

Editorial

Heesoon Bai

Volume 17, Number 2, 2008

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1072425ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1072425ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Philosophy of Education Society

ISSN

0838-4517 (print)

1916-0348 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this document

Bai, H. (2008). Editorial. *Paideusis*, 17(2), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1072425ar>

© Heesoon Bai, 2008



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

Editorial

HEESOOON BAI
Editor

Philosophy at its best in the field of education is both deconstructive and reconstructive. Philosophy is *the* place where “reality” is called into question, is subjected to a critical and creative examination, and is given a new reading, leading to a new look and feel of reality. Who could be against such a treatment? In the fashionable world of beauty and personal care, this is known as spa treatment, and has become an indispensable service for many in urban life. At the thought of steam sauna, vigorous massage, exfoliation, and what have you at their next appointment, consumers of spa treatment groan with pleasure, and can hardly wait. The new reality of how they would look and feel after the spa treatment is, understandably, something most inviting. But since the thought of philosophy usually does not have the same effect on most educators, as some of our authors in this issue point out, my analogy of philosophy to spa treatment must not be right. Let me change my analogy, then. Philosophy must be like painful reconstructive surgery. If even necessary for some people, they don’t look forward to their surgery with sighs of relief and groans of pleasure. Where am I going with this analogy? Nowhere too far for time and space reasons--besides, this is not the space for me to write a lengthy tract of my own, but one thought I wish to leave with you is the need I feel for us philosophers in education to highlight the more nurturing and nourishing side, combined with joy and happiness, of doing philosophy. Throughout human history, East and West, doing philosophy, especially in the company of each other, gave its participants immense, even transcendental, joy and happiness. Somehow--I know there are complex reasons--we tend to forget this. Perhaps there should be a special issue in future *Paideusis* on the theme of Joy of Philosophizing in Education.

As I review all the articles in the current issue—in both Tracts and Fragments—I am once again struck by the recurring *modus operandi* (MO) behind philosophy of education, or, to put it more descriptively, philosophizing in education. The MO is de/re/construction of reality, where reality refers to the way we conduct our practice of education, from the aims of education that we put forth implicitly or explicitly to the various pedagogic and administrative practices we enact and enforce in learning institutions, kindergarten to graduate school. Most philosophers want to call education, theory and practice, into question, not out of idle curiosity but out of burning concerns for a world that they see as mired in ignorance, injustice, indignity, and ills of one form or another, in one degree or another. This de/re/constructive orientation makes philosophers both idealists and realists, simultaneously, inviting attacks from both sides. Who in philosophy have not been accused of being (naïve, dreamy-eyed) romantics—presumably the most debilitating insult? But, then, to be accused of being a closet conservative philosopher who is really defending the ruling power and status quo is perhaps a worse fate. Thankfully, philosophers tend to be trainees in courage and risk-taking, and they charge on with their de/re/conceptualization missions and visions. Nonetheless, as an educator deeply committed to encouraging the positive perception and reception of philosophy in education, I am interested in interpreting, and presenting to the world, the philosophical activity in education in such a way that educators in practice and in training find it indispensable and empowering, not to mention pleasurable. How do we do this?

The present volume contains a wealth of articles and book reviews that all confirm, affirm, and enact philosophy’s vision and mission in education of de/re/conceptualization. This seasonal gift-bag

volume is indeed bulging at the seam with six hefty Tract articles, two delicately probing Fragment articles, and two book reviews. Pour yourself your favorite drink, curl up by the fire, and indulge in these pieces while watching the winter lights dim, snow falling Wait, many of our Pai readers across the planet are not sharing this cold snowy winter scenery! In fact, I don't, either. It's been raining all day in Vancouver, Canada. Fog and rain: that's our winter here. And I might as well add a note of apology for the late arrival of the current volume. In reviewing what I wrote in my last editorial in the spring, I find: "Since January, I have taken up the administrative position of being the Director of Graduate Programs in my Faculty, which has had an unfortunate effect of delaying everything I do." No change here. The volume of work and degree of responsibility I assumed (without knowing, of course) is staggering. I am just glad that we are managing to launch the fall issue before the New Year—feats of academic dedication, collaboration, and just plain hard work amply shown by all the partners of Paideusis' publication. Once again many rounds of cheers and gratitude to "pai bakers" (managing editor, copy-editors, formatters, editor's assistant). A few more rounds of cheers and appreciation to the discerning authors from North America and elsewhere who chose Paideusis for publication. We are being noticed and are becoming more widely known in the field. Our readership has grown by over eight times in the last two years since Paideusis became an open access, online, peer-reviewed journal. We will continue our effort of outreaching to the international community for article submissions, readership, and constitution of editorial board and reviewers. Speaking of reviewers, another round of hearty thank-you is due to all our reviewers who have dedicated their time and energy to support our journal. Since these are blind peer-reviewers, they work behind the scene, unseen, of course unpaid, and for that reason, it is difficult to publicize their service! But there is a way: here we shall publish the names of all the reviewers for the past two years by way of acknowledging their contribution to Paideusis. A most deeply felt thank-you from this Editor of Paideusis:

Barbara Applebaum	Susan Barber	Charles Bingham	Sean Blenkinsop
Michael Caulkins	Ann Chinnery	Don Cochrane	Avraham Cohen
Sheryle Dixon	Claudia Eppert	Michelle Forrest	Larry Green
Glen Grigg	Emery Hyslop-Margison	Bob Jickling	Donald Kerr
Scott Lawrence	Michael Ling	Don Nelson	Walter Okshevsky
Anne Phelan	John Portelli	Johanne Provençal	Stuart Richmond
Claudia Ruitenber	Leslie Sassone	Charles Scott	Greg Scutt
Fleurette Seeney	Douglas Simpson	David Smith	Douglas Stewart
Daniel Vokey	David Waddington	Hongyu Wang	Sean Zwagerman

Wishing you all a beautiful winter repose and a happy New Year!

Heesoon Bai