies to point out the intra-structural contradictions in philosophers' texts. What Derrida meant by "text" is somewhat more than language, including all concepts proposed under a metaphysical system. The statement that individuals cannot overstep the text reinforces the impossibility of our direct access to the pure-presence that is without difference and deferability. At the same time, it implies that the attempt to overcome the metaphysical orbit is only possible via uncovering the structural blind spot from the inside.

Therefore, against the persistent effect of logocentrism that deletes plurality and differences, Derrida chose faithfully to think about Genealogy from the very inside, to deconstruct. Again, this is because logocentrism cannot avoid using language and concepts; thus any attempt to overcome it cannot be made outside of language and concepts. Therefore, there is intense tension between language and the philosophy of otherness.

Deconstruction, a method Derrida used in *Of Grammatology*, is not his final purpose but more like the by-product of his thinking about difference. On the surface, it is work to "internally" problematize the texts of Saussure, Levi-Strauss, and Rousseau. However, more fundamentally, the reason Derrida chose their texts is that there are more inclusive and more ongoing symbolic structures of time beyond these texts, while they are also exemplary and symptomatic of a particular metaphysical field (Derrida, 1974, p.99).

Derrida tried to violate a traditional mode of thinking in order to push a metaphysical field towards some other place where difference and otherness can be reflected. This was not about identifying the origin of metaphysics, nor about producing something new outside the metaphysical closure (Derrida, 1974, 99). Rather, he was trying to balance philosophy and to defend ideological justice by pointing out the extremely biased tendency of the structure of metaphysics to highlight the purity and the sameness of the Origin.

3.2. The Idea of Supplement: *Différance*

Derrida (1974) introduced the term *différance* to mean both the differing space and deferring time characteristics of difference. *Différance* suggests that each signified is differentiated from the other, and that meaning is ultimately deferred in the substituting chain of the signified. He tactically used *a* instead of *e* in “difference” to point out how phonocentrism misses this significant difference. The difference cannot be detected in pronunciation but can only be made explicit in writing (Derrida, 1974).

Différance is a terminology which addresses the fundamental difference in the Origin, which is excluded in the present. From a positive perspective, some people suggest that the fundamental difference exists as present potentiality. In any case, metaphysics always desires the self-identical, self-present, and pure Origin, and it excludes difference and undecidability within such desire. For this reason, metaphysics is a closure, and within such a repetitive and reproducing economy, sameness is successfully preserved.

Derrida intentionally avoided subjectivation of himself; he did not refine the theory of subjectivity. In this strategic way, he addresses attention not to the subjectivity but to the otherness. Because the play of subjectivity often falls into a power exercise, the assumption of the Origin may impose a particular order and location for beings. If the Origin is absent or insecure, then according to Derrida, every existence that happens to be considered as proper therefore would no longer be proper.

As in the Western philosophical tradition, if we assume that pure consciousness present before writing, the position of writing becomes ambiguous. Although writing has been considered as a neutral deliverer of ideas over history, it actually plays the role of supplementarity. To Rousseau, writing is a dangerous supplement because it not only mediates thoughts; it also replaces consciousness (Derrida, 1974). In other words, a substitute takes over a real position.

Not only writing but any signifier cannot fully represent the object, and the loss of meaning-heterogeneity within the origin; our uniqueness-caused by signifier is violence (Derrida, 1974). Signifier defers an utter understanding of meaning and generates the difference of meaning as well. Therefore, this supplement is “more, less, or something other than what [the person] would mean” (Derrida, 1974, p.157). Signifier is indeed not value-free nor influence-free; thus, it is always dangerous (Derrida 1974, p.155). In short, consciousness is not self-sufficient, and it needs an exterior supplement, which ultimately causes the distortion of the original meaning.

Due to the impossible access to the Origin, all presences have lacks and absences; therefore we can only experience the chain of supplements (Derrida 1974). However, there is the danger of these supplements overstepping the Origin and ultimately replacing it. This fear repeats itself in logocentric history. As Derrida wrote, “There have never been anything but supplements, substitutive significations” (Derrida, 1974, p.159). If we trace back the chains of supplements to the Origin, the very first absolute presence always escapes, and it is utterly unthinkable.

