EXTENDING PHILOSOPHY FOR CHILDREN INTO THE STANDARD CURRICULUM

For those of us who have experienced Philosophy for Children in the schools, it has become increasingly clear that the program meets the educational needs of school children viewed as autonomous and thoughtful rational agents. As expressed by Matthew Lipman, philosophy is concerned with "the improvement of reasoning proficiencies, clarification of concepts, analysis of meanings, and fostering of attitudes that dispose us to wonder, inquire, and seek meaning and truth."(1) These traditional philosophical goals, as implemented through the various curricula developed by the Institute for the Advancement of Philosophy for Children (IAPC) yield benefits that rebound to the advantage of both teachers and students. For teachers, Philosophy for Children helps develop attitudes of open-mindedness and respect for the opinions of children. The program also offers a course of study in thinking skills and a pedagogical framework based on the community of inquiry. For children, the novels present a model of rational dialogue, and issues that reflect their deep concerns. In addition, they are helped to practice the skills of logical inference and analysis, skills central to reasoning of whatever sort. For all concerned, the program creates a climate of shared issues and intellectual competence, confidence in rational process, a commitment to the classroom as a community, and to open and critical inquiry. Such a rich yield would seem sufficient to impress schools with the appropriateness of Philosophy for Children as a thinking skills program, but unfortunately, for all of its virtues, the program is deficient when viewed from a number of pragmatic perspectives common in schools that are interested in the development of higher order cognitive skills.

Among the issues raised by school administrators and teachers, relevant to their judgment of the adequacy of Philosophy for Children, two loom large. The first of these is the relationship of philosophy to the other school subjects, and the second is the requirement that the school day be modified to include separate instruction in the philosophy program. Clearly these two are related, but they reflect different concerns. For the first of these, the concern is that reasoning skills will be isolated both in the day and in the minds of teachers and pupils, and that the potential value of thinking skills instruction to all aspects of the curriculum will remain unrealized. The second reflects the demands of national, state, and local authorities that standard curriculum, whether basic skills or cultural literacy, be more adequately mastered. Such pressures on an already over-crowded school day frequently render a separate and time-consuming program in philosophical thinking impractical or even impossible.

In New York City, my response to such issues has resulted in three models for utilizing Philosophy for Children in relatively non-standard ways. These approaches all attempt to link philosophy to traditional school subjects. They, therefore, demonstrate the utility of a philosophical perspective in teaching traditional curriculum materials in ways that develop higher cognitive skills and autonomous thinkers. The three approaches are:

1. Philosophy for Children as the basis of teacher-generated curriculum: On this model, teachers who have been trained in the program are helped to develop curriculum support material based on aspects of the standard curriculum.

2. Philosophy for Children as the basis for a second generation of curriculum prepared by academic specialists: On this model, a professional philosopher, cognizant of the theoretic underpinnings of the program, translates its methods into a curriculum that could be used as part of standard pre-college instruction.

3. Philosophy for Children as the theoretic and methodological basis for staff development whose focus is on thinking skills infused into the ordinary curriculum: On this model, teachers with no Philosophy for Children training are helped to begin the exploration of thinking skills instruction, by a staff developer who is an expert in Philosophy for Children but who addresses school curriculum directly and without a formal presentation of IAPC materials.

1.

Of the three strategies, the first is by far the most natural as an extension of Philosophy for Children. Teachers who have been trained using IAPC materials and have developed a basis in experience and understanding, quite naturally begin to apply philosophical strategies to areas of the curriculum that lend themselves to creative critical thought. This is especially true in the elementary schools where self-contained classes and a relatively undemanding curriculum enables teachers to deal flexibly with conceptual issues as they arise. All school subjects have philosophical aspects. Epistemological and ethical issues are frequently apparent to children who, after working with philosophy, see ideas within the questioning perspective engendered by the philosophical novels. Further, many logical skills have ready application to problem solving and analytic reading; skills and strategies identified through IAPC materials are necessary for excellence, even in the most standard skill areas. Although this extension is natural, it is by no means guaranteed that teachers will make the transfer from the specific IAPC curriculum to standard school subjects in a fashion that is consistent with the high standard embodied in IAPC programs. Without the support of carefully developed exercises that point to crucial issues and reinforce central inferential skills, teachers are frequently at a loss to respond to students' thoughtful discussions or to structure activities needed to develop and exemplify higher-order thinking. Trained teachers tend to revert to more standard teaching methods when not teaching Philosophy for Children, thereby blocking the transfer of reasoning skills into other school areas.

