

Editorial

Welcome to a special issue of the *Journal of Philosophy in Schools* (JPS) that explores whether moral education may take place in the community of philosophical inquiry by practitioners of philosophy in schools. To be even more specific, the issue hotly debated in this, Volume 7 Number 2 of the JPS, is whether there is room for directive teaching within the CoI (Community of Inquiry; the pedagogical method favoured by practitioners of philosophy for/with children). Given that ethical issues are significant, divisive, and central to the well-lived life, it matters whether they can be taught and/or discussed and debated in appropriate ways with young people.

Included in this special issue are different arguments as to whether the CoI is the right place for moral inquiry, and how moral debate, moral instruction, moral formation and ethical inquiry may best be facilitated with young people in educational settings using philosophical tools and techniques. Of particular concern is how such moral education may occur whilst avoiding the charge of indoctrination.

The most recent past issue of the JPS included papers that were presented at the 2018 Conference of the Federation of Australasian Philosophy in Schools Associations (FAPSA) held in Fremantle, Western Australia. At that conference, Michael Hand presented a keynote entitled 'Moral education in the community of inquiry'. This paper generated much discussion and disagreement, and the dialogue and debate continued throughout the conference and beyond.

Given the interest in this question as to whether it is ever appropriate for facilitators of CoIs to be directive within this pedagogical praxis, it seemed fitting to devote an entire issue to the topic. Therefore, Michael Hand's paper forms the central article in this issue and five responses were sought—to agree, to disagree, to somewhat agree and to formally continue the dialogue that commenced a couple of years ago.

In his paper, Hand sets out a defence of moral education and directive teaching in the CoI that, he acknowledges, faces some resistance by P4C practitioners. The three specific concerns he tackles in this paper are fears to do with indoctrination, claims that questions discussed in a CoI must be open and unsettled, and the idea that the teacher, the facilitator of the CoI, must be philosophically self-effacing and 'neutral'. It is interesting to question what is meant here by 'neutrality', and whether such neutrality is ever possible. In our current climate with a focus on identity politics, certain values present themselves to others simply by the fact (or facticity, as Sartre would say) of our appearance.

Hand defends directive moral teaching within the CoI, with a particular emphasis on the support such pedagogy provides for moral education. He is careful to distinguish directive teaching from didactic teaching, and argues that directive teaching within the CoI may be non-indoctrinatory.

Five replies are published alongside this paper, as well as a reply to the replies by Hand. Some of the replies have been penned by academics who attended the 2018 conference and were asking tough questions after the keynote. Some of the replies were invited because their author's work is referenced by Hand, and we were curious as to whether they would support the arguments made. A couple of practitioners were also invited to respond, in order to share another perspective on the theoretical arguments defended and to further consider their practical application.

We are grateful to Michael for writing up his plenary presentation in the form of an article (to be honest, it was a condition of his accepting the invitation to be keynote!), and we are incredibly pleased that Philip Cam, Michelle Sowe, Grace Lockrobin, Laurance Splitter, Tim Sprod and Sue Knight agreed to write replies to Hand's paper. We thought it only fair to grant Hand a brief right of reply, but, as you can see, this special issue is only the start of a very interesting and ongoing dialogue. There is much more to be said on the topic of how moral education may and should occur within a community of philosophical inquiry.

As will become apparent, Hand argues for a more expansive understanding of the CoI. In his view, the CoI pedagogy has room for directive moral teaching, and directive moral teaching is an important part of moral education for young people. Note that such directive teaching is not the only aspect of moral education Hand identifies, as moral inquiry may also be non-directive, and moral formation is equally as important as moral inquiry. However, Hand argues that educational settings are ideally suited to support moral education and, furthermore, directive moral teaching can avoid the charge of indoctrination. As well as considering directive teaching, he also tackles in his paper two further characteristics that are often connected to the CoI; namely, that CoI questions must be open, and CoI facilitators must be philosophically self-effacing. The replies to his paper tackle these same themes and more.

Through its open access publications, the JPS has also supported an inclusive and fairly wide approach to the teaching of philosophy and ethics in pre-tertiary educational environments. We have published interesting papers that explore theoretical and empirical investigations and arguments defending innovative as well as more classical approaches to philosophy in schools and the CoI. There has been a

particular focus on how P4C pedagogies work in various cultural contexts and the changes that need to be made to practice in order to bring philosophy into various contexts. These contexts include various discipline and subject areas, different countries and cultures, and formal or informal educational settings.

It is exciting for us to witness such philosophical dialogue and debate continue, particularly with respect to the ways in which the P4C/philosophy in schools movement and its associated pedagogies should evolve. One thing is for sure: evolve it will, even as we now see the emergence of 'third generation' P4C-ers (if the first generation are to be recognised as Lipman, Sharp et al). We look forward to continuing to publish these emerging voices.

Also included in this issue are two book reviews. Elizabeth O'Brien has reviewed *How to Disagree: Negotiate Difference in a Divided World* (White Lion Publishing, 2019) by Adam Ferner and Darren Chetty. And Tim Sprod has reviewed *Philosophy in Classrooms and Beyond: New Approaches to Picture-Book Philosophy* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2019) edited by Thomas E Wartenberg.

As we complete what is now the seventh volume of the Journal we would like to thank once again our excellent colleague, Anne Morrison. Anne brings an unparalleled knowledge and diligence to the copy-editing of the Journal's content and we owe her a large debt of gratitude for her continued work and support.

We hope you enjoy this special issue and we also hope that you are keeping well and staying safe even as the COVID-19 pandemic continues in the form of a second wave across Europe and the USA. Hopefully a vaccine will become widely available soon, and the coronavirus-free Australia and New Zealand will be able to safely re-open their borders, once again allowing for travel and physical gatherings. In the meantime, the virtual space has allowed for truly international collaborations and we are pleased to bring you another issue of our fully open access online journal.

Dr Laura D'Olimpio and Professor Andrew Peterson

Editors