Phenomenology & Practice, Volume 5 (2011), No. 2, pp. 1-5.

Editorial

Tone Saevi, School of Education, NLA University College, Bergen, Norway.
Email: ts@nla.no

The second issue of *Phenomenology & Practice* volume 5 is published. For the first time in the journal's short history we ambitiously planned for a second issue in one year, and we did it! As 2011 draws to a close we present eight phenomenological papers across a diverse range of topics and foci. However, these essays share a commonality – they bring to our awareness experiences that challenge us and call forth responses to our daily lives in both domestic and public places.

As our journal continues to grow, we find a need to make space for the multiple voices in the phenomenological field. In this issue we introduce a new section called *Phenomenological Notes*. The inaugural "phenomenological note" is entitled "Seven Epochēs" by Lester Embree. His work reminds us that phenomenology has the potential to nourish a democratic attitude in our shared scholarly field. In this spirit it is hoped that *Phenomenological Notes* will serve as a discussion space to allow scholars opportunities to disseminate ideas for dialogue in a reflective-conversational manner. We anticipate every issue can present a quality phenomenological discussion; but more, we hope that you take up what is presented in our *Phenomenological Notes* by submitting responses and furthering the author's ideas with supportive discourse.

As editor of *Phenomenology & Practice*, I am "one who puts forth" (Online Etymological Dictionary) the standpoints, perspectives and intentions of the journal through the collection of papers selected. As well, this editorial puts forth my personal voice. To make something known, to accomplish something, to nurture something, or to call something into awareness is the core mission of the journal editor. A phenomenological journal, and in particular a hermeneutic phenomenological methodological journal like *Phenomenology & Practice* helps call forth "fine" human science writing (Henriksson & Saevi 2009, p. 36). This journal brings into awareness diverse professional social disciplines and their experiential practices. The profound existential orientation of the *fine human science*, called for by the Utrecht School, is characterized by "the personal responsibility and social *engagement* of the individual human being" (Levering & van Manen, 2001, p. 278, italics in original). This orientation represents a challenging responsibility that I would like to call attention to in this editorial. The willing ability to re-establish contact with the world and accept its radical complexity, like the social engagement of and with human beings brought forth by the former Utrecht School writers, presupposes a responsible attentiveness addressed by Simone Weil (1990). She says: "Attentiveness is to let the thought be free, to let it be open and accessible to the object […]. The thought first of all should be waiting, empty, not searching for anything, but ready to accept the object in its naked truth" (p. 74-75). The openness of thought and the patient willingness to receive and let in something new – something that was not there before, profoundly characterize a phenomenological responsiveness and attentiveness. This is the

awareness that goes beyond and precedes thought, while not directing the attention to anything in particular. It is a kind of reflective attention that partly dwells in itself, partly seeing beyond what is at hand while possibly seeing what is between self-disclosure and self-concealment.

Calling Forth Openness to the Given

Phenomenological awareness might bring within our sight the other and his or her absolute otherness, and call forth human responsiveness to this foreign-other. The unfamiliarity of the unknown might disrupt and provoke us but the concern for the other, as other, is in itself a commitment to a world of difference and plurality. As Biesta notes (2006), it is a process that presupposes a certain understanding of the "violation of the sovereignty of the autonomous subject" (p. 28). The human condition is fundamentally one of existence, other-existence and co-existence and is in itself an interference with our individual territory. It is a situation that challenges us as phenomenologists to write inter-subjectively and to make life recognizable. To challenge or to *provoke* (dating back to the Latin *provocare*, to call forth) provides synonyms such as "to incite," "to cause," or, more expressively loaded terms like "to aggravate," "to irritate," and finally, to indicate the act of creating a reaction or a response, sometimes an angry one, to the actual issue in question. What exactly does the phenomenological text have the authority to provoke or call forth, however? The phenomenological text most convincingly provokes, I think, because it evokes urgent experiential material that gives a personal voice to those who do not belong to the conventional authors of settled statements and those who do not take part in the established formation of matters (Fairclough, 1992). The singularity, as well as the universality of lived experiences, transcends borders such as appearance, age, gender, ethnicity, religion, and intellectual capacity. It considers plurality and dissimilarity inseparable from what it means to be human and part of human condition. Hermeneutic phenomenology aims at describing and understanding human life from the complexity and diversity of the human condition that opens up a multitude of interpretations and descriptions that are always profoundly insufficient and temporary.

