Thomas E. Wartenberg is Professor of Philosophy at Mt. Holyoke College in South Hadley, MA; and author of several books, most recently *Big Ideas for Little Kids: Teaching Philosophy Through Children's Literature* (Rowman & Littlefield, 2009).

Doing Philosophy With Children

Prepared for "Keeping the Child in Mind"

September 12, 2009

Thomas E. Wartenberg

For the past decade, my principal involvement with pre-college philosophy has been teaching a course at Mount Holyoke College in which my students, after a brief but intensive period of learning how to facilitate philosophical discussions among second graders, practice what they have learned in weekly sessions in a local elementary school. What I'd like to do here today is to tell you a little bit about that course and what its effect has been on all of those involved in it: myself, my students, and the elementary school children.

But before getting to that, let me begin by explaining how I got involved in teaching philosophy in elementary schools in the first place. Looking back, I see my commitment to doing philosophy with children as the result of the confluence of three different factors. First, sometime in the mid-1980's, a friend of mine invited me to come to a mini-conference at the University of Massachusetts. It was there that I first became acquainted with the notion that one could discuss philosophy with young children when I heard Gary Matthews give a talk in which he explained how children's literature could be a stimulus for philosophical discussions with children. I found the idea of doing

philosophy with children that young fascinating, but it remained something filed away in my memory for years, as it turned out, awaiting further developments.

The next step in my "conversion" was reading a book called *Among Schoolchildren* by Tracy Kidder.[i] The book is, among other things, a portrait of an elementary school teacher in Holyoke, Massachusetts, who is struggling against the odds to reach her charges, most of whom are minority children from very poor backgrounds. One technique Mrs. Zajek uses and that Kidder praises is the read-aloud. But she uses this in a carrot-and-stick strategy in which she threatens to withhold this valued treat unless her pupils do all the things they need to: math worksheets, spelling assignments, etc. What struck me was that this teacher had things inverted. Instead of using something that the children were really interested in – the read-aloud – to stimulate the entire learning process, she left the coercive learning process in place, only providing a treat for her pupils if they managed to fulfill the tasks she set for them during the school day. To me, this smacked of a lost opportunity, for I believed that the students' interest in being read to could be used to transform the entire nature of the classroom.

It was only after I had a child of my own and discovered to my surprise that he naturally raised philosophical questions that I began to put all this together and realize that young children deserved to have the chance to discuss philosophy. There are many incidents I could relate in which Jake surprised me with his philosophical acumen. I'll tell you about one of them. I was making dinner one night when Jake finished watching the one TV show we allowed him to watch each day. Jake came into the kitchen and asked me if he could watch a second one. I told him, "No. Two is too many." Jake was clearly upset, because he really wanted to watch that second show. Instead of having a

tantrum, though, he was quiet, and I could see the wheels turning. Suddenly, his face brightened and he turned to me with a slightly mischievous smile. As he held up two fingers, he asked, “Daddy, how many fingers are these?” “Two,” I replied. “Are they too many?” he queried.

Jake was all of four at the time and I was stunned. He had presented me with an enthymeme, an argument with suppressed premises that its auditor had to supply. It was not a *sound* argument, but, still, it showed quite a bit of sophistication. Indeed, to explain to Jake why his argument was not cogent, I would have had to discuss arguments from analogy and explain why they didn’t always work. But I was too surprised to do this and anyway dinner had to be made, so I just let him watch the second show as I shook my head and pondered the implications of what Jake had just done.

It was not that night, but eventually similar incidents with Jake, together with the lessons I had learned from Gary and from reading *Among Schoolchildren*, convinced me that children deserve the opportunity to discuss philosophy. They do because philosophical questions occur naturally to them and they ought to have a chance to pursue their philosophical interests more fully than they are likely to without the assistance of adults. Most rationales for teaching philosophy to young children emphasize the need to develop critical thinking skills. The idea is that, especially in a democracy, it is imperative that citizens be able to think for themselves and one way to achieve this goal is to teach those skills early in the educational process. From one point of view, philosophy is precisely that discipline whose subject matter is thinking itself, so there can be no better way to teach such thinking skills than getting young children acquainted with philosophy.

I have nothing against this rationale for doing philosophy with children. In fact, I think it is an important part of what makes teaching philosophy early in a child's education very important. Our society would be better off if everyone had learned to detect fallacious and unsound arguments while still in elementary school. But just emphasizing the acquisition of such critical reasoning skills leaves out something important about doing philosophy with children.

