What would David Wheeler tweet?

EGAN J. CHERNOFF

What would David Wheeler tweet? First, would David Wheeler tweet? I contend that, yes, David Wheeler would use Twitter. Let me explain. The current editor, in his perusal of David Wheeler's editorials from the early years of FLM, noted in **31**(1) that "one recurring issue stands out: [Wheeler's] strong desire that FLM provide a place for the exchange of ideas, for dialogue, for discussion, for interaction" (p. 1). In similar vein, Twitter's co-founder, Jack Dorsey, wanted to provide a platform for the exchange of ideas, dialogue, discussion and interaction. Barring the immediacy associated with social media and Twitter's 140-character limit, David Wheeler's desires for FLM are similar to (some of) those of Jack Dorsey's for Twitter and, for that matter, founders of other social media platforms. David Wheeler would definitely tweet. Of course, this is a metonym for Wheeler's desires for FLM being similar (*i.e.*, idea exchange, dialogue, discussion and interaction) to the central tenets for a variety of social media platforms. Alternatively stated, using today's parlance, David Wheeler, in 1981 (over a decade before the advent of social media) wanted his platform, FLM, to have a user-generated social component comprising one quarter of the journal's content (see the Editorial in **1**(2)).

Based on my reading of CMESG Newsletter 17(1), dedicated "To the Memory of David Wheeler," Wheeler's tweets would, no doubt, possess sharp wit, humour and (based on Sandy Dawson's piece) perhaps a picture of a cat (or two). To get a better sense of what Wheeler would tweet, I decided to see how prominent members of the mathematics education research community use social media. Simply put (barring a few exceptions), they do not. This was a surprise. Prominent members of the mathematics community (Timothy Gowers, Terence Tao, Marcus du Sautoy, John Allen Paulos, Keith Devlin, Steven Strogatz and many others) have fully embraced social media. Why not prominent mathematics educators? Looking further into the matter, I found that the mathematics education research community, as a whole, is very late to the game when it comes to the use of social media. Certain mathematics education organisations have adopted social media: ICMI is on Facebook, NCTM and PME-NA use Twitter, as have a handful of individuals (@joboaler, @mathhombre, @mathedresearch, @rmosvold and others). For the most part, however, the majority of mathematics educators has not embraced social media.

Based on these findings, I have a new contention: David Wheeler, like the majority of mathematics educators, would not tweet. Indeed, David Pimm (2000), discussing how Wheeler's name rarely appeared in the pages of FLM, notes, "He had a short editorial on page 1 together with a few briefly-worded questions and comments in his interview/discussion with Caleb Gattegno in issue number 1, and a second editorial to end things off in issue number 50. And that's it" (p. 8). David Wheeler would definitely not tweet. Of course, this is a metonym for Wheeler being more involved in the creation/development of a platform, where a community (or network) of individuals are given the opportunity to exchange ideas, dialogue, discuss and interact (akin to Dorsey being known for Twitter and not for his tweets).

Which platform then, the social component of FLM or one of the (multitude of) social media sites, would truly provide the best opportunity for an exchange of ideas, for dialogue, for discussion and for interaction on mathematics education? Previously, for mathematics educators, there was little doubt in the answer to this question: comments, such as these, would be submitted with the hopes of being published in a journal and, ultimately, warrant a follow up response in a subsequent issue (and thus an additional line on the vitae). Times have changed. Instead of submitting these comments to a paywalled journal (like FLM and others), submitting to an open access journal could, potentially, increase the number of individuals who would read them and, thus, increase the potential for the exchange of ideas, dialogue, discussion and interaction. Extending the argument further, not submitting these comments to a paywalled journal or to an open access journal, but, rather, posting them on a social media site (*e.g.,* Scribd or Tumblr) could increase, even further, the number of individuals reading them and, thus, the social component potential. What to do?

Of the choices presented above, I have, in the end, decided to submit these comments with the hopes they grace the pages of (what I call the "social component" of) FLM and, in doing so, provide a prompt for user-generated content on the following topic: Would David Wheeler embrace social media for mathematics education? Will you? I look forward to the opportunity to exchange ideas, for dialogue, for discussion and for interaction concerning these comments—wherever that ends up taking place.

References
Pimm, D. (2000) David Wheeler and the FLM adventure. *CMESG Newsletter* **17**(1), 8-9.

Writing for the learning of mathematics

ANNA SFARD

For the learning of mathematics … Just five brief words. Without much ado, without formality or pomposity, this brief phrase leaves no doubt as to what motivates those who write on these pages: it is mathematics that they have in mind, and it is its learning that they hope to promote. But do they indeed? Or should it rather be *we*, not *they*? After all, I am among this journal's occasional contributors. So, let me rephrase: are we really writing and publishing for the learning of mathematics? Am I doing this? Are you, the FLM reader and writer? And even if we do write for the learning of mathematics, are we passionate enough about this goal to pursue it with undivided attention and in a truly effective manner?

These questions, of course, should be asked about any mathematics education journal, not just FLM. Still, the answers for FLM may be special. Indeed, FLM differs from the majority of mathematics education journals in several important ways. This anniversary issue is the place to celebrate this difference, and it is my aim to do so. To this end, however, I must devote much of the allotted space to the context.