The fact that the exterior addition is necessary implies the incompleteness of logocentrism. In Western philosophy, the Origin should not supplement itself at all. However, Derrida (1974) exposed the necessary supplements in Rousseau’s philosophy that assumed pure Nature; he disclosed the fact that Nature has an originary lack that actually needs something *inferior* or *unnatural* from “the exterior.” For example, no matter how nature-like the approach Rousseau takes, any educative interference in childhood is self-contradictory because then it means that childhood is one other name of originary lack. The supplements deny the absolute faultless of the Origin. In other words, writing, difference, and violence are there in the Origin, and there is no such as pure beginning.

3.3. The Moment of *Différance*, the Time of Birth

Traditionally, supplements have represented evil. This is because all supplements come from the exterior (Derrida, 1974). Humans construct meanings within their capability of imagination, and the things placed outside the imagination supplement the limits of human imagination. Things from the outside are considered as alien, vice, and the violence of towards sameness. Probably the very first heterogeneity must have been “nothing or nearly nothing” (Derrida, 1974, p.257), but the chains of exteriorities have served negativity in the history of thought.

Using a certain mode of “internal structural” criticism, Derrida questions the Origin. Is it possible to think or to speak the Origin? According to Derrida (1974), it is not possible to grasp the pure presence. “It is the ungraspable of the almost” (Derrida, 1974, p.253). Not the full presence but the originary *différance* was there from the beginning. This *différance* is only *real* and present as irreducible complexity, even in the moment of the Origin. The very first scene that humans can think of is the being-born of the supplement; the helplessness of infancy, when the play of supplementarity begins, it is the time of festival.

A new paradigm, that the essence of being is difference and becomingness of difference, is the time of birth and creation, provides the foundation for the value of individual uniqueness in education. This paradigm also allows educators to give up on their stubbornness due to the fact that the flawless Origin and the Truth cannot be possessed nor be considered. The presence of community is fuller when individual differences emerge; when students and teachers are able to present their unique differences, classrooms would be the space of continual birth and growth.

Unlike the binary contradiction that only allows absence/presence and negative/positive relationships, Derrida opened up the possibility for non-presence, neutrality, and other values outside the binary system. Under metaphysics, fundamental *différance* is unthinkable because it is the philosophy of sameness and the movement of effacing traces. His deconstruction project is meaningful because it opens up the space for multiplicity and complexity. Ideally, in this field, the significant *différance* of individuals is thinkable and possible. To sum up, his strategy was to loosen the strict contradicting symbolic system that forms and regulates our understandings.

4. Irigaray's Strategy: The Sexual Difference and Not-Yet-to-Come

4.1. Phallocentrism and the Fantasy of the Same Self

Irigaray (1974) criticized the Cartesian cogito as a fantasy that unquestioningly assumes the unity and simplicity of the subject (Irigaray, 1974). This Cartesian subject reduces the difference between the actual self and the reflected self, assumes the sameness between the two, and converts difference into non-existence. Disappeared difference generates two fantasies: first, a fantasy of the same self and second, a fantasy of the mirrored-difference between the subject and the other (Irigaray 1974).

Irigaray (1974) analyzed Freud's theory and pointed out the phallocentric tradition as the fundamental culprit. Similar to Derrida, who found his way to criticize the idea of the pure Origin to refer to the originary difference from Rousseau's texts, Irigaray used Freud's thinking to critique the masculinity of Western philosophy and to uncover the emptied feminine subjectivity. At this point, she aimed for a different goal from Derrida: she wanted to produce feminine values and to provide political space for *hers*.

If Derrida problematized the self-evident and unitary subjectivity and structure, Irigaray disclosed silenced females and patriarchal desire and dominance from the same history. She used genealogy like Derrida, and she pointed out internal structural flaws and what is excluded from texts. Historical totality erases the ontological existence of women by silence, and it simultaneously frames and freezes feminine subjects with its speculated-representation of masculinity (Irigaray, 1974). Irigaray interpreted the way male philosophers reduce female otherness, due to “its” hard-to-represent characteristics; they envelop it with the void of reflections and this fixes women by developing discourses over history (Irigaray, 1985).

4.2. Constructing Difference with the Conception of the Sexual Difference

Within Lacan's paradigm of *imaginary*, *symbolic*, and *real* dimensions, Irigaray (1985) tried to make changes to the symbolic system by using the idea of sexual difference. She focused on how this symbolic structure elevates current patriarchy as the dominant ideology and on plural symbolic systems along with their transformable characteristics. To change the symbolic system, Irigaray (1985) analyzed the symbolic structure; created the feminine imaginary system which allows self-representation of women and initiated the new relationships between subjects who reflect sexual difference. Through these processes, she ultimately projected to provide the space for women who have been forgotten for so long in history.