Phenomenological research and writing, from a perspective of phenomenological inquiry, as I see it, is fundamentally both publicly and politically oriented as action and as a "vita activa" (Arendt 1958, p.13). Since the lived experience is personal, immediate and unrepeatable, and with a lived-through vitality that might call forth experiential recognition (although in one's own unique ways and manners), phenomenological writing at its best orients from the uniqueness of lived diversity. Phenomenological writing, being attentive to ruptures, contradictions and to the utterly different in life, reflects the Levinasian responsibility for the utter otherness of the other and is a sympathetic response to our shared vulnerability and exposure. Phenomenological texts, in fact, should call forth in us awareness and responsibility for human beings in all kinds of life situations and make room in us for tempered reflection upon the "fragile conditions under which all people can act, under which all people can be a subject" Biesta (2006, p. 145). We are all *data* in the Roman sense of the word; we are all part of a shared temporal condition, and granted to the unpredictability of human and to the plurality of human beings.

Phenomenological research should provide a deeper understanding of the human condition – of experiences of situations, actions and encounters that are otherwise, in life and research, hard or even impossible to see. The phenomenological project is persistently and

provocatively asking what it means to be involved in, and profoundly enclosed by, the "worldliness of the world." Phenomenological thinking and writing demand a radical openness to what it means to be human and to how we deal with the human givenness to the world, just here in the middle of our everyday complexity of life in relations and research. To me, however, the most provocative question for *Phenomenology & Practice* is: What would phenomenological writing be like if what it means to be human in a world of others was a genuinely open and open-ended question to be explored experientially again and again? The journal continues, as its core endeavor, to tirelessly inquire into this "unpretentious" pretentious intent.

Unique Yet Commonly Recognizable

The current issue of *Phenomenology & Practice* begins with Erika Goble's experientially challenging text "Facing the Ugly Face." The author thoughtfully examines the lived encounter with what we see as ugly and questions both the socially accepted cultural opposition between beauty and ugliness and our psychologically charged belief of what ugliness is. Ugliness as lived experience, as Goble demonstrates, tests the limits of humanity and the absolute otherness of the other. In addition, she existentially discloses that the limits of humanity do not belong to the humanity of the other, as one might be led to believe. Rather, facing the ugly face of the other calls forth the limits of my own humanity and confronts me with myself.

Rochelle Skogen and Paulin Mulatris' paper "Experiences of 'Hospitality' by Racialized Immigrant Pre-service Teachers on Canadian School Landscapes: A Phenomenological Analysis," explores the lived experience of foreign students being met as strangers in their student-teacher practicum. The students sense the teacher-host's unwilling welcome or conditional hospitality that denies them, as student-guest, the human dwelling that they need in an experientially foreign world. The authors attentively reflect on how pedagogy might "borrow" the core features of hospitality in order to *be* a hospitable, welcoming practice, and on how pedagogical awareness in and outside the classroom might open up pedagogical practices that respectfully recognize the potential and dignity in the foreign student as well as the despair and hope.

In her paper "Children's Lived Spaces in Suburban Taiwan during the 1960's," Mengchun Chiang invites the reader to accompany her as two grown women re-member what it was like for them to be girls living in a traditional san-ho-yuan-inspired family home in rural Taiwan. Chi-Lin and Li-Mai re-create spaces through illustrations, and experientially explore their childhoods' open and perceptibly unrestrained nature (albeit in a sheltered familiar space of the extended family household). Children's lived home spaces, architecturally formed as lively atriums, seem to foster relationships between the generations, between children and domestic animals and between human beings, culture and nature. The author demonstrates that the close and embedded relationships between child and adult are intertwined with their experience of lived space and intentionally seem to extend and invite an experientially common as well as a private sense of space.

