ENTREVISTA COM KEITH SWANWICK

Entrevistadores: José Nunes Fernandes e
José Alberto Salgado e Silva

Transcrição e edição:
José Alberto Salgado e Silva

RESUMO: Entre os dias 20 e 30 de setembro de 2002, realizou-se na UNIRIO o evento "O Ensino Musical da Música", tendo como convidado especial o Prof. Keith Swanwick *(Institute of Education – University of London)*. Como parte central de uma intensa programação de atividades, o professor convidado conduziu a exposição de sua mais recente produção teórica em educação musical – iniciada com duas oficinas (dias 20 e 21/09), tendo seqüência com uma série de cinco palestras (de 23 a 27/09) e completando-se com a conferência anual de abertura do Colóquio do Programa de Pós-graduação em Música da UniRio (em 30/09). Na tarde do dia 27, nosso convidado reuniu-se com dois dos organizadores do evento, para conceder uma entrevista em que falou com simplicidade e bom humor sobre sua extensa carreira como estudioso da música e da educação musical. A publicação da entrevista em *Debates* aparece, oportunamente, no momento em que se lança no Brasil o livro *Ensinando Música Musicalmente*, de Keith Swanwick. Na entrevista estão delineadas algumas das idéias centrais do livro, além de reflexões e relatos em primeira mão, sobre a trajetória intelectual de seu autor.

ABSTRACT: In September 2002, UniRio hosted "O Ensino Musical da Música", a series of seminars and workshops having Prof. Keith Swanwick (Institute of Education – University of London) as special guest. At the core of an intensive programme of activities, our guest presented his recent theoretical production in music education – beginning with two workhops (20-21 Sep.), followed by five lectures (from 23 to 27 Sep.) and culminating with the opening lecture for the annual Colloquium of the Programa de Pós-graduação em Música da UniRio (30 Sep.). In the afternoon of the 27th, our guest met with two of the event's organisers, to concede an interview in which he spoke candidly – and in usual good-humoured fashion – of his extensive career as a scholar of music and music education. Debates publishes the interview timely, as the book Ensinando Música Musicalmente, by Keith Swanwick, is launched in Brazil. Here, the reader will find outlined some of the central ideas in the book, besides reflections and first-hand accounts on the intellectual career of its author.

José Alberto: *Prof. Swanwick, it is an honour and a great joy to have you visiting us and we hope that with this interview we can present more of your ideas to those who could not attend the series of meaningful activities you've been conducting here. First of all, could you tell us about your professional career?*

Keith Swanwick: O.K., well, a professional career, of course, begins long before anything professional happens. As a boy, I suppose my most musical activity was as a member of a brass band. From the age of about ten or twelve I played in a brass band and had piano lessons. And I noticed that very curious things occurred. When I was playing in the band, for example, I was playing the Eb tenor horn and when I played the note written G (which I now know that sounded Bb), in some contexts it was very easy to play, but then in another context obviously a different chord was going on around it, it was more difficult to play, it sounded more stressful. And I began to be interested in listening to what was going around me, in the band. What my part did in relation to everyone else's part. And should I play loudly here or not? Could I contribute to this texture or not? So it was very informal, autodidactic sort of way of going on. And then, I eventually transferred to the trombone, and at the age of 16 I won a scholarship as a trombonist to the Royal Academy of Music in London, and for two years I studied seriously the trombone, conducting, piano, organ and other things like composition and so on. But, after the experience of playing the trombone for a while, I began to realise that it was a profession that I really didn't feel too comfortable with. It seemed to have a lot of hanging around; you have to drink quite a lot of beer... This seemed to be the tradition of trombones in our country anyway. And, you know, it was a bit sort of precarious as a livelihood. In any case, I don't suppose I was a particularly good trombone player. So, I switched to the keyboard and conducting and I took the teacher's course. And taught for six years in secondary schools, full-time. At the same time I was a church organist in a Methodist church for three years, while I was doing this job in London, and I worked in that capacity as a choirmaster as well.