To make changes in the symbolic structure, the imaginary system has to change as well. Although it is impossible to escape the symbolic system, it is important to create a feminine imaginary system by speaking and formulating the discourse about women's body, and women's desire. Under the phallus-centric symbolic structure, sexual difference lies outside the symbolic system, is unthinkable, and is continuously wiped out since this potential difference is unimaginable. Irigaray says this symbolic structure implies only one sex, and under the same sex symbolic system, women's desire is excluded because it cannot be spoken (Irigaray, 1985). Under the paradigm which views a single sex symbolic system as a whole, $A + B$ is not a whole but only $A + \text{non-}A$ makes a whole; thus B , essentially different from A , is unthinkable. What we lose due to this unthinkability is not femininity but more fundamentally, difference itself (Irigaray, 2002).

According to Irigaray, the real of being corresponds in three ways: masculine subjectivity, feminine subjectivity, and their relation (Irigaray, 2002). These three correspondences interact and are dependent on each other; thus each part is not proper by itself. If Real is represented in the single Same, not as the trilogy, it is destroyed.

Sexual difference is Irigaray's strategy to provide the space for different subjects and the other. Concerning the philosophy of sameness, she said if we speak the same language together, we will always reproduce the same history. "The same difficulties, the same impossibility of making connections. The same... Same... Always the same" (Irigaray, 1985, p.205). Irigaray found the possibility for the exchange of significant difference in the style of women's discourse and desire.

Irigaray ultimately projected to (re)discover the imaginary space for feminine imagination outside masculine domination. Primarily, sexual difference is to address the essential difference between two subjects and the imaginary space between them. It can be named differently; however, the key idea is that there is the most essential difference between individuals, and that has at least some connection with sexuality.

4.3. Between Two: Dwelling for Difference and Not-Yet-To-Come

Irigaray viewed sexual difference as the essential difference of two different subjects. She thought, to overcome the binary structure, the most fundamental difference of beings, sexual difference, has to be played between two essentially different subjects. The difference will be continuously formulated in the space between two subjects. She searched for the exchange of desires allowing the difference. In the space between two subjects, a sense of awe, attraction, and other emotions play, and yet the distance for the difference remains. In this way, two different subjects can be considered equally. The space between subjects is maintained as they come up and draw back as they encounter each other.

Irigaray does not assume a concealed a priori world that exists before a particular perspective and interpretation of the subject. Meaning is not something that hides or reveals itself but is becoming and dwells. In order to experience multi-simultaneous becomings of relations and a multi-vocal world, a dwelling space made of language should be constructed. And "cultivation of the living must accompany a building of that which does not grow by itself" (Irigaray, 2002, p.144). This is to construct an educative space where individuals dance

together in their own unique ways, not to perform a round or group dance. In this process of dancing, individuals constantly move towards a new location of the subject; thus "another relation to space and to time becomes necessary" (Irigaray, 2002, p.81) every moment.

Unlike the tradition of logocentrism which discovers the measure of subjectivity only in relation to death, Irigaray focused on the space where the living may continually experience becoming and being. To her, the problem is how to locate and manage power, space, and time within life. Her philosophy is about how we should *live*, and more specifically, what we should do to construct a new living space (Irigaray, 2002).

In this new space, individuals require separate dwellings for intimacy (Irigaray, 2002). This irreducible distance creates a space and time for individual differences to be present. In order to establish relationships that let others *be* rather than controlling others, individuals should be free to create their own differences and to possess strength to keep their own uniqueness. Irigaray emphasized the importance of the solitude rest, a return into oneself, after an individual meets the other, bringing impulse and thoughts for inward gathering (Irigaray, 2002).

4.4. Teacher and Student Relationship with the Lens of the Post-Structural Relational Ethics

Although it seems like Derrida and Irigaray used different strategies to think about otherness, both of them pictured the other as a *becoming, unstable, undecidable*, and *transferable* image. Derrida and Irigaray have in common in that they both address the *field* where the subject and the other subject encounter each other; they draw our attention to the space rather than the subjectivity. Instead of conceptualizing the relationship as approaching one way or another, i.e., from I to you, or you to me, they invite us to think about the incidents of differences occurring *between* two of us, based on the sentiment of becoming otherness. In short, they shift our perspective, tense, and topic concerning the relationship issue.

