In *Children in Chaos*, Harris purports that philosophy can be understood as a subject in elementary schools and used as a critical thinking skills program. He points out that educational efforts to teach very young children in urban America, often inadequately address the critical "Why?" questions children raise as they attempt to make sense of the social knowledge and behaviors around them. Harris and his contributors offer a persuasive alternative interpretation of the teaching and learning process. They view education in an explicit relationship with philosophy. They identify the use of critical thinking as a viable approach for empowering students with cognitive and affective tools for understanding how to influence and resolve social crisis or cultural chaos. They further suggest that the use of a philosophical mode of interacting, encourages educators to re-examine fundamental teaching concerns that shape the nature of educational content, practice, and actual student outcomes. Harris's investigation into the relationship between elementary education and philosophy, serves to strengthen the need to question the presently unexamined acceptance of the benign benefits of schooling. Unfortunately, the investigation presented does not, in the end, support his main contention: that "The meaning and the mission of education, if schools are conceived as sites for the acquisition of liberating goods, constitutes the community of inquiry as mission rather than one in which self directed learners construct such a mission" (p. 91).

Harris divides the text into four complementary parts, with adequate notes and references. First, in the Preface section, he identifies the program used to prepare teachers, alter curricular focus, and generate empowering teacher and student behaviors in three elementary Washington D.C. public schools. The original program developers are Matthew Lipman and Ann Sharp of the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy in Children. Harris adapted their program to meet the needs of the targeted third through sixth grade African American students. However, detailed descriptions of program components were not provided. Additionally, Harris identified the book list used to introduce teachers to ways of bridging "the gap between a program generally of use across lines of culture and the specific needs of a distinct cultural community" (p. v). Yet, the influence of the readings on teacher behaviors and program changes was not addressed. Finally, the volunteer status and teaching experience of participating teachers, as well as the variability of student social and academic competencies and the cultural impact of the predominantly African American communities on the schooling processes, were also not addressed.

Second, in Section I, commentaries and arguments from contributing authors, weaved anecdotal threads into explanations
of how program parameters evidence relationships among Deweyan assumptions, classroom dialogue and matters of elementary school philosophy. Harper and Lipman independently argue that one common justification for the strong positive correspondence between education and philosophy, is the world-view that brings the conditions of humanism to the elementary education arena. This view offers explicit opportunities to isolate and analyze social constructions and their value. In support of this relationship, both contributors inadvertently pose the following questions: How can teachers learn to use the program to address specific needs of urban communities? How do teachers facilitate the process of discovery and values clarification? How do very young African American learners demonstrate their understanding and use of the knowledge and competencies gained from the identified philosophical education experiences? and How can teachers convey the benefits of a philosophically-based critical thinking program to other educators?

As important as these questions are, it is the social context in which the questions are asked that lends them weight. For Harris, the questions contextualize a heightened awareness of the application of inquiry for engaging in and experiencing critical thinking as defined by its relevance to African American cultural chaos and community. In the wake of the disproportionate failure and drop out rates of African American children in public schools, the efficacy of the purpose and practice of this context can be readily understood as paradoxical to the realities of traditional education.

The authors' main challenge to the idea that children can learn to create and maintain beneficial and self-satisfying realities of choice, comes from a third source. In Section II, Harris presents excerpts from teacher diaries, completed under his direction. The diary entries consistently reported: name of recording teacher, school site, number of students, seating arrangement, grade level, entry date and a three or four page narrative detailing the story read, and student and teacher interactions. In addition to the unexplained number or the nature of entries selected for inclusion in the book, no explanations or analysis of the entries are presented by either the author(s) or the teacher-writers. Teachers noted the variations in student reported satisfaction with class sessions, and detailed reflections about the nature of student and teacher participation. Unfortunately, they stop short of providing a context for understanding the meaning of how the reported experiences empowered them or their students. Simply, overarching generalizations based on evidence from limited diary entries, were left to be drawn by individual reader assumptions about what the entries meant.