Later I took a job in another school and I moved to Leicester, where I became conductor of the City Schools Orchestra – that's a combined orchestra –and also the local Operatic Society, and had a lot of conducting experience. It was a very practical musical involvement, in a number of

ways. I also sang in a choir in the City Temple, in London, for three years, and played the first trombone in Leicester Symphony Orchestra for a while. So I was quite busy as a musician, as a singer, as a conductor, as a player.

Then, when I began teaching at the second job, someone suggested that I should think a bit further than just teaching and doing the music we did, and take a Master's course. And I did this, at the University of Leicester, where I was asked if I'd consider researching popular music and its effects on education. My supervisor was very much against popular music and felt it was uh... corrupting young people. This started me off on a career of research. I was still a school teacher, I was able to work with different classes at the age of 13 and 14, teaching different kinds of curricula, and using popular music in the classroom for the first time in our country. This was in the 1960's, so popular music was a big thing with the students. But it hadn't entered yet the mentality of the teachers. And I was experimenting with its effects on the attitudes of students, and on their musical learning. I had a few findings, which became my Master's degree and proved exactly the opposite to what my supervisor was looking for. But he was a very tolerant person and as long as it was done scientifically, that was research, and that's the way it works.

And eventually I got a job in teachers' education, training music graduates who wanted to become teachers; that was in London, at the University [of London – Institute of Education]. At the same time, I was keeping the musical activity going: I conducted symphony orchestras and choruses, outside of the daytime hours of my teaching job, and for many years I did this sort of thing, I kept going as a musician. Then, eventually, the PhD, on the topic of "Music and the education of the emotions", which was a broad topic but I did quite a lot of very specific work, some of which I've shown you actually, on children's perception of musical change and its connection with their sense of feeling in weight, time, space and flowing – which I think was quite new in its time and interesting topic.

Then I was very lucky in time that, in our Institute of Education, the first Chair to be created in any Curriculum subject was not in Science or Mathematics or any other subject but Music. It was an accident: a retirement of a Head of Department meant that the thing could be reviewed for the possibility of a Curriculum Chair. And that was the first professorship of a Curriculum subject in Education in the U.K.: it was quite interesting

that Music was this kind of forerunner. So I thought it very important that I had to establish a research tradition, to attract research students, internationally, to write and publish and all the rest of it, and I was quite industrious, I think, in doing those things. And then, I suppose, a lot of my work has been independent but a lot of it in collaboration with students, whose own PhD's relate to my work (when they are any related), and there's a way of constant conversation, with students criticising each other's work and trying to understand the ideas and get them clear which is very formative and necessary for a university teacher not to be seen as sort of having all the knowledge but to put knowledge forward clearly and to be prepared to have it challenged and amended and criticised by others, including students. So, that's merely a kind of thumbnail sketch of my career today, and last year I became Professor Emeritus which means I am retired but still active in ways I wish to be and not too active in my University.

J.A.: *And what are some of the tasks that you have at the moment at the University?*

K.S.: I should say that, in the previous year (again a new thing), I became for two years, before retiring, a Dean of Research at the University, for the Institute of Education. My predecessor, for example, was Basil Bernstein, this is sort of an important post, which means that I was in charge of the whole research programme, including 8 million pounds of research money a year, from outside agencies, and 600 PhD students on a big programme, and I was responsible for those things and for staff's own development and consultancy. So I ended up being in a managerial position, as I reduced my contribution to the Music Education Department. Now, since January this year, I've enjoyed myself by having afternoons to read books: I've been reading books, this is very unusual for a University teacher, to read books [laughs]. I still have six PhD students, two of them graduating now and I have four more to keep going for another couple of years. But I'm not interested in continuing to carry on what I was doing. I spent a lot of this year in foreign countries, in Cyprus, Spain, Greece, Brazil and so on, working there, and I'm quite stimulated by travel and by ending up in other cultures and trying to have conversations in different settings. I rather feel now that I've come to a crucial time, when I'll probably engage in a project, and I have several things in mind. One is to offer myself to

the local brass band as a trombone player and say "I'm very happy to come and deputise, join your rehearsals, if you want anybody give me a call", just as a sideline. But the other thing is I really feel I've done most of what I can do for the field of Music Education. I've been fairly industrious, there have been developing ideas over many years, and in a way I want to stop doing that and let it lie and have the people do what they want with it, and take up some new lines, which I am going to get by reeling the things I feel are important – taking up new philosophical and psychological positions to see how far they take me. Of course, music itself is an interest and I shall continue to play music. I want to spend time doing things I'm interested in and thinking about the things I'm interested in, and not working to other people's agendas. That's the great liberation of retirement.