In *Of Grammatology*, Derrida (1974) opened up the undecidability of the future. In the beginning of chapter 1, he commented on his own work of arch-writing, as "the wandering of a way of thinking that is faithful and attentive to the ineluctable world of the future which proclaims itself at present, beyond the closure of knowledge" (Derrida, 1974, p.4). The Derridian future is segmented from the normality defined by the present society and one can "dream while writing" (Derrida, 1974, p.316). He knew logocentrism would last forever, however, he also understood that it is the difference, the power to weave the future. He thus critiques the systematic unity of logocentrism, and he found potential polyphonical elements in order to issue philosophically the *différance*.

Moreover, in his illustration of the conception of hospitality, Derrida (2005) describes the stranger who visits the master as the one who may liberate the master. The stranger always comes from the "exterior," and he comes as a liberator or emancipator of the subject. Without this foreign subjectivity, the master would never get chance to escape himself without the opportunity to encounter with his potentiality. However, this attitude of embracing the stranger places the master into very fragile position since a foreign agent may come with hostility. In such a relationship, we cannot assume the starting point and the destination.

There is no solid ground for the subject. As if a text cannot be bound to one interpretation, and as if the future is essentially discontinuous from the present, each subject always has potential otherness within them. There is no fixed subject: individuals play subjectivity and otherness time and again. I am *becoming self* and yet *becoming other*. Derrida read the desire to join sameness with the insecure ground of the self. Irigaray (2005) described fluidal, open, not-yet completed, and ultimately becoming subjectivity.

In the conception of not yet to come, or hospitality, we cannot know who and what is coming and how we are going to greet them. Here, the content of becoming is not important; it is about our understanding and attitude of difference. In the education site, teachers should understand that the progress of student and themselves are always becoming, and it happens

when they encounter the stranger; thus, as educators, they should have open-mindedness to embrace difference.

How the difference can be handled? A dilemma of the philosophy of otherness is that it cannot speak about the other. It can mention about the possible difference, but as soon as it tries to think specifically, the other becomes the subject, not any more the other. The other seems impossible to reach. If Derrida defers access to the other, Irigaray actively wants to approach the other via the idea of sexual difference.

Should we leave the conclusion open after deconstructing the difference? Or, should we revisit Hegelian dialectic and synthesize the difference? The reason Irigaray intentionally leaves sexual difference as the essential difference of subjects is that there are dangers of femininity being synthesized by masculine sameness. Whereas Derrida assumed that, under this thesis-antithesis-synthesis paradigm, masculinity would always win over femininity and perpetuate its monopoly. Derrida, in an extremely cautious attitude, tried to open up the space for plural differences, avoiding all sorts of essentialism-sounding vocabularies. Irigaray was also aware of the risk of going back to essentialism; instead of going back to the traditional binary paradigm of masculinity/femininity, she is making a call to reconstruct the new order outside the dichotomy (Irigaray, 1985).

Although Irigaray's idea has high risk to fall back in to essentialism, her trilogy of correspondences of real-the masculinity, the femininity, and their relation-as one set opens up possibility to think about the relations of educative subjects differently. The relationship of a teacher and a student is not anymore only vertical but horizontal as well (Irigaray, 2002). By this distancing strategy to secure absolute difference, a teacher is guaranteed a space to understand and respect a student, and a student can do the same thing for a teacher. Eventually, classrooms and larger education communities would be able to construct infinitely complex relations not in hierarchy but in more fluid and net-like ways.

Moreover, the conception of the sexual difference humbles subjectivity. Irigaray (2000) argues that we need to be aware of our own limited identity, followed by mutual-recognition of subjectivity. As I recognize the fact that I belong a particular sex, it means that I understand that I cannot represent the whole human being; everyone is partial and limited since we are all sexed being. Both male and female are just about the half of the human race; thus, as a sexed being, individual cannot fully represent human race. It also means that I accept the fact that I do not know the other, and I recognize the other as the limit of my existence. In language perspective, Irigaray (2002) calls this as the syntax of indirection. In order not to project the other as my object, she says we need indirect syntax instead of transitive, which makes the other the object. For example, instead of saying "I love you," we can add preposition "to" in between verb and the other and say "I love *to* you." Irigaray explains the function of preposition "to" in many ways; in this way, I can love you and yet leave you as who you are (Irigaray, 2002, p.47).