When we do philosophy with children, we take their concerns seriously. That is, we honor their interest in philosophical questions, an interest that springs up naturally as they make their way through this confusing and contradictory world in which we all live. This requires more than just helping them become critical thinkers; it necessitates our discussing with them substantive philosophical issues that they are puzzled about. I think this distinction between critical thinking and philosophy proper is important, though I can't go into it in very much detail now. I just want to say that teaching children to participate in philosophical discussions has a substantive as well as a formal dimension to it.

But in any case, when we engage in a philosophical discussion with children, we really have to listen to what the children say. Of course, we all do listen to children a lot, but I've come to recognize that, most of the time, we are not really listening. Or, to be more precise, that the type of listening we do is not the appropriate one. What we do is to listen to children in so far as doing so accords with our own goals and purposes. But we don't allow what children say to become the focus of our concern. I wanted to finish making dinner when Jake presented his argument to me about two not being too much, not have a philosophical discussion with him about arguments from analogy. But our

children deserve to have just the type of loving attention and attentive listening to their concerns from the adults who care about them that it would have taken for me to have had that latter discussion with Jake. This is another reason why I think doing philosophy with children is so important: It affects the way we interact with children in a positive way that validates children's own interests and concerns, letting them see that grown-ups take those concerns to be valid and important.

To return to my narrative, when Jake entered elementary school, instead of volunteering for the PTO, I decided to try to develop a program in philosophy at his school, the Jackson Street Elementary School in Northampton, Massachusetts. It took a good deal of perseverance, but eventually I was able to hold a workshop for the teachers at the school. The principal and I had invited all the teachers to come to an after-school workshop and six of them accepted our invitation. I proceeded by reading the teachers "Dragons and Giants," a Frog and Toad story by Arnold Lobel, that raises the question of how you can tell if you are brave.[ii] After reading the story, as a sort of warm up to a real philosophical discussion, I asked the teachers if they could give an example of something they did in their lives that they thought was brave. I'm not sure what I expected them to say – maybe something like it was brave to teach a subject they didn't really know much about – but I was bowled over by the honesty with which they revealed the struggles they had faced with courage in their lives. One spoke of dealing with breast cancer; another with raising a son with a severe disability. And from there we got into a discussion of what made those acts and others like them brave.

I was not the only one who was impressed by what took place that afternoon: One of the teachers later told me that she became committed to having philosophy

sessions in her classroom because that discussion about courage made her see that doing philosophy was a way of moving to a deeper level of communication between people than was the norm. It has taken me a while to see how perceptive her comment was, for I now see that, among the things that doing philosophy does for young children, is that it helps them learn how to talk to their classmates and really listen to what they have to say.

The initial result of that workshop was that one second grade teacher, Mary Cowhey, asked if I would help her introduce philosophy into her classroom. We decided that I would meet her after school once a week to work on a philosophy lesson and then come to the classroom later in the week and discuss the philosophical issues raised by a children's picture book with her pupils. After only a short time, Mary told me that it no longer made sense for me to come to her class because she was not able to contain philosophical discussions to our 45-minute sessions. Her pupils became so interested in discussing philosophy that they were doing it all the time, even when it was not "appropriate." I continued to meet with her to work out lesson plans that she would use, but I no longer worked directly with her students.

The next important step in the development of my commitment to doing philosophy in elementary schools came when I decided to teach a college course on philosophy for children. Some of my motivation for doing so was selfish. To that point, all of my efforts at introducing philosophy into elementary schools were taking place in addition to my "day job" of teaching philosophy to college students. And I was getting burned out. I was also worried that I didn't have the time to work with more than one teacher, so my goal of introducing a philosophy program into all the grades at the school was not really progressing.

As I pondered my situation, a thought hit me: "Why not use my college students to teach philosophy and thus be able to reach more children in more classrooms than I could on my own?" Actually, this was more of a revelation than a thought, for I became convinced immediately that this was the way to go. After all, I had a ready supply of free labor in my students. They could, I thought, learn to teach philosophy and, in so doing, teach it at different grade levels. And, perhaps best of all, this would transform my own volunteer efforts into a legitimate part of my job.