For this reason, in New York, we have begun to include in the total staff development concept, advanced workshops for teachers who have used the IAPC materials effectively. These teachers, working in groups, select curriculum areas and develop support materials that reflect the standards and concerns central to Philosophy for Children. Such teacher-generated materials form a growing library of lesson plans, exercises, and discussion plans that can be shared among the teachers in a district or school. Based on the curriculum standard in the schools, such lessons reinforce the effectiveness of philosophical training and transfer the reasoning and dialogical basis of the program into appropriate aspects of school instruction. The sample included in Appendix A was designed by a group of junior high school teachers in District 24, Queens, New York. The teachers had participated in a semester workshop using Lisa with their classes. Curriculum was developed in three areas: English, art, and consumer math.

Among the materials created were a series of exercises for the story, "The Baroque Marble," by E. A. Prouix. This story is common in junior high school readers. It

tells of a young working class girl who decides to buy a pearl to be part of her marble collection. This requires that she earn and save a relatively large amount of money. The decision to buy the pearl is presented as a family decision taken within the context of their social and economic position as well as personal and family goals. It, therefore, offers an example of a group decision made within a clearly defined context. Values reflected in the story include rational discussion, compromise, self determination, education, upward mobility, and aesthetics.

This approach, using trained teachers to develop supplementary materials for curriculum infusion, has many advantages. The materials created, although of varying quality, are generally superior to discussion plans and exercises found in standard commercial textbooks. Further, teachers take responsibility for the careful articulation of thinking skills lessons and increase the likelihood of significant discussion. There are, however, problems with the approach. One difficulty is the relative lack of system and organization to the lessons. The teachers rarely develop materials that move skills in an orderly fashion. IAPC materials generally present thinking skills in a developmentally plausible and logically structured hierarchy. Teachers, who are theoretically naive, do not have the knowledge base in cognitive science, logic, and philosophy to plan sequences of lessons analogous to those articulated in Philosophy for Children. Their lessons, although creative and frequently excellent, do not form a coherent structure over the course of instruction.

One way of responding to this issue is for teachers to follow the structure of the IAPC manual used at their grade while developing mechanisms to transfer the skills into other curriculum materials. This may be impractical, however, since the sequence in a subject may not be compatible with that of the grade-appropriate novel. Another alternative is for the staff developer to create a conceptual frame within which the materials are to be created. A third is to offer a richer theoretical basis than is usual in Philosophy for Children training. Each of these approaches have strengths and weaknesses. It remains to be seen which approach is best suited to a given actual context.

Judging from the experience in District 24, curriculum developed by trained teachers is a viable method for extending Philosophy for Children into other school subjects. What is needed, if such development is not to be mechanically tied to IAPC manuals or dependent on the insights of a teacher trainer, is a more over articulation of the theory underlying the choices of materials and themes found in the grade-specific manuals. Philosophy for Children has not been characterized by overt theoretic explanations of its choices of skills and concepts and the sequence with which they are presented. If teachers are to use the materials as models for their own work, it seems that such a rationale must be forthcoming and made available to trained staff. Theoretic and pragmatic justifications of the scope and sequence of thinking skills instruction are found in many available approaches to teaching thinking. Theoreticians with knowledge and commitment to philosophical education must begin to articulate the intuitive understanding that governs their work.(2) Such a framework, once available, would enable teachers to transfer skills from IAPC materials in a more thoughtful and orderly fashion. A growing body of significant and pedagogically justified teacher-generated materials would go far to demonstrate the value of philosophical training as an effective basis for instruction throughout the curriculum.

2.