J.A.: *Can you tell us something about the origins of the "Spiral Model"?*

K.S.: Well, when I was doing my work on popular music in the 1960's, I read [Suzanne] Langer and [Leonard] Meyer, which I did with great interest, it kind of opened a lot of things I had not even thought about and they are references in the book I wrote in 1969, *Popular Music and the Teacher*. And I suppose that set me off along the road of thinking about the characteristics of music experience. And then I began to notice that people writing about music tended to commit themselves to one way of looking at it, as though it were the only way. For example, what we might call referentialists writing about that kind of referential meaning; others, sort of formalists, writing about musical structures and all that kind of thing. And others were psychologists writing about musical preferences and values. So all these people were writing in different ways as though their way of analysing was the way to look at music. They were right that this was an important angle or dimension of musical experience; they were wrong in that the others didn't really matter. In other words, there wanted to be some kind of theory that would take into account all of these things. And I needed a new idea. While I was on holiday one year, in France, I just sort of realised that a thing I had already thought about, this Piagetian idea of assimilation and accommodation, I began to see that musical characterisation or expressive character was in fact an imitative activity. It fulfilled the requirements of accommodation:

we become like what we hear. So it all began to fall into place, there was this equilibrium between these two things that Piaget never spoke of, in relation to the arts. And when people talked about Piaget in the arts, they always resorted to some very crude stage theory, you know, usually it would be children's development in the material's ways, like differentiating sounds at certain ages and being able to play rhythm patterns and so on. It was all very limited, I thought, not big enough to take in really important musical things.

I was aware that there were two dynamics in this process – assimilation and accommodation of musical experience – and they could account for quite a lot of things. I was also aware of the debate about sounds and music, and the relationship of sound to music and so forth. I realised that the difference between sound and music was a psychological change, not a physiological change. It was a different quality of experience. And then, in a professorial paper, dated 1983 (probably), my inaugural lecture, I discussed alternative theories about the arts. One was about Freudian theory, and would that account for the arts? And the other was this Piagetian idea. And I began to see that this assimilation-accommodation (in this paper) occurred on different levels, it occurred not quite as clearly as I set it up in the Spiral, but between materials and expressive things and form. I got that far in this paper, really. And it needed some data, to try to work the theory to see if it was o.k., and that was when the data from [June] Tillman came and I was able to work with her on developing this idea.

But in fact the levels that I have are simply elements that you find in the psychological literature and the aesthetic literature: those people emphasise the use of materials, the different kinds of materials in the arts; those who emphasise the value systems and so on; there are also those who emphasise the social side, to do with social shaping and cultural forces – the right-hand side [of the Spiral], and those who emphasise the more psychological, interpersonal side of things. So I knew when we had it and June and I thought about it. We even managed to draw the thing, I got a machine that could draw the Spiral. In fact, I'd copied it from the Manhattanville Curriculum Program and rubbed out all that text; that was the first version of it, to get the Spiral before I computerised the drawing.

We got these levels and we got these different things, for every level

we had two things. We started with three levels and then we thought, "no, there must be another one because there's another category of piece here, which is different from these, with different qualities". We should have actually eight of these, we had eight piles of compositions, collected them to eight groups. And then we needed a name for each group and we needed also to put them into some kind of structure to understand how it was working. We knew there was an age sequence and we had this curved line that went up 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8. And I remember I wrote to June Tillman from holiday, and I said: "June, it forms a spiral" – I remember writing this postcard, "it's not simply 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8"; it has this form and at the same time rising. And I drew it by hand to show what I meant. And that was the first time it entered the frame. And after that it has become pretty well known, if much misunderstood. Like today, I was trying [in the lecture] to clarify it, you know how people misinterpret it.