All I can say now is that I had a lot to learn about every aspect of that apparently simple idea. For starters, I was not able to discover a model for the course I wanted to teach. I attended various different workshops – sponsored by the American Philosophical Association, Mount Holyoke College, and the Five Colleges – only to discover that no one seemed to be doing exactly what I wanted to. At the time, the community-based or in-service learning idea was just beginning to hit Mount Holyoke. But there was not yet, as there is now, a well-functioning center to help people like me figure out how to expand our teaching efforts beyond the classroom. So I had to invent the course whole cloth.

Despite the difficulty that this task presented, I did manage to develop a course and I have been teaching it at Mount Holyoke every fall since 2001. Before I tell you why I think such courses ought to be taught by other philosophy professors, let me describe it to you. Let me also mention that you can find virtually all the materials we use posted on my website, teachingchildrenphilosophy.org

I will begin by describing the sessions my students facilitate in the schools. So far, my students have taught in three schools. Since I already had contact at Jackson Street, this is where my students began teaching. At Jackson Street, they have taught

philosophy to every grade except first. Then, a couple of years ago, a charter school opened in inner city Springfield, Massachusetts. The students at the Martin Luther King Jr. Charter School of Excellence are 97% minority and 60% come from families below the federal poverty line. Most of them also come from problematic home situations and that has meant that we have faced some significant obstacles in introducing them to philosophy. Still, for each of the past two years and this year as well, we have taught philosophy to all of the second graders. That's been an advantage for the course, because all of my students are then working at the same grade level. (Incidentally, the reason it's second grade has to do with the MCAS exams that older students are forced to take. The teachers are nervous about "losing" time by having us come into their classrooms!) Finally, the principal of the Pioneer Valley Chinese Immersion Charter School in Hadley, Massachusetts, got in touch with me after reading an article in a local paper about my work and students doing independent work with me taught there last year. This year we are doing a yearlong intervention in conjunction with a research study undertaken by psychologists from Boston College.

What we do in each of these venues is very similar. We ask the teachers to divide their classes in half so that we have about 10-12 students in each discussion group. I assign two students to each group to facilitate the discussion. Each session is scheduled for 45 minutes, which the teachers say is about as long as the children are able to pay attention. Because of the nature of our schedule, each session is generally devoted to a new book.

Before we discuss the books, it is important that the children have a clear sense of what is expected of them. Since philosophy is new to them and, in particular, they are

generally not used to the type of discussion they will be having with their fellow students, we need to make it clear that there are certain rules that they have to follow in order to take part in a philosophical discussion. The way I put this is that there are only certain "moves" that they are allowed to "make" when they "play" the "game" of philosophy. These include stating your position clearly, supporting it with reasons, agreeing or disagreeing with others, and being able to explain why you do.

To make all of this less intimidating, we present the children with a list that we call, "How We Do Philosophy!" Here it is:

How We Do Philosophy!

---

1. We *answer* the questions the teacher asks as clearly as we can
2. We *listen* carefully and quietly to what someone is saying.
3. We *think* about what we heard.
4. We *decide* if we *agree or disagree*.
5. We think about *why* we agree or disagree.
6. When the teacher calls on us, we say whether we agree or not and why.
7. We *respect* what everyone says.
8. We *all* have valuable contributions to make.
9. We *have fun* thinking together!

As you can see, this lists specifies the basic rules that the children are to follow in their philosophy discussion. Although it appears here that we just require the children to do

these things, I actually try to get them to develop these notions through a philosophical discussion about the nature of discussions when we first visit the school.

Once the children have been reminded what the rules for doing philosophy are, one of my students reads the children a story. This might be "Dragons and Giants" or *The Important Book*[iii] or, indeed, virtually any other picture book. We then ask the children to help fill in a chart about the central ideas from the story. We started doing this because we discovered that some of the children had trouble moving directly from the story into a philosophical discussion. The chart takes the story and puts the information contained in it into a form that is more congruent with a philosophical discussion. In many cases, it is just a summary of the central incidents in the story, but it can also already ask the children to make some preliminary judgments about what they think about ideas presented in the story.

To see how this works, let's turn to a book that we use to discuss metaphysics, Margaret Wise Brown's *The Important Book*. This book has a simple, repetitive form. For each of a series of objects – a spoon, a daisy, rain, an apple, etc. – a series that culminates, finally, in "you ," the book states that "the important thing about" the object is that it is "something" where that something is a property that the object possesses that the book claims is more essential to the object than other things that the object also has, some of which it then lists. Finally, it reiterates the important thing about the object. So, for example, the book says that the important thing about rain is "that it is wet." It also says that rain "falls out of the sky," "sounds like rain," "makes things shiny," "does not taste like anything," and "is the color of air." Then it reaffirms that "the important thing about rain is that it is wet."

