

Emotional Intelligence: Does Philosophy Have a Part to Play?

Ann Gazzard

This article was presented as a paper at the 5th NAACI Conference, Vancouver, Canada, June 2000.

Philosophy and feeling have probably enjoyed as much popular separation as head and heart, body and mind or body and soul. It is not unusual for thoughts and feelings or emotions to be considered very different kinds of things, and hence autonomous processes. Moreover, it is also not unusual to find this perception mirrored in psychological literature when, for example, people are characterized as either «thinking types» or «feeling types». This paper represents an attempt to close this gap. Recent neurophysiological research has made it clear, at least on the physiological level, that indeed emotional behavior, most particularly desirable emotionality, is a product of both the «thinking brain» and the «emotional brain». Looking inside the intricacies of this neural connection, one finds an important, if not necessary, role for philosophy in the development of emotional intelligence. This paper explores what is meant by «philosophy», what is meant by «emotional intelligence», and then sets about to explain the connection between them. Early childhood education is the context used to show how this might be done. The interplay between philosophical thinking and emotional well being is not restricted to any age level or category of people. Early childhood, however, has been selected as the case in point because it clearly sets the stage for the quality of emotional experience to follow.

EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE - DOES PHILOSOPHY HAVE A PART TO PLAY?

Insofar as philosophy is a tool to aid reflection and analysis, and insofar as philosophy is a means of generating alternative ways of making, saying and doing things, it has a lot to offer those interested in improving the way they relate emotionally to the world around them. Certainly the advocates of philosophical counseling, a school of therapeutic practice dedicated to the use of the medium of philosophy as the medium of treatment, think so.

At the level of counseling or therapy, philosophy is perhaps most remarkable in its ability to provide the inquirer with new frames of reference, alternative conceptions and understandings and a myriad of possible interpretations for any one act, feeling or perception. Indeed, one of the benefits of

philosophical counseling is the confrontation with belief systems that must exist to support certain behaviors. Changing the feeling that supports the behavior is known to change the behavior, but even further, changing the thought that supports the feeling is more likely to have longer lasting effects.

What I am interested in doing in this paper is further examining the connection between emotional intelligence and philosophy. In particular I am interested in early childhood and the possibility that philosophy might provide a cognitive environment sufficiently rich to forestall the child being limited by thought patterns (and hence neuronal patterns) that restrict his or her opportunity for an emotionally satisfying existence. Emotional intelligence is, at least in part, the ability to express and communicate emotions effectively so that satisfying social and personal relationships can be sustained. Without the tools to formulate new ways of looking at things and understanding them from both one's own and the other's perspective, and without the opportunity to rehearse and act upon these new conceptions, it is unlikely that this can be achieved. The new neuronal pathways necessary to sustain desired behaviors might not come into play with the old habits remaining stronger.

If, on the other hand, cognitively rich environments could be provided for the child very early on, especially at the times of emotional difficulty, then perhaps therapeutic efforts to retrain the mind in later life could be reduced, if not eliminated. Moreover, the facility for generating with ease new ways of seeing things would be inbuilt making, one could argue, for a more emotionally flexible person. This is a role for philosophy that I am interested to establish.

EQ, IQ, AND PHILOSOPHY

Before proceeding further, however, I wish to clarify some terms, at least as they will be used herein. They are «emotional intelligence», «right/left brain» functioning, and indeed, «philosophy» itself. Let us begin with «philosophy.»

«Philosophy» can be used to mean a variety of things. For example, it can be used to refer to the study of the famous philosophers and their ideas, that is, the history of philosophy, or it can be divided into the study of the different philosophic disciplines and the major ideas and philosophers peculiar to them. «Philosophy» has also been used to refer to the search for wisdom, or the search for the good life, and more recently, it has referred to a way of thinking about things, a tool by and large, to analyze and reflect where it acts more like a meta-discipline that can attach itself to any subject. The way «philosophy» is being used in this paper is not restricted to any one of these. Rather it refers to an approach that could make use of all of them at any given time, but that would by necessity have some components of the second and third method mentioned above. It is not enough, that is, that people understand or know the great philosophic tradition, as admirable as that may be, but rather we are talking about the practice of *doing* philosophy. «Philosophy» here means thinking of alternative ways to perceive or understand something; it means learning to appreciate and look for the assumptions and implications of our thoughts, feelings and actions; it means learning to clarify what we say and to request clarification from others; it means that style of reflective thinking that allows us to observe our own thinking and thought patterns and make corrections where necessary and where desired; it means having the facility of think-

