

EDITORIAL

In the realm of ideology as well as that of action, the decade of the nineteen-sixties has been an especially turbulent one. A vast number of social assumptions, theories, and practices that used to be questioned, if at all, by small minorities in earlier decades, have been questioned by significantly large minorities or even in some cases by majorities. This is true of virtually every social institution, indeed every sector of human activity. In the West, capitalism has been openly challenged; so, in the East, has communism. Traditional economic theories, whether Keynesian or Marxist, have come into question. The point need not be laboured. One cannot read an informed journal or newspaper without encountering questions about formerly "secure" points of view — whether with respect to sex ethics, human relations, or whatever.

In common with other members of the academic community, the editors of *The Journal of Educational Thought* believe that the exploration of issues leads toward clarification, and that clarification is itself a necessary first step toward the eventual constructive solution of problems raised or implied by issues. During its three years of publication the *Journal*, editorially and in the selection of articles, has reflected important kinds of turbulence in public education. This and succeeding issues continue the process.

What is a student radical? Franklin Parker gives us his portrait, and invokes the assistance of Sidney Hook and Harold Taylor in identifying opposed faculty positions on student radicalism. Parker's own conclusions may not be highly controversial. Lupul's conclusion almost certainly will. Calling for an end to hypocrisy in religion and education, he proposes a tripartite school system which would make it possible for Canadian parents in every province to send their children to a Catholic, a Protestant, or a religiously neutral school. Not that Lupul is himself in love with his proposal — except insofar as it seems to represent the only means whereby the preferences of parents and the feasibility of administration may both be accommodated. The thoughts of Ernest Bayles about the role of educational philosophy in teacher education represent a distillation of ideas from many decades of teaching, thinking, and writing. Coming down on the side of the art (rather than the science) of teaching, he provides a kind of prospectus on what one needs to do if philosophy is to pay dividends in teacher education. Sing-Nan Fen, finally, offers us one more opportunity to understand Marshall McLuhan's basic theses, and with meticulous care attempts to evaluate the approbations and the criticisms relating to McLuhanism.

“Structure of the disciplines” has for some time been a fashionable term in educational discourse. In our Communication section we look with Matthew Meisterheim at both the uses and the abuses to which his term is particularly susceptible.

With this issue the *Journal* concludes its third year of publication. The April 1970 issue will have a new cover design, together with a number of other changes. We hope that our readers will like them, and that they will accept our best wishes for the New Year.