J.A.: *What are some of the most common misunderstandings?*

K.S.: The most common ones are that these are boxes, which don't relate, that they simply don't connect, that's one misunderstanding: there's no connection between one category and another, and that they are fixed stages, which you leave behind as you go up, when in fact you take them all with you, you build on what you already have. A second misunderstanding is that there's no social consideration here; Piaget has been criticised as being interested as a zoologist, (actually he was), in psychology, but not in the social things, like Vygotsky, whereas there is an opening here on the right-hand side for the social input. And I think it is assumed, but we can't say much about that, because social input is very specific: you can't talk about idioms in general, you have to talk about this idiom in particular, it depends on the cultural thing. So that's one misunderstanding, that it doesn't take into account socialisation. And I suppose the other one is that it only happens once in a lifetime, that it's not recursive, which we made quite clear, in fact, in an article of 1986; even onwards from that article, it's quite clear this is reactivated each time you re-engage with music.

They are the major things. Because what people do, they see something like this [the spiral theory], they misunderstand Piaget and they immediately make an assumption about what they think it means. But in fact, I've always been very careful when I write about it, to try and be very explicit

just to what it means, and not to claim too much for it. I must say that ever since the 1990's I always encourage students whenever possible *not* to use it [laughs], not to rely on it. They think somehow that if they write about it and do some little piece of work about it, they will get a PhD. And this is very dangerous because not everyone is convinced by it and some academics have their own theories, which they are very fond of, and they bring to the PhD examination these parameters. So what I try to do is to say "look this is it, but"…the trouble is people still come to me saying "I'm very excited by these ideas and I want to do some work related to it" – and I find it very difficult to say "no!", if they want to do that. But I do try to encourage people to look elsewhere for alternative theories. And sometimes I wish I could get rid of it altogether, abolish it [laughs]! The trouble is whenever I come back to it, it just seems quite powerful as an explanatory instrument.

José Nunes: *Shall we talk about the C(L)A(S)P model?*

K.S: The C(L)A(S)P model of course is very different from the Spiral. The Spiral talk is really concerned with musical development, whereas the C(L)A(S)P model is concerned with musical activities. So I began writing about activities, though the kind of objectives we are looking for are there in the *Basis for Music Education* [1]– I talk about four levels of possibilities.

The C(L)A(S)P model precedes the other. One of the problems was a practical problem about the English or National Curriculum, which was to do with what activities were valid. And there was a strong feeling that composition as a very important activity; there was [John] Paynter, Murray Schafer, Brian Dennis and so on. And there were other people in traditional methods or ways, who thought that listening to the music of the masters was important and all the rest of it. And I wanted to work out a theory that would again take in all these points of view but relate them in a systematic way, and also place skills and what I think were literature studies as assistant pillars. But I wouldn't write it now, I mean, this is 1978, published 79, I think then it was o.k., it cut the knot between people who had different curriculum perspectives, and it became very influential

---

[1] O modelo C(L)A(S)P foi apresentado por Keith Swanwick em seu segundo livro, *A Basis for Music Education*, publicado inicialmente em 1979 (N.E.).

for future curriculum developers. Though curriculum developers, government officials, never give references, they simply take these things as though they come from heaven or they thought of them themselves. So, some years later, we have the same kind of proposed curriculum with these activities.

But now a better model, I think, is the one I showed [in the lectures], what I call a curriculum model, which has three activities along the top [of the diagram], at three levels of quality – materials, expression and form – along the signs, saying: "this is the way you could have your objectives". The aim is valuing, but not the objectives. And then, here are the three major activities to the curriculum. I think you then have to decide what you do about information about music – literature studies. Because some people were teaching literature studies, they were teaching the life of Beethoven – people called it "What Beethoven had for breakfast". It was information *about* music and not information *of* music, it wasn't experience of music at all. So, gradually, I moved away from the C(L)A(S)P into the quality of the experience and the outcomes we were looking for. I think the C(L)A(S)P is very useful but perhaps it is time to move away from it.