New York City has proven to be an effective site for Philosophy for Children. But, like many other areas in the country, programs have been limited to the elementary and junior high schools. New York City high schools have been unwilling to introduce Philosophy for Children. This is particularly unhappy since many of the area high schools include innovative programs in related areas. Courses in medical ethics and just community approaches to moral education have been piloted in Bronx high schools; a high school dedicated to the humanities teaches philosophy through the standard texts, and aspects of formal logic are frequently included in math or science courses. An attempt to incorporate Philosophy for Children into the ethics curriculum of the Fieldston School, a private high school sponsored by the Society for Ethical Culture, met with considerable resistance. It was felt, by both teachers and students, that IAPC materials were not relevant enough to contemporary concerns and were too unsophisticated in style to meet the needs of the college-bound student population. At the request of the school, Beatrice Banu and myself designed a curriculum in ethics based on world literature and contemporary nonfiction. The result of this effort, the Fieldston Ethics Reader(4) is an example of the second approach. The book relies heavily on strategies consistent with Philosophy for Children and reflects lessons learned through IAPC training and from Lipman's theoretic work. But it, nonetheless, constitutes an independent effort to take the approach further than the IAPC materials allow. In particular, it utilizes texts appropriate for a secondary school literature course and includes, aside from discussion plans, written exercises, creative writing assignments, debates and research projects. Like the IAPC novels, the Reader attempts to offer a unified philosophical experience. The book is organized around a central theme: the self. It includes more than one hundred short pieces organized to articulate the concept of the self by exploring related philosophical issues. The Reader is divided into three parts: "Who am I? What controls me? and Where am I going?" Within this framework, students explore classic philosophical problems, including personal identity, the mind-body problem, free will, and death. More basic concepts like truth and knowledge and values are also developed. Contemporary issues racism, sexism, and abortion; social issues, family friendship, marriage, and education are also included, as are typical concerns of adolescents, autonomy, peer pressure, and dating. Readings are by authors ranging from James Joyce to Judy Blume, Kafka, and Steven King. Excerpts from philosophers including Plato, Kant, Mill, and Sarte are offered as are pieces from contemporary periodicals.(5)

The Reader conforms to standard textbook practices in that fewer exercises are offered after each selection than are found in correlative portions of IAPC novels. Each reading is focused on a particular issue. The exercises, however, have been constructed so that each develops a reasoning skill, a moral concept, a philosophical issue, and a language arts task. Once familiar with the Reader, teachers can use exercises and discussion plans interchangeably to support discussions that reflect other aspects of a reading. The sample included in Appendix B is part of the support material for "The Lost Soul," by Ben Hecht. In this classic short story, James Hartley, the "axe fiend" who murdered his wife and two children, awakens as a total amnesiac after some months of incarnation. The story takes place during the hours before his execution and focuses on his bemused responses to finding himself in jail. He is executed without ever knowing who he is or why he is to be hanged. The story is placed after selections that discuss appearance and reality, the reliability of

perception, knowledge, and truth. It is followed by selections that deal with aspects of social and personal identity, including self perception, social role, and racial and religious prejudice.

The Fieldston Reader has been developed with a firm philosophic and theoretical insight as to the appropriateness and sequencing of texts and materials. It, therefore, has none of the apparent randomness that characterizes the teacher-generated materials discussed above. The approach, however, has other shortcomings when contrasted to IAPC materials. A main deficiency is the absence of the model of dialogue found in Philosophy for Children. The IAPC novels do more than present issues for discussion, they furnish an exemplar of how discussion can be convergently developed, even among people of differing points of view and with different cognitive styles. This is an enormous strength, one that the Reader cannot compensate for given its dependence on literature written for non-philosophical purposes. There is another serious problem, one that the Reader shares with IAPC curriculum. The Reader is presented for adoption in lieu of more standard secondary school curricula. Despite the attempt on the part of its authors to make the Reader desirable as an anthology appropriate to a secondary school literature course, it does not address the standard guidelines adopted by the various states for such courses. It, therefore, remains to be seen to what extent the Reader will be a curriculum of choice within secondary schools. Further, the emphasis on reasoning skills and philosophical and moral issues detracts from the agenda of the normal literature class. There is no attempt to deal with genre, style, period, or purely literary analysis, topics central to the literature teacher. The reaction of teachers to the focus on the conceptual issues developed in the Reader constitutes another unknown. It remains to be seen whether this will be an acceptable approach in schools that find IAPC materials inappropriate.

A final difficulty with both the Reader and with Philosophy for Children is that they are completely constructed curricula. As a complete curriculum offering, the Reader does little to develop the sense of ownership and commitment to thinking skills that may result from teachers developing materials of their own. Much of the theory of cognitive skills education expects that teachers will alter basic teaching strategies. Prepared materials, of whatever sort, seem less apt, in this regard, than teacher-generated curricula or teacher restructuring of standard school materials. Programs that offer teachers a theoretical and practical basis for autonomous development of thinking skills materials and classroom strategies remain the ideal of many school systems and find support in the writings of theoreticians in the movement. Only a growing body of experience and careful evaluation will show whether curriculum packages are effective in producing such change in teacher style and attitude. Similarly, only a careful analysis of teacher-produced materials will show whether teachers can develop materials of the quality found in the IAPC curriculum or similar professionally developed efforts.