In her paper "Whose Eyes? Women's Experiences of Changing in a Public Change Room," Marianne Clark addresses women's lived experiences of "un/dressing" body and self in the typical public change room found in fitness and recreation centres. Women's experience of participating in physical activity in fitness studios has received much attention

from scholars within professional areas such as feminist research and sport studies, but the specific change room situation has been relatively unexplored from a phenomenological perspective. Clark's probing inquiry into the experience of seeing others and seeing oneself through the eyes of others in the various stages of nakedness in a public change room, is revealingly recognizable in our own bodily vulnerability and self-censorship.

With the intriguing title "Awakening Movement Consciousness in the Physical Landscapes of Literacy: Leaving, Reading and Being Moved by One's Trace," Rebecca Lloyd opens up the lived experience of leaving tracks or traces. The author explores a world of snow-shoeing, snowboarding and animal tracking. By contrasting running on a treadmill and walking in fresh snow, walking as exercise and walking as seeing, Lloyd offers a revitalizing understanding of unassuming, yet deeply embodied ways of knowing and being in the living landscape. Lloyd outlines ways of being and knowing that stand in stark contrast to the dominant approaches to most of today's physical education pedagogy and program development. The paper provocatively asks how the awakening of movement consciousness through the simple and everyday experience of one's own stride might provide a pathway for inscribing curricular understandings of what it means to become physically literate within and beyond the context of physical education.

Shane Denson, in his paper "Faith in Technology: Televangelism and the Mediation of Immediate Experience," investigates the self-presentational modes evident in faith-healing television shows that are broadcast daily to North-American and global television audiences. The author asks: "What relations are implied and enacted in an ideally 'straight' viewership between socially situated, concretely embodied subjects and the objects and apparatus of televisual mediation?" Based on a Merleau-Pontian understanding of the lived body in the world, and Don Ihde's interpretation of mediating technologies as transforming the intentional subjectivities that engage them, the paper offers what the author calls a techno-phenomenological analysis of the experiential paradoxes, included in that kind of faith-healing television that transcends the separation implied in the televisual medium between the viewer and the televangelist.

Lester Embree's text "Seven Epochēs" is the opening piece for the new section we are introducing under the title *Phenomenological Notes*. The author reflects on different iterations of phenomenological reduction and invites the reader, through the lens of research, to consider if their reflections hold up to critical examination. With Embree's paper as the inaugural submission to this new section, *Phenomenology & Practice* opens up to scholars the opportunity to disseminate ideas for dialogue in a reflective-conversational manner. We hope readers respond to what is presented in *Phenomenological Notes* by submitting and building on the author's ideas, by picking up the threads of the ideas presented and weaving them further.

The dialogical and essayistic book review that we introduced earlier this year continues to call forth both the voices of the authors of the review and of the book being reviewed. Wendy Kraglund-Gauthier's essay "A Reader's Response to Norm Friesen's *The Place of the Classroom and the Space of the Screen: Relational Pedagogy and Internet Technology*" includes Norm Friesen's reply to the critical review of his book. Centered in the complex experiential intertwinement of lived time, space, body and relation, the two authors explore the experiential, pedagogical meaning of educational practice in online and offline classrooms.

Before concluding I would like to express thanks to each of the authors in this second issue of *Phenomenology & Practice* for 2011. I would also like to thank the reliable and intuitive phenomenological "connoisseurs" in my editorial team. However, we would not make it without our comprehensive and creative peer reviewers and our preeminent proofreader, Merilee Hamelock. Thanks to all of you.

References

Arendt, H. (1958). *The human condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Biesta, G. (2006). *Beyond learning. Democratic education for a human future.* Boulder: Paradigm

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Henriksson, C. & Saevi, T. (2009). "An event in sound." Considerations on the ethical-aesthetical traits of hermeneutic phenomenological text. *Phenomenology & Practice* (3)1, P. 35-58. Retrieved from http://www.phandpr.org/index.php/pandp/article/view/36

Levering, B. & van Manen, M. (2001). Phenomenological anthropology in the Netherlands and Flanders. In Teresa Tymieniecka (Ed.), *Phenomenology World-Wide* (pp. 274-286). Dordrecht: Kluwer Press.

Oxford English Dictionary. (4th ed.). (2010). (J. Simpson, Ed.). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Weil, S. (1990). *Ordenes makt*. Oslo: Solum.