A much more serious failure is the lack of any analysis by Harris or his contributors in Section III. Failure to put the entries into a largely consistent framework, also failed to challenge the conventional wisdom of teaching content without adequate attention to the role of dialogue as the process by
which meaning emerges. Despite the stimulating and refreshing discussion about the congruencies between Dewey's and Woodson's vision of education offered by Harris in Section IV, by the last page of the text, the reader is left with the ongoing problems of understanding the relationship between the discussions and the entries, as they relate to the overall meaning of the text itself. The selected diary entries then, leave the reader unsure as before about how to use philosophy with children to help them make their decisions. The question of how to use this format to introduce philosophy to elementary students also remains unanswered. Why Harris did not answer the question "So what does this mean?" is not addressed. There is no systematic effort to illuminate applicable uses of teacher descriptions of student interactions. Within the framework presented, much of Harris' critical evidence must be questioned, such as: reliance on the suggested texts, training content and process, expectations of teachers, and evidence of student skill acquisitions. If the suggested use of philosophy obliges us to expand the comfort zone of traditional educational teaching habits, standards and outcomes, then the author(s) should have worked to define a more detailed and cohesive way of building consensus among educators. One book can not build a consensus of course, but it can lay a good foundation.

Nevertheless, Leonard Harris's book has been long needed and it comes at a culturally opportune time. It illuminates the need to modify and expand the sources of educational thought. My criticism of the book is frustration with the lack of process. In a society with heavy tendencies toward the experimental arrogance of education for behavior control, the humility imposed by the knowledge that each individual is the source of his or her own meaning-making power, remains a constant necessity. From this perspective, educational emphasis on heterogeneous rather homogeneous successes of children, based on connections and inclusion rather than on differences and divergences are the goals Harris and I have in common. Unfortunately, the book falls short of moving educators closer to actualizing this emphasis.

Finally, Harris performs a valuable service by raising the issue of explicitly addressing the teaching of philosophy early in the educational experiences of children. He directs us to de-emphasize and transcend ordinary notions of thinking about and interacting with children. At the least he hopes that, the ambiguities he has addressed will be considered. He identifies some cogent influences necessary for contributing to and improving the field of education. Not everything said is new. However, although philosophy grounds educational purpose and practice, few educators have chosen to use it in the classroom. The use of philosophy provides alternative educational plans for addressing rudimentary problems of values and criteria as the source and locus of wisdom. Harris calls attention to some very central and practical truths about education that we have consistently and perniciously ignored. The book is valuable precisely to the extent that educators learn to pay attention to and build upon these truths. This is an important book. It should be read if
continued research and practical application of philosophy for children is to become integral to schooling. Harris' book leads us to hope for a society where education will be instrumental in empowering individuals to intentionally use philosophical contexts to better understand how to create societies for our collective good.
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Jonathan Smith's *Fact and Feeling* is another call for the constructive engagement of the poet and the philosopher, only now the battle is set in 19th century Britain and the would-be combatants are the natural scientist and the literary artisan. Smith's central argument is that the opposition of creative thought and cold factuality loosely attributed to Bacon is ill-founded; moreover, its origin cannot be attributed to thinkers of the 19th century à la C.P Snow. There is, in fact, a continuous co-presence of imaginative hypothesis-making and inductive Baconianism in fields as varied a geology and painting.

The introductory chapter surveys the 19th century intellectual landscape and reveals that the scientific method of "naive Baconianism" had been largely discredited; the scientific thinkers of that time had come to recognize the necessity of imagination and not just the observation of particulars. Each subsequent chapter pairs a scientist or theory with a particular person or work, and is intended to show both the poetry in science and the science in poetry.

This book should be useful to those who already have an interest in 19th century British intellectual culture, but it should also excite those who have a particular interest in one or more of the chapter subjects, e.g. Wordsworth, Ruskin or Sherlock Holmes.

Smith is at his best in discussing Edwin Abbot's *Flatland*, partly because it is a fine example of the interplay which he wants to elucidate. At some points, however, what Smith says fails to be very surprising: Of course Darwin used some literary devices and displayed a certain amount of rhetorical flourish. At other points, Smith's readings stretch credibility. The chapter on Eliot's *The Mill on the Floss* is a creative reading of that text to be sure, (an imaginative element in one of the particulars, no less!) but the connection between the text and geology is strained. I, for one, fail to see "the novel's relentlessly uniformitarian current" (p.143).

The book unhelpfully overlooks a couple of points: It is always important to notice the difference between what scientists (or poets, painters, engineers) do, and what they (and philoso-