ing to go from the abstract to the concrete and the concrete to the abstract; it means being able to see the «bigger» picture and take a distance, or assume some stance of impartiality to our own favored perspective; it means an openness to appreciate the familial and cultural conditioning in our thinking and feeling; and, with all of this in mind, it means these tools being used in service of some sense of the search for truth, understanding or a better way. That is not to say that a background in academic philosophy might not contribute. The point rather in this case is that it is not necessary in order to help somebody think philosophically about his or her own process. An openness to new ways of looking at things, and a capacity to generate the same (which indeed the study of philosophy can breed) is rather what is important here. Learning about philosophy does not guarantee being able to do it.

The second set of terms to be clarified is that of the two hemispheres of the brain and their functions. The notion of the two hemispheres of the brain having different primary functions has gone in and out of vogue in the academic world. Regardless of its popularity at any given time, however, it is evident that the left hemisphere is responsible for the more traditional academic skills like verbal ability and logical/analytical reasoning, whereas the right hemisphere (once called the «dumb» brain) takes care of musical, artistic/spatial and poetic type of abilities. If there is damage to the cortical layers in any part of the brain, moreover, other parts, even sides, can take over the lost function in time.

Finally, the notion of emotional intelligence (EQ) needs clarification. Unlike its counterpart, IQ, which has an extensive practical and research history, EQ has only more recently been introduced to us in 1995 by Daniel Goleman.¹ Whereas IQ has most generally referred to mathematical and verbal ability, EQ, according to Goleman, refers to a person's ability to get along with other people, to be aware of one's own feelings and to be able to handle one's self in the face of any emotion.²

What makes EQ all the more interesting is its purported contribution not only to academic success but also to having a «successful life.» Indeed, the argument goes that, with respect to being successful, EQ makes an 80% contribution whereas IQ makes a 20% contribution.³ Unlike what schools have traditionally geared themselves towards, namely, enhancing IQ scores and academic performance believing it to be the measure of future success, it seems from this more recent research that it is indeed more self-management and interpersonal skills that make the difference. Even though we know at a common sense level that intellectual knowing is limited if it can not be communicated or applied, or if the social contacts are not available for its sharing, there now seems to be considerable physiological evidence lending support and charting out the neural basis of this phenomenon.

Goleman's research shows us that there are neural pathways that can be held responsible for both emotional literacy and emotional illiteracy. Although Goleman proposes that these pathways are correctable, which is very good news especially for the therapeutic practitioner, my interest is preventive. I hope to show the role philosophy can play in forestalling the development of those neural pathways that make the person a captive of negative emotional reactions and hence emotional illiteracy. Prevention and remediation both require effort. This is well known. But insofar as much suffering could be avoided by the former and insofar as greater gains in the scholastics and school performance can be achieved when the emotions are more stable, prevention seems the preferred path. Education, that is, seems a more enlightened path than therapy.

THE PHYSIOLOGY OF EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

What we need to do then is examine the structure and development of the neural pathways that account for the lack, or possession, of emotional intelligence and see what the connections to philosophy might be that could more readily secure their formation.

Goleman establishes the notion of an *emotional hijack*. The major saboteur of EQ, emotional hijacks occur when emotions take over conscious choice, are inappropriate in intensity or type to the situation, and/or are basically responsible for social difficulties whether in child or adult - «the emotional outburst» as it were! According to Goleman, «The hallmark of such a hijack is that once the moment passes, those so possessed have the sense of not knowing what came over them»⁴ This condition, according to the literature, is neurally based and long-thought to «originate in the amygdala, a center in the limbic system,» that part of the brain often thought of as the *emotional brain*.⁵ «If the amygdala is severed from the rest of the brain, the result is a striking inability to gauge the emotional significance of events.»⁶ Yet more recent neuroscientific research, however, points to the interplay between the amygdala and the neocortex (*the thinking brain*) as being actually the heart of emotional intelligence.⁷ Moreover, it is in this interplay that we can find the connection to philosophy that we are looking for.