After reading the book the children, we ask them to help us fill in a chart that takes the information presented in the book and puts it into a form that the children can use during their philosophy discussion.

The Important Things About…

Object	A Spoon	An Apple	You
The Important Thing About…	You eat with it	It is wet.	That you are you.
Other Things About It	It is hollow, etc.	It falls, etc.	You were a baby, etc.

This chart stays up on the board during our discussion so that both the children and the facilitator can refer to it.

Once the chart has been filled out, my students initiate the philosophical discussion proper. Unlike some practitioners of philosophy for children, we always are prepared to begin by asking the children a question. Sometimes a child may spontaneously ask a question and, when that happens, we generally let that determine the course of the discussion. But we have a set of questions ready to hand that focuses on philosophical issues that each book raises. I developed this method because I wanted to give some guidance to a facilitator who might not recognize what the philosophically significant issues raised by a story were.

Here is the set of questions that we have used for *The Important Book*:

Topic: Artifacts and Essential Properties

The book says that the important thing about a spoon is that you eat with it.

1. Have you ever seen a spoon that is not a spoon that you eat with?
2. What are some other things about spoons that are important?
3. Is there one " important" thing about a spoon? If so, what is it and why? If not, why not?

Topic: Organic Things and Essential Properties

The book says that the important thing about an apple is that it is round.

1. What are some other important things about apples?
2. Is being round the important thing about an apple?
3. Could something be an apple and have some other shape?
4. Is there one important thing about being an apple?

Topic: Personal Identity

The book says that the important thing about you is that you are you.

1. Tell us one very important thing about you.
2. Could you still be you and not possess that very important thing?
3. What makes you *you*?

This is a book in the field of metaphysics and its specific concern is the idea of essential properties. That is, I interpret the book to be claiming that each of the objects it discusses has an essential property, such as the wetness of rain, when it claims that that one property is *the* important thing about the object. Now, some of you may have noticed what the book is here claiming is false, at least when interpreted as I do. I'm not sure about whether any of you would agree that the most important thing about rain – its

essence – is that it is wet, for I'm not even sure what the wetness of rain amounts to in this context, perhaps what the rain feels like. But, in any case, one of the things we do when discussing this book is to encourage the students to see that they don't always agree with what the book says and that is not just O.K., but actually what we hope they will do. We want them not to take anything on authority but to reason things out for themselves.

One of my students, Ariel Sykes, led a discussion of this book with third graders at the Jackson Street School a couple of years ago. When the discussion turned to rain, she did something interesting: She asked the children to add a column to the chart she had made with them, listing all the things that rain *is*, and to vote for the important thing about rain. Here is the result:

Rain
Makes puddles
Makes ponds
Splashes
Makes things grow (every living thing depends on it)
It can evaporate (take different forms: solid, liquid, gas)
Makes mud
Most Important: Makes things grow

Take a look at the difference between what the books says about rain and what the children did. Do you see anything interesting? Well, Ariel asked the children to discuss the differences between their list and the book's. Here is a short excerpt from the discussion that ensued:

Ariel: Let's talk about this, why do you think our list looks different than the book's list?

Jamilla: Well, the book's list has things mainly about what it looks like, like the senses, but not what it does. Our list is more of its purpose.

Alice: Our list is kinda like a dictionary. The book's list is sorta not so good because 'wet' is what rain is but 'makes puddles' and 'makes things grow' has more of a description, it tells you more about what rain does.

Ariel: Well do you think there is only one most important thing about rain? Because the group as a whole didn't agree on what was most important.

Mark: It is impossible for there to be any one most important thing!

Christine: I agree with Mark. I think that everything about an object is important otherwise the object wouldn't have that thing. Also, because what is important to one person won't be the same for everyone else. I think that everyone wants something different so everyone will see what they want from that thing as the most important thing.

I was blown away when I read this transcript, for I was amazed by what I saw the children doing here. To begin with, Jamilla and Alice develop a very important philosophical distinction, that between a thing's structure and its function. In twentieth-century philosophy, this distinction is registered most centrally by Martin Heidegger as that between the categories of *Vorhandenheit* (being present at hand) and *Zuhandenheit* (being ready to hand). The two girls says that the list that they have made of rain's properties is better than the book's because they have focused on rain's functions rather than just describing it. To my mind, that's a pretty impressive piece of philosophizing.