Imagine a teacher with such ontological humbleness in relation with students. A teacher who does not assume s/he can know everything about a student; aware of his/her limit in terms of knowledge, classroom management, and being a model adult. Similarly, Derrida, with the conception of the inaccessible Origin and supplements, humbles various authorities within education realm. For example, some knowledge and particular values that claim absolute authority in education may not be considered as proper and so may lose their dominance. This post-structural violation on the authority within education site demands a new paradigm of teacher-student relationship. By losing absoluteness, a teacher would be able to access the world of students, this voluntary give up is not towards destruction but towards the full blossom of humanness in the future.

Back to "Il n'y a pas de hors de text [*There is nothing outside the text*]", our speech, writing, and thinking cannot escape the historical context of logocentrism. Simultaneously, there are some parts within me that always slip away from the verbalization attempt and that are always new and becoming. As the Origin already has the Supplement or the Différance, individuals have the potentially plural subjectivity which locates them in the center/peripheral

according to context/situation. The essential difference of individuals is the *otherness* in them, undecidability and becomingness.

5. Conclusion: Ethical Educative Space

To sum up, I have examined the post-structural relational ethics of Derrida and Irigaray in order to overcome the deeply-rooted binary discursive structure, and the closure of potentiality in education realm. In this section, I would like to briefly sketch the ethics of teacher in terms of constructing the educative space for becoming differences.

Within the philosophy of otherness that takes *difference* as dynamics, the movement of consciousness has to be more *fields*-like or *spatial*, not anymore linear. For this reason, the philosophy of otherness calls for the thoughts of this space where the essential *difference* can endure; each subject harmonizingly forms a part of the space. This reminds me of the *Taoist* view of nature, that individuals find themselves within the constantly changing world.

As Irigaray relates our attitude of anticipation to the becoming inclusive time, she asks us to cultivate the present in order to become ideal. As much as anticipation is critical, building present dwelling cannot be neglected. Irigaray uses the illustration of dancing and claims that we should construct space where individuals dance together in their own unique ways, but to perform a round or group dance (Irigaray, 2002). She strategically uses the dancing metaphor because in this process of collective and yet individual dancing, individuals constantly move towards a new position of the subject. Within this dynamic, the present constantly changes to another space and time.

How different teachers, different students, and becoming differences can present in education site? Common education for all cannot blossom by teaching commonness. As in the history of American schooling, emphasizing a unitary commonness has divided some as dominant and others as the minority (Spring, 2011). A dual paradigm in educative discourse locates some students and teachers to the inferior position and ultimately excludes them. Inclusive common education is only possible when we explicitly claim the value of difference and actively construct physical and discursive educative space for becoming different.

The ideal of public schools, as social institutions for the purpose of social integration and common experience of citizens, would be achieved as a common experience to cultivate culture and understanding together, using the vitality of individual difference as the driving force rather than teaching the same curriculum to close the achievement gap for common test scores. In the educative space for the absolutely different subjects and their dwelling, students and teachers experience one another as the expansion of experience-growth. The continuous becomingness of diversity would be the fuel for a progressive society (Dewey, 1916).

The construction and the qualitative development of horizontal relations should be considered not only in terms of physical classrooms but in symbolic dimension as well. Within the relation of a teacher and a student, classrooms, schools, districts, and all other education related discourses, where language of human growth and future are spoken, absoluteness, rigidity, and unilaterality should be avoided. Educative discourse, which is fundamentally about continuous human growth and progress, should be based on the principle of openness, flexibility, and plurality. This is "a space where the bridge between past, present, and future is elaborated, as well as the passages between the other and oneself" (Irigaray, 2002, p.146).

Even at the moment of encounter, becoming potentialities produces the parts we do not know yet in the exterior and interior of our selves; therefore, we can always meet the other as if it were the first time. If this humble unknowingness becomes a common ethical ground for all education related discourses, including teachers, curriculums, administrations, and policies, school might become a different place.

References

- Derrida, J., 1974. *Of grammatology*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University.
- Derrida, J., 2005. *Rogues: Two essays on reason*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Dewey, J., 1938. *Experience and education*. New York: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Dewey, J., 1916. *Democracy and education*. New York: Macmillan.
- Irigaray, L., 1974. *Speculum of the other woman*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Irigaray, L., 1985. *This sex which is not one*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Irigaray, L., 2002. *The way of love*. New York: Continuum.
- Rousseau, J. J. 1978., *On the social contract, with the Geneva manuscript and political economy*, Masters, R., ed. Translated by Judith R. Masters. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Spring, J.H., 2011. *The American school: A global context from the puritans to the Obama era*. 8th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.