Indeed more recent research indicates that intelligent emotional behavior requires the input of the *left* prefrontal lobe of the neocortex, that is, the highest of rational thought. Some might argue that this was always obvious, that this was always understood. However, what is new is that now there is a physiological basis accounting for the overt behavior. Emotionally intelligent behavior is now best described as that type of response that results from a neural interaction between the amygdala and the prefrontal neocortex insofar as the amygdala's firing is tempered by firings from the left prefrontal neocortex. Psychologically speaking, this means that the emotion is tempered by the type of thought available to the left hemisphere, namely, rational, analytic, judicial type processes. In other words, an emotion is evaluated for its appropriateness and intensity in respect to the situation and in so doing it is tempered at the level of behavior.

In the case of an «emotional hijack», however, these pathways from the left neocortex are not available and the raw emotion bursts forth whether it be fear, rage, jealousy, lust or greed. In fact, according to Goleman, «the amygdala can take control over what we do even as the thinking brain, the neocortex, is still coming to a decision.»⁸ It most typically acts this way when it senses an inherent danger or threat. What constitutes a threat for any one person at any one time, however, is where things become very interesting. Why is it that some children and adults are more reactive in this way, often inappropriately so? Why is this neural tripwire more vulnerable in some and not others? Citing

LeDoux's work, Goleman provides a description of this tripwire:

*a visual signal first goes from the retina to the thalamus, where it is translated into the language of the brain. Most of the message then goes to the visual cortex, where it is analyzed and assessed for meaning and appropriate response; if that response is emotional, a signal goes to the amygdala to activate the emotional centers. But a smaller portion of the original signal goes straight from the thalamus to the amygdala in a quicker transmission, allowing a faster (though less precise) response. Thus the amygdala can trigger an emotional response before the cortical centers have fully understood what is happening.*⁹

Until LeDoux's work, there was no knowledge of this pathway straight from the thalamus to the amygdala. It was believed that all emotional processing came after cortical processing, that is, thought before emotion or emotional response. But now we have a physiological explanation of how the thinking brain can get swamped and arrested by the emotional brain. «The amygdala can have us spring into action while the slightly slower - but more fully informed - neocortex unfolds its more refined plan for reaction.»¹⁰

Indeed this finding that there is a pathway straight to the amygdala that can bypass conscious rational processing, has been used as the physiological explanation for the existence of unconscious emotions and unconscious emotional memories. The long standing psychoanalytic principle that emotional patterns for later behavior are set in the first few years of life now seem to have neuroscientific support. Such findings establish that these emotional patterns have neural counterparts that are «rough, wordless blueprints» and at times drive us to act in a particular way supposedly without us ever quite realizing why. Apparently these patterns are established at times of intense emotion ranging from abuse or neglect through to intense love and nurturing. Moreover, they are established at a time when the child is unable to understand or articulate them. As a result, it is argued, when these patterns produce emotional outbursts they are as disturbing in later childhood or adult life as when they were established in the early years. Once a pattern has been established, it seems, a situation later in life need only be similar to the original situation for the amygdala to go into a full blown response. «Precognitive emotions», as they are called, are «reactions based on neural bits and pieces of sensory information that have not been fully sorted out and integrated.»¹¹

In summary then, the prefrontal areas of the left brain normally govern our emotional reactions, that is, our emotions are tempered by thought. In the case of an emotional emergency, however, whether it be rationally justified or not emotions speak for themselves. The amygdala is triggered but the neocortical processes are not activated, at least not in time.

THE ROLE OF PHILOSOPHY

Two earlier questions arose earlier, namely, why are some children more vulnerable to hijacks than others, and what is the role of philosophy in enhancing the communication between the neocortex and the amygdala?

It appears from Goleman's research that there are two reasons for differences in reactivity among children. On the one hand, some children are born that way. They are «timid» children, so-called, children with over excitable amygdalas. On the other hand, there are those children not necessarily inheriting that condition, but due to unfortunate early childhood experiences, they develop it. Undoubtedly there is also a panoply of possibilities in between, many of which may not be socially or personally destructive but are of the kind that could nevertheless be well prevented making for a happier, more capable child. The lack of pathways from the prefrontal cortex to the amygdala whether by genetic endowment or later conditioning, it is argued however, is correctable by later experience, and it is the formation of these new connections that also seems to be at the heart of the prevention of the condition in the first place.¹² It is prevention that I want to address here. In particular I want to address the role that philosophy might play in that in the early childhood years. Needless to say, the experiences that have already left their mark even before the child enters preschool are confirmed both by our everyday experience and psychological and physiological research. Yet each of these areas also shows us how in many cases the marks of these experiences can be moderated. Notwithstanding the immeasurable importance of parental education and support even before the formal education process of children begins, my attempt here is to show what can perhaps be done in early childhood to reverse the undesirable, and create and strengthen new possibilities for future functioning. Neurally speaking, there is now sufficient evidence to suggest this can be done. *Hardwiring* changes can be made.

