

terminology. The trick is to see that more is involved than just teaching people to parrot the words.

I am suggesting therefore that we begin to think about the task of teaching critical thinking almost as if we were teaching a foreign language. First we introduce vocabulary, define it precisely, develop rules for use, and then we immediately introduce exercises which require using the new vocabulary to start talking and thinking about things differently. This approach requires that we come to some common agreement about how to define central terms in the vocabulary, terms like opinion, fact, belief, fallacy and principle. It also requires that we work out a good order for presenting the concepts so that they slowly develop a coherent picture of the point of view critical thinking offers. Lastly, it requires that exercises be designed to clarify what the concepts of critical thinking mean as tools we can use to make sense of things. The exercises must try to make each concept into a habit in the student's behavior.

Ultimately, by the end of the course, you want to be able to give the students newspaper articles, essays, video tapes of lectures, the six o'clock news, sales pitches, etc. and have them take out their tool boxes, now full of words, and go to work. If we have done a perfect job, it will all seem so natural and intuitive for them—just like riding a bike. Perfectionism of course will kill you. So for myself, although I aspire to perfection, I can live with them at least knowing what I want them to do.

*Daniel Baker teaches philosophy at Ocean County College,
Toms River, New Jersey.*



TO THE EDITOR:

I'm writing to express how much I appreciated Russell Hvolbek's article and your response to it in the October issue of *Inquiry*. I am also writing to explain why I don't intend to subscribe to the journal.

In a nutshell, I find *Inquiry* tantalizing and fascinating as well as intensely irritating, and it has to do with the issues discussed in Hvolbek's article. I am a somatic educator. My work involves teaching people to observe, monitor, experience, and understand changes in breathing, muscle tone, posture and movement as processes of consciousness. I work with a broad variety of clients, from athletes and musicians, to computer users, to child abuse survivors, teaching them how to achieve more effective ways of moving, feeling, thinking and living.

Thinking is not a merely cognitive act. Thinking is not even a merely mental act. Thinking is done, at least partly, in and with muscles and breathing. The structure and function of the body influences even "purely intellectual" thinking. Lack of clarity and vibrancy in the body will drag down the mind (speaking for a moment as though the two were separate).

As part of my work, I have developed ways of applying the scientific method to life experiences. By having students operationalize feeling and value assertions through detailed use of body-based language to describe physical events in the body, they can uncover and test the hypotheses about the self and world that structure their ways of living.

I find *Inquiry* tantalizing and fascinating because so much of my work involves teaching students formal patterns of clear thinking, and it feels good to see articles by other people who believe in the value of clear thinking. However, I find *Inquiry* irritating and unsatisfying because it leaves out the body and heart and feeling of life. Hvolbek's article is certainly a step in the direction of making the field of critical thinking more whole and more human, but his article doesn't go nearly far enough.

—Paul Linden,
Columbus [Ohio] Center for Movement Studies

[A lengthy and cordial phone conversation in response to this letter resulted both in the promise of an article for *Inquiry* and a check for a two-year subscription. —Editor]

"THE COMPUTATIONAL PROBLEM IN SPEECH COMPREHENSION"

A LECTURE BY
DAVID TOWNSEND, PSYCHOLOGY

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1993

3:00 - 5:00 P.M.

KOPS LUNGE, RUSS HALL