The thing about the C(L)A(S)P model is that it does two things: first, it puts composition, audition and performance as main activities, and the others go in. The other thing is that "clasp" has a meaning: it means "to hold together", it is an English word and that of course meant to integrate, to bring together different activities of the curriculum.

J.N.: *You said in the panel that you were a cognitivist. Are you a cognitivist or a developmental psychologist?*

K.S.: I'm not either, really; I am a musician who is interested in psychology, but I'm actually, if anything, interested in the development of cognition. So I suppose it's both. One of the problems with cognition is that people tend to use it to mean the opposite of affect or feeling. They use "cognition" and they use "emotion", and I don't like that. Because cognition simply means apprehension or taking hold of, constructing ideas. I think that in this sense [Howard] Gardner is right: music is a form of understanding; therefore it's a cognitive activity. I am interested in the cognitive activity we call music and its development – not particularly anymore in a life span terms, in terms of children's development; I've

done a lot of work on that, obviously — but I am interested in its development in a contemporary setting. For example, how did the children in "Bloco do Passo" come to understand these rhythms[2]? How did they acquire those skills? I'm interested in the development within educational and cultural settings. How music develops in societies, not necessarily in formal schooling, which is probably not where it develops very much, in some cases.

J.N.: *Why did you choose psychology to create a foundation for your theory? Why not sociology or anthropology or biology?*

K.S.: Well, I think it wouldn't be sociology, it would have to be anthropology, because sociology tends not to be interested in the precise meanings within a tribal culture; it tends to be more general in theorising or it is more demographic, the older sociology looks demographically at social patterns, which doesn't tell you anything about the quality of life within the pattern; or more recently, yes, there has been interpretive sociology, which has been more ethnographic, in which case you move more towards ethnography or anthropology and out of sociology. And philosophy, well, I think my work *is* philosophical. I'm amazed at psychologists, how little they examine the concepts they use: psychologists seem to use concepts as though they were there, existing, and make all kinds of assumptions about methodology whereas I would really wonder about. I have an amateur philosophical background, I mean, Langer was a very important person to me and other people in my past, and not because they were interested in music. For instance, at about 18, I'd become very interested in the theory of theology (not in the religious practice particularly). Also I spent a lot of time in very good choirs in very good Methodist churches in London, and I heard a lot of sermons. Now, I'm not a particularly religious person, but every week I heard two *arguments* — religious ones, but they were arguments, basically —, so I got used to the idea of arguing and discussing things. I was also fascinated in university by lectures; other students wouldn't go, but I'd always go because I was interested in the arguments lecturers would be putting forward, and similarly in the reading. So, philosophically I have a sort of background knowledge, not a systematic study of philosophy...

---

[2] Swanwick refere-se a um dos grupos musicais que se apresentaram como parte da programação do evento, durante a semana de palestras.

J.A.: *By immersion…*

K.S.: Yes, *informal* in a way. So I write critically, in a philosophical way, I examine concepts and try to construct clear categories and things of that kind. I'm a kind of conceptual analysis philosopher, if you like, not metaphysical.

But I don't think philosophy could give me the ability to satisfy the practical needs of teachers. And nor do I think that sociology does that either very well. I think psychology can, if it allows us to understand more of the transaction in the classroom between the students and the teacher. I find it more illuminating perhaps, because although my work is highly theoretical, it also transposes into workshops.