The success of such an approach rests upon finding ways to develop stronger and multiple neural connections between the neocortex and the amygdala particularly at times of emotional difficulty. That is to say, when the child is experiencing a difficult emotion we have to find a way to help the child develop thoughts and behavior to strengthen the messages from the left hemisphere to the emotional center. We need to create those experiences that activate with excitement the children's conscious, left brain thinking process. The excitement of new ideas and concepts must be there so the child is stimulated enough to make new neuronal connections. The child needs to experience the «ah-ha» that comes from at once seeing things in a different way and understanding them that way, the humor that makes the originally absurd all the more plausible, for example, and the daring to think of saying or doing things differently. The child needs to experience the freedom and safety to say what's on their mind so the limitations, consequences and implications of what they think and feel they can see. What's more all of this stimulated left brain activity needs to be connected to, relevant to, or in some way directed towards the emotional experience. That is to say, we're not talking about the development of critical and creative thought processes outside the context of the difficult emotion it's happening in. This might provide a temporary distraction from the emotion but it in no way provides a means to understand, resolve or appropriately express the emotion. Walking around the block when you are angry, for example, helps to prevent you from doing something out of anger you might later regret. It temporarily distracts, but in and of itself it does not serve to resolve the feeling unless of course one is also in the habit of thinking reflectively and clearly about the problem and how to express it while walking. One could spend years walking around the block but if one would eventually like to not always have to do that, something else has to be put in place to be carried into the future. It must be «understanding» that the left hemisphere can provide. Insofar as stimulating the brain in the ways described here, philosophy has a long-standing reputation. Philosophy, or at least the study of philosophy, however, has been typically reserved for the college or adult population. Nevertheless, the practice of doing philosophy with children or teaching children to philosophize has a growing and ever increasing following starting as early as the first grade.¹³

THE PHILOSOPHIC ENVIRONMENT

This type of bi-modal cognitive environment is not commonly experienced between child and caretaker, and sadly to say not always between child and teacher. So let us' turn to see how this might be done.

The moments in question are those crucial moments in the interaction between child and adult when the chance for a communication to be developed between the amygdala and neocortex is there. That is to say, what we are concerned with is the onset of negative emotions and the development of left brain messages to deactivate the messages from the amygdala that has, for whatever reason, already been flung into overdrive. Again whether the pattern of functioning is from inheritance or conditioning, our job is, as soon as possible, to deactivate it. Parenthetically it is interesting to note that whether or not the child is in need of this type of support at the time, their immunity to these emotional hijackings will be strengthened as a result of participating in this type of communication.

Let us consider anger as an example. Typically, parents in their more relaxed moments admit to feeling badly that they don't always stay reasonable. They often regrettably report that out of their own frustration and anger they lash back at the child who is him/herself angry and frustrated. Parents report not wanting to do this, but also not knowing what else to do in the moment. This it seems is the crux of the matter. The essence of emotional intelligence, or at least the development of some pathways from the neocortex to the amygdala that might enhance it hangs in this moment and moments like it. Quite obviously, an emotional reaction of the type just described back from the adult to the child is providing very little, if any, opportunity for the development or, strengthening of these neural pathways. Clearly what is needed is a more *cognitive rich* response cast in an *emotionally neutral* or positive context rather than a context that is already saturated with its own negativity. I want to propose that these are two important aspects of the adult's response to the child that need to be in place in order for emotional intelligence to develop - a) the *cognitive-rich* aspect of the response, and b) its *emotional neutrality*.

THE COGNITIVE-RICH RESPONSE ENTER PHILOSOPHY

There is little doubt that much of what parents say to children at these moments of emotional tension is of little developmental use. The child is often experiencing bodily, emotional and cognitive feelings either unknown, unfamiliar or frightening in their uncontrollability. The child's state is not unlike having the first experience of a bad drug, intoxication or illness. Its a feeling of unknowingness - of not knowing what to expect, when it will end, or if it will end at all, for the child has no experience to fall back upon in order to make a prediction. Adults, who are generally familiar with the type of feelings the child is experiencing may give recommendations, advice, orders or reprimands all of which are contingent upon their years of experience with such emotions. How unfair this seems! From the child's perspective, this must seem an awful punishment, an impossible request which is added to what is already happening to them. Telling a child to stop crying, for example, when she hardly knows how it started and does not understand her experience at the moment is, apart from being potentially hostile to the child, of little positive use or meaning. Rather, what children need at this moment is for someone to be engaged with them in their experience - someone as interested and involved in their experience as they are, interested in puzzling through the feelings with them, in considering where they may have come from, in wondering where they may be going, in seeing if the feelings have changed, in looking at