And the discussion quickly moves on to make another important claim. After Mark denies that things have one essential property, Christine offers some arguments to support his claim. Let's concentrate on her first argument. She claims that *every* property of an object is essential to it or else, as she puts it, why would it have that property? Clearly, she is a budding Leibnizian, asserting that everything that is true of a thing is part of its essential nature, what makes it the thing that it is.

This is a very brief sample of a discussion that the children had about *The Important Book*, but I hope you can see that they manifest an ability to make philosophical distinctions and defend their claims that is really quite amazing. Of course, my own students don't have the philosophical sophistication to always notice what's going on, especially in the heat of the moment. But I think it is very important to recognize that my students have been able to help these young children think carefully about the nature of objects and their properties, and to formulate some quite sophisticated philosophical positions in regard to the nature of the essential properties of objects. Doesn't this make it clear why doing philosophy with elementary-school children is so important? I doubt that first year college students would be able to carry on as sophisticated a discussion of essentialism as these third graders did with Ariel's assistance. How could one not think that elementary-school children deserve the chance to think about things philosophically if they can do so with such skill and insight?

My students have generally had the opportunity to teach seven sessions during our course. In light of this, I decided to create an introduction to philosophy class for elementary-school children that my students would teach over those seven weeks. I modeled this course on a pretty standard conception of what an introduction to philosophy course looks like at the college level. So, each week we introduce a book from a different field of philosophy. Here is one version of such a course.

1. "Dragons and Giants": Teaching Ethics
2. *Frederick*: Teaching Social and Political Philosophy
3. *The Important Book*: Teaching Metaphysics
4. *The Wonderful Wizard of Oz*: Teaching the Philosophy of Mind

5. *The Giving Tree*: Teaching Environmental Philosophy
6. *Morris the Moose*: Teaching Epistemology
7. *Knuffle Bunny*: Teaching the Philosophy of Language
8. *Emily's Art*: Teaching Aesthetics

As you can see, we cover all of the central fields of philosophy using a different book each week. This course is just one example of what you might do in bringing philosophy into an elementary-school classroom. Teachingchildrenphilosophy.org has many other options to choose from to create such courses and even more specialized ones.

The Mount Holyoke students who take this course don't enter it ready to teach philosophy to elementary school children. They are a rather diverse group of students. The only prerequisite for registering for the course is that they have already taken one course in philosophy or one in educational theory, although many of my students have taken a great deal more philosophy and/or education than this. In an ideal year, I get an even balance between philosophy students and education students. This allows me to team up a philosophy student and an education student. The goal is to have a team with some knowledge of philosophy and some skill in dealing with classroom issues.

You have just seen what the second half of the course is like. For the first half of the semester, the students are engaged in learning how to teach philosophy. First, they need to understand what is involved in bringing philosophy into elementary school classrooms. Some of them are surprised to discover that we never mention the name of any philosophers to the children. As you have just heard, our goal is to assist the elementary-school students learn how to express, defend, and assess their ideas, the key elements of philosophy. So we don't try to introduce either philosophical terminology or

the names of famous philosophers, but only to refine and develop their discursive abilities.

There actually are a lot of different skills that my students have to learn – and learn very quickly. Many of them, for example, really have trouble reading a story to the children in a dynamic and entertaining manner. So I try to get them to shed their inhibitions and really ham it up. Most of them also need to learn a lot more about philosophy than they previously have, even if they are philosophy majors. None of them have in-depth knowledge about all of the different issues we discuss with the children, so they get a chance to learn about issues as different as the nature of personal identity and whether there is an appropriate manner for humans to relate to the natural world. In addition, teaching is new to most of them, so they also have to acquire the skill of facilitating a discussion. They practice doing so on each other, which is the closest experience I can provide for them to that of teaching the children. Despite all this, their first session in a classroom is always terrifying, surprising, and, usually, enormously gratifying.

Now that you have a sense of what my course is like, it's time to address what the different parties in this enterprise get out of it. I've already addressed the question of why I think it is important to teach philosophy to young children. Not only do they develop critical thinking skills by doing philosophy, but they also have the opportunity to discuss some questions that have real significance for their lives and about which they have insightful things to say. I want to stress that my approach to doing philosophy with children emphasizes their taking part in genuine philosophical discussions. I have become aware that many educators who are devoted to the idea of doing philosophy with

children take their job to be that of helping them become critical thinkers. While I am interested in that as well, I don't lose sight of the centrality of the children actually doing philosophy during our classroom interventions.