J.A.: *What about the relationship between culture and education, in your perspective? How does your theory approach cultural issues?*

K.S.: Again, culture is a word that you either use sociologically or anthropologically, I think. Oddly enough, I agree with Mrs. [Margaret] Thatcher, when she said there is no such thing as *society* – and what she meant was there's no such thing as big social issues. If you interpret it to mean that there is no such thing as generalised culture, that's also true. There are only cultural groups and subgroups, there are only social groups and sub-social groups, and we all belong to several groups. We belong to a professional tribe, to a linguistic tribe, to a national tribe and we belong to a local tribe of people we choose to be with. We belong to different tribes, mainly, and we move from one to the other. These groups have different goals and change all the time, of course. So I don't have any general view about culture, I have a view that *schooling* is always problematic. Schooling is a narrow concept; education is a broad one: schooling and education are different phenomena. Education can take place out of school and much of it does: the language learned by everyone is mainly learned out of school, we learn it before we start school, by the age of five we are already a long way into language. And also social relationships, well developed before the age of five. Schooling has to have a value added to what's already there, and I suppose it can remove unevennesses. It could remove injustices of poor social groups, who haven't got access to good ideas and good things, like the kids from a *favela* who wouldn't have access to professional instruments or a good teacher,

normally[3]. So, that form of schooling helps to give some value added to their life, and you can see that that could be so. But in some cases schooling "value-diminishes" life [laughs], it can take away enthusiasm by boring programmes or by giving people the wrong idea about what music is about, particularly. So I think one has to weigh carefully what schooling is adding to community values that are available.

J.A.: *Would you like to add something to what you said about the transformation of your ideas?*

K.S.: I think they have been transformed but they are also *informed* by an intuitive sense of what music is, because I've always been a musician. Because of that, I always have a very strong sense of the reality of the activity. So I feel very unsympathetic towards theories that don't seem to relate to that, that don't tell me much about the transactions within the classroom. In all of the evolutions, I've moved back and forward; for example, *Popular Music and the Teacher* was basically about the social-cultural life out there, children buying records of The Beatles and The Rolling Stones, and the teacher in school telling them about Beethoven, putting the name on the board. That was what was going on. My first book, therefore, was about the interface between children's culture and the school culture.

J.A.: *By the way, this is a question that we have also: how should the teacher treat the student's culture and the culture that comes with the media? So, if you can take all that in your previous answer...*

K.S.: My second principle is the respect for the discourse of students. Now, my first principle is respect for the discourse of music, as a human activity. I suppose my answer to you is that the discourse of students can be drawn into the discourse of music, of the teacher's music discourse, provided there are enough opportunities for them to engage in it. But the teacher's job is not to leave the student's discourse where it was. If you leave it where it is, there's no point in having music education. What's the point of having this expensive thing if the students can access the music anyway?

What the teacher does is to make it possible for the students to go

---

[3] De modo implícito, Swanwick faz alusão a outro grupo, da Escola de Música da Rocinha, que se apresentou na UniRio, durante o mesmo evento.

further in understanding how the music they bring works. To understand how it can relate to the music of others and to understand how it can develop. And these things are not always simply there in the media, the media leaves it as it is and tries to sell things. So a sense of increasing the power to *discriminate* in music and the power to *participate* in music is a special function of the school.

J.A.: *That has much to do with Paulo Freire...*
K.S.: Yes, very similar.

J.A.: *Still in terms of transformation of your ideas, what is new in your recent thinking, for instance in your latest book, and what do you see ahead?*
K.S.: I think in the latest book the theory takes one step forward. I try to deal with the critique by certain music educators, and sociologists to some extent, of the relativity of music to particular settings; in other words, asking the question "what is music good for?" It's good for this church service; it's good for the samba in the street; it's good for this, it's good for that; it's good for the advertisement on TV; and all of that. And I think the new thing is to ask "what is music in education good for?"[4] And the answer I give to it I just gave you: it is good to empower the student – Paulo Freire-wise – into better possibilities of producing music and better possibilities of discriminating and enhancing their enjoyment of music.