the thoughts connected to the feelings, etc. This is not to say that the adult should play therapist or counselor, but rather a curious, interested and caring companion, a support and therefore someone who might be able to assist the child in understanding her experience. The adult may be able gracefully to make light of the experience with the child - to make a game out of it as it were - perhaps to draw the experience, or to act out the feeling, or to find music that's like the feeling, or the color its like, etc. These are all ways to help the child understand their emotional experiences creatively. In other words, the adult needs to become a team player with the child to help him/her more fully understand the depth and meaning, and the consequences and foundation of this form of experience.

It is at this point that we find a significant connection between philosophy and emotional intelligence, at least that is, philosophy in the form of that outlined in the introduction. *Doing* philosophy with children and philosophizing with them about their experience in ways that are both informative and playful is what is needed to build bridges successfully from the neocortex to the amygdala. Question-answer dialogue is not what is meant here - rather, an inquiry with the child, in which there is a sharing of experiences and perspectives, so that each interlocutor, young or old, is affected by, and learns from, and finds significant meaning through the other.¹⁴ Such a *joint* adventure should allow the child to feel comforted by the presence of an adult in their experience with them, as opposed to the adult being someone outside their experience telling the child to get outside their experience also.

This notion of cojoint experience is not unlike what the existential psychiatrist RD Laing recommended for working with people in schizophrenic states.¹⁵ Laing suggested that the helper should take the hand of the person experiencing the disturbance and walk through their experience with them. And similarly the point here is that, in the case of children and emotional difficulty, the child needs to feel the presence of the adult there with them in such a way that they feel open to express themselves about whatever it is they're going through. The adult then becomes a companion through their experience, and «help» is more *being there* than trying to intervene or change. Moreover, we find in Rousseau not a dissimilar argument.¹⁶ He claims that the parent/teacher's role with the child should not be to administer rewards and punishments, but rather that, if these things are to occur, they should come as the natural consequences of the child's actions on the environment. He argues that the adult's role should be to remove as much as possible those elements of the situation that are potentially dangerous, then let the child do as he/she will, allowing the consequences of their own actions to serve either as reward or punishment. In so doing, the child eventually comes to the parent as a friend and ally - as one who the child sees avoiding and not being subjected to so many consequences as he/she is, and who is obviously not suffering to the same extent. The adult then becomes someone to whom the child can come for advice as a more advanced, informed traveler on a similar road. The child understands or acknowledges the adult as one who can help bring meaning to his or her experience, a companion in search of meaning and understanding, as opposed to the one who attempts more to control or regulate experience.

THE EMOTIONALLY NEUTRAL FRAMEWORK

The second necessary aspect of the adult's response to «emotional hijack» is that it be from an emotionally neutral, or at least negatively disengaged state. Apart from not knowing how to re-

spond cognitively, parents often report not feeling capable of doing anything else but responding in any but an angry way, because of being caught in the grip of their own emotions.¹⁷ Here the *practice* of philosophy is a potentially useful tool for helping parents disengage sufficiently from their own emotional state to be able to *be present* with the child. Unless this can be achieved, the net effect is that two people instead of one are caught in the whirlpool of their own emotions; if the adult can disengage, there is just one set of problematic emotions to be cared for. The burden of responsibility for gaining control is the adult's. It's not that the adult should suppress or deny his or her feelings, but rather find sufficient cognitive distance from them. On the one hand, this will enable them to be clearer about what their feelings actually are, and on the other, it will allow the psychic space to engage in someone else's process. By engaging in philosophic inquiry with the child of the type discussed earlier, the caretaker slowly disengages from his or her negative emotion, and hence is more available to the child. Philosophic inquiry is unique in its capacity to engage the mind purposefully and creatively with the problem, yet at the same time enabling the inquirer to feel less controlled *by* the problem. As adults allow themselves to focus upon understanding the child's experience in ways that are more philosophical, not only will the child be more content, but the adults will have a better chance of behaving free of the dictates of their own emotions.