Another aspect of the impact of what we do on the children is that they learn to talk with their peers in a deeper manner than they are used to. This is an important thing for them to learn, for it will affect the nature of their classroom. In the terms that Matthew Lipman and others have used, it transforms the classroom into a *community* whose members engage in cooperative *inquiry*.[iv]

Because our method relies on children's literature, we hope that the children emerge with a great interest in and respect for picture books. I recall a fifth grader telling me that he never realized how interesting little kids' books could be. We hope that our philosophy lessons also foster such renewed interest among the children in literature as a source of interesting philosophical ideas and theories. In sum, then, doing philosophy has important benefits for the elementary-school children who have the opportunity to engage in it with us.

But what about the college students? You'll recall that I initially characterized them as "free labor." Am I exploiting them for my own and the elementary-school children's benefit?

Actually, the aspect of my course that has been most surprising to me is what my own students have gotten out of it. At one level, as I have already indicated, they learn a whole set of skills that will be useful to them later in life. Because they have to talk with children and read books to them, they tend to become more confident in their own "oral-language" skills, something that colleges desire that we teach but that we aren't always

good at teaching. In addition, in order to lead the philosophy discussions that we have with the kids, my students have to really develop their command of a wide range of philosophical issues in a more active manner than they may have had to previously. Since we are teaching an introduction to philosophy course for the kids, my students wind up knowledgeable about a set of issues that spans the entire discipline of philosophy, from ethics to epistemology, and social and political philosophy to metaphysics.

But most of my students connect to this course in a much more existential manner. I realize this from the term papers and journals that they have to turn in. For many of them, this course marks their deepest encounter with the nature of education in our society and in their lives. When things go well, my students come away from their experience discussing philosophy with the school children with a recognition of the importance of education in the lives of us all. And because they realize that education could be doing a lot more than it generally does by way of educating young children, they become much more critical of all the educational institutions in our society, including the one that they are currently attending.

As a result of all this, a surprising number of students who have taken this course go into elementary education. Not all of them become teachers, although some have. Others have entered into various teacher education programs, such as the Algebra Project at Harvard. I had not anticipated that teaching the course would affect the career plans of my students, but it has been an important consequence. One of the things it has made me realize is that we philosophers do not do well by our undergraduate students who are not planning to go on to graduate school in philosophy. We give them little by way of career

advice, other than pointing them to law school as the obvious path for philosophy majors. But being an elementary-school philosophy teacher or being involved in education in some other manner is a very good way for philosophy graduates to apply their philosophy education in their careers.

And, finally, what about me? What benefits have I received from teaching the course? As you have seen, the course has succeeded in allowing me to introduce philosophy into a variety of different elementary-school contexts. And, certainly, this has been gratifying. I am currently involved in three different projects – in addition to the ones I've mentioned at MLKCSE and PVCICS, I am also teaching sixth graders for the first time in my career. Like my students, I find myself genuinely moved by the effects that our seven sessions have on the second graders.

But I want to end by acknowledging something else. I have been extremely moved by the way in which this course has created closer relationships between me and my students. In part, I think this is because I find myself in a different role with them. I'm not trying to explain to them what exactly Kant means by the Transcendental Unity of Apperception. Nor am I trying to get them to see how films are able to engage in philosophical thinking. Instead, I am helping them do something that they are interested in doing, teaching philosophy to elementary-school children. So, as partners in an enterprise that we both want to succeed, we find ourselves in a different sort of relationship to that which I have with them in more usual classes. This allows me to be more like a coach, who is trying to get them to be able to do what they want to do at the highest level possible for them. The assessment piece of my job recedes and that enables us to relate to one another quite differently.

All in all, then, doing philosophy with children has immensely enriched my own life as a teacher, a father, and a human being. And, at the same time, I think it has enhanced the lives of many students, both college and elementary-school, who have gotten the opportunity of doing philosophy in an unusual setting.

NOTES

---

[i] Tracy Kidder, *Among Schoolchildren* (New York: Harper, 1990).

[ii] From Arnold Lobel, *Frog and Toad Together* (New York: HarperCollins, 1971).

[iii] Margaret Wise Brown, *The Important Book* (New York: HarperCollins, 1949).

[iv] See, for example, David Kennedy, "Forming Philosophical Communities of Inquiry in Early Childhood Classrooms," *Early Child Development and Care* (120) 1996, Pp. 1-15.