I think the new thing is actually the "space between" idea, which is not new, it's actually come from [Karl] Popper, the philosopher, and other people too. It's actually cultural interactivism, Blumer also, and all these people engaging in it. What it brings, especially Popper's work, is the middle thing, the world of discourse, the world of conversation, of science, of music, of production. These things are independent, to some extent, of any individual; they are also dependent on individuals for its renewal, and even to take things away. So I think the new thing is to bring the Popperian view – which I've hold for quite a while – more to the

---

[4] Em seu livro (London: Routledge, 1999), Swanwick reconsidera o tratamento em termos de usos e funções da música, proposto por Alan Merriam para o estudo antropológico das músicas (v. The Anthropology of Music, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1964). Com empréstimo dos mesmos termos, a questão é direcionada ao âmbito do trabalho educacional (N.E.).

foreground, in which we can see that the student's contribution is also in there, the student contributes to this "third world" of musical ideas; teacher does; the community does; and the media – everyone puts things into this marketplace of ideas. That seems to me to resolve many of the issues that worry people about the relativism of things. Because it has to be negotiated within that world what is valuable – what is valuable will have to be continually redefined and argued and shown to be valuable, for various reasons. In a sense, that's new. What I've been anxious to remove is the idea that music is simply symptomatic of a culture. It's very deterministic: "people cannot understand the music of another culture unless they live in that culture". This is absolutely impossible for schooling to function: What's the point of taking up music from a hundred years ago? Or the music of India, China or Japan, if you happen to live in Belo Horizonte? That's because the thinking [in the deterministic view] is too simple; it has forgotten the "third world", the mediating world of ideas, it has forgotten the re-interpretations that we all make of different cultures and their musical output. That, I think, is new: the *seed* is there, of that idea.

J.N.: *How do you see your theory being applied elsewhere?*

K.S.: I don't know, my theories are in the "third world" and people can take what they want. The only thing I would want to be sure about was that what they take and use and adapt is my *theory* and they recognise their own adaptation. It is like what I said about the evidence for notated music: there are many ways of doing it, but if your objective is to reproduce, reinterpret something from a notated source, then you must be true to the evidence of the text, it's within those limits. Now, that would apply also to text of a theory. There can be nothing worse than to take a bit of a theory, get it wrong and then say "I'm using this theory and developing it in a new way". But if you want to say "there is a theory there, which I don't think I want to take, it's a bit like mine, but mine is completely different and now I am creating a new thing, I'm actually composing a theory", that's ok. But to start to use references from other theories to support that – when you actually misunderstood the theory – is actually not scientific.

How are they [my theories] going to be used? I hope that they would challenge people to think about education and music, particularly. I would

hope that maybe in fifty years someone would come across them in the library and think: "oh, this is something that we might even look at again", they might want to give it more attention, that would be nice. And I'll tell you what I do notice: whenever I talk to teachers or do workshops or explain the theory, their eyes kind of light up, because there is nothing more useful than a good theory. They recognise themselves in the theory, they recognise their students and their students' music – they can say "yes, that describes what helps me understand my classroom". But also anything that helps you to organise your thinking, anything that helps to gather together a messy life... it's a bit like [John] Dewey, it's the aesthetic, the *an* experience[5] of getting things together, whereas life – left to itself – gets its *entropia,* it falls apart. The natural tendency is to fall apart, and then it has to be gathered. While this [my theory] continues to gather together practice of teachers and their thinking...

J.N.: *Do you want to say some words to Brazilian music teachers?*
K.S.: [laughs]
J.A.: *The final classic statement...*
K.S.: [laughs] Oh, dear! Ok, I suppose, what should I say? "Keep smiling", I think is the answer.

JOSÉ ALBERTO SALGADO E SILVA é doutorando do PPGM e atualmente realiza estágio de doutorado especial com Prof. Swanwick na Inglaterra com apoio da CAPES..
JOSÉ NUNES FERNANDES é músico e doutor em educação faz parte do corpo docente do Instituto Villa Lobos e do PPGM.

---

[5] Swanwick faz referência à teoria de John Dewey – apresentada em *Art as Experience* (New York: Perigee Books, 1934) – sobre qualidades presentes na experiência estética. Dewey usava a expressão *"an experience"*, com o itálico, para distinguir esta de outras experiências, marcadas por desatenção, interrupção e formas variadas de interferência – fatores que o filósofo entendia como obstáculos à consumação do sentido (N.E.).