An example offered by a student recently illustrates simply the beginning of what is being suggested here.¹⁸ The student, herself a kindergarten teacher, was talking about how she calmed a young boy who was crying when his mother dropped him off at school and left. She said she put him on her knee and talking to him said «You know that happens to me too, I feel sad and get tears in my eyes when I miss someone, but you know what I do - I think about what it will be like when I see them again.»

I think in this small interaction there is an illustration of the point. On the one hand, she (the teacher) was *being there* with the child in his feeling, letting him know that she too at times feels the same way he's feeling, and on the other, she is also giving him some strategies to walk through the feeling, to get to the other side of it, as it were. The child feels acknowledged and is made aware that his feeling is OK - nothing to hide or be ashamed of. Yet at the same time, he is also given some «left brain» strategies - «think what it will be like when you see her again». The child is not left all alone with his feeling, perhaps wondering if what he is feeling is OK or normal. Instead, he's comforted by knowing that adults feel this way too, and he's also given some positive things to think about at the time he's feeling that way. He's not left to have the mind wander into negative thoughts about the feeling, but rather the positive thoughts that are encouraged in respect of the feeling may very well lead to positive affect. This would be a gratifying goal in light of emotional intelligence, that is, catching the emotion at its inception and providing at one and the same time as it is happening cognitive strategies to move through it. Philosophy and art do provide us with those very strategies that can serve as stepping stones through life's emotional spaces. The teacher's response above could be directed even further towards building pathways from the neocortex to the amygdala with suggestions like, «let's make a list of all the things you might do when you see her, let's draw a picture of what you might do together, let's write a poem telling her what it's like to see her after missing her,» and «what do you think she does when she misses you, do you think your friends feel the same way? Why? Why not?, do you think your pet ever feels like this?

Why? Why not?» and so on. The list could go on and they are all examples of potential ways to create these important connections.

Knowing what one is feeling and being able to express and communicate clearly the same have already been earmarked as important features of emotional intelligence. Without the psychological distance that philosophy can provide and without the enriched understanding it lends to any inquiry, it's hard to imagine how one could do either.

NOTES

1. Daniel Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, (New York: Bantam Books, 1995).

2. IQ is being used here in the way that it has most traditionally been understood. It is not being used here in the sense of Gardner's *Multiple Intelligences* which is currently very popular and which includes both IQ and EQ. See Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind*, (New York: Basic Books, 1983). Goleman defines EQ as: «abilities such as being able to motivate oneself and persist in the face of frustrations; to control impulse and delay gratification; to regulate one's moods and keep distress from swamping the ability to think; to empathize and to hope.» In Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, 1997,34.

3. Ibid., p.34,193.

4. Ibid., p.14.

5. Ibid., p.14.

6. Ibid., p.15.

7. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, 1995, 1997. Also found in Antonio Damasio, *Descartes's Error*, (New York: Avon Books, 1994). Damasio, a neurologist, also amasses an array of neuropsychological findings and comes to the sane conclusion. See Chapter 7 in particular, Emotions and Feelings.

8. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, 1997, 15.

9. Ibid., p.19.

10. Ibid., p.18.

11. Ibid., p.24.

12. Ibid., p.

12, 199, 207-208.

13. Perhaps the most well known and widely embraced program specifically designed for doing this is «Philosophy for Children.» This program to teach children from K-12 to think for themselves using philosophy as the means was designed by Matthew Lipman and is housed at the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children at Montclair State University, Upper Montclair, NJ, 07042. A good example of this program can be seen in a BBC production entitled Socrates for Six Year Olds.

14. Dewey would reserve the word «communicate» for this type of interaction, and would further define «education» as «communication.»

15. An example of the argument can be found in Ronald Laing, *The Politics of Experience*, (New York Ballantine Books, 1967), Ch. 5.

16. This argument is developed throughout Book 2 of Jean Jacques Rousseau, *The Emile*, (New York Teachers College Press, *Classics in Education* No. 10, 1956).

17. Personal experience giving workshops to parents of the Early Childhood Center at Wagner College and Early Childhood administrators of Staten Island, New York.

18. Graduate classes in education at Wagner College, Staten Island, New York, February, 1999.

Address correspondence to:

Ann Gazzard

Education Department

Wagner College

Staten Island, NY 10301

e-mail: agazzard@wagner.edu

[Back to current electronic table of contents](#)