3.

Many of the districts in New York City that have become involved in thinking skills reject Philosophy for Children in favor of a direct infusion model.(6) In projects of this sort, the staff developer, an expert in thinking skills including Philosophy for Children, works with highly motivated teachers to develop strategies and materials that apply to existing school curriculum. In District 5 in Manhattan, a team of two teachers and an assistant principal developed lesson plans for use in history classes. The example included in Appendix C is based on three documents standardly included in

compendia of primary sources for American history. They are a letter from a German immigrant, Hans, to a fellow countryman attempting to induce him to come to America; an excerpt from a letter by Gottfried Mittelberger describing the difficulties of immigration; and a selection from the diary of Gustavus Vasa, a slave who describes the torments of the voyage from Africa. The material is presented in a lesson plan format that was jointly developed by the staff developer and the district staff; it represents a compromise of these various points of view.

Like teacher-generated curriculum on the first model, this approach suffered from unevenness of quality and a lack of overall system in the work generated. Further, this model had problems of its own. Since the teachers had little or no practical or theoretical experience in the teaching of thinking skills prior to the staff development workshops, teachers found the entire process difficult and threatening to their sense of competence. The focus on writing curriculum also had a serious shortcoming. Teachers met in writing teams, but there was little in-class support, whether modeling of lessons or monitoring of teachers by the staff developer. Therefore, teachers could not experience the utility of thinking skills lessons during the period of staff development. As is obvious from Philosophy for Children, concurrent in-class experiences render the workshops more meaningful. Teachers who implement during the training period see their children flourish as the program generates classroom behaviors that are striking in their cognitive and interpersonal sophistication. Without the motivating experience of classroom success, teachers found it hard to sustain significant effort and came to see curriculum writing as a burden with little relevance to day-to-day instruction.

The issue of clear and immediate application of thinking skills to classroom instruction was seen to be so crucial that this year's program has been redesigned to address the issue. District 5 will place less emphasis on curriculum production. Rather, the focus will be on questioning strategies and the incorporation of useful materials found within a number of different thinking skills curricula. Thinking skills education based primarily on pedagogical strategies promises little in comparison to the carefully articulated approaches developed by the IAPC. It seems highly unlikely that, without a body of teacher support materials, a pedagogically based thinking skills program can yield much of lasting and substantial value. Further, the promiscuous incorporation of materials from a number of sources seems likely to produce incoherence and fragmentation just where a system is most needed.

The net result is that direct infusion of thinking skills into the curriculum, although the overwhelming strategy of choice in New York City, seems the most problematic and the least likely to develop successful models. This is not the case in other areas of the country. The program at the University of Massachusetts/Boston has generated an impressive record of curriculum infusion based on teacher-generated materials. This, however, requires an extensive course of teacher preparation with a substantial emphasis on theory and a commitment to ongoing practice. Philosophers working at Sonoma State University in California have taken another approach. A manual, rich in theory and examples, enables teachers to redesign curriculum to include a thinking skills focus.(7) As this latter program proves itself through school adoptions, the value of such an approach will become clearer. Other approaches, like that of Barry Beyer(8), are so alien to the theory and practice of Philosophy for Children that their success bodes ill for IAPC methods as a basis for curriculum infusion.(9)

4.

In the foregoing text, we have looked at three models, employed in New York City, for extending Philosophy for Children into the standard curriculum. This effort was prompted by the unwillingness of many area schools to accept Philosophy for Children as sufficient to their needs. Even in schools where Philosophy for Children was most successful, pressures from the state-mandated curriculum and the desire to ensure thinking skills transfer required that attempts to operationalize that transfer be attempted. In the other approaches, the theoretic and experiential core of Philosophy for Children was basic to the development of curricula whether directly by, or under the supervision of, professionals trained in the IAPC approach. Each of these models of moving Philosophy for Children beyond the IAPC materials has strengths and weaknesses as we have seen.

As we move into the "Second Decade", efforts such as these must be attempted and evaluated. The alternative, which seems to be the policy of Lipman himself, is to retain the model based on the philosophical novel. Perhaps this is best. But if so, the philosophical intuition behind the program remains tied to the productivity of Lipman himself and to the few others who have followed his example. Ron Reed's Rebecca, Ann Margaret Sharp's Geraldo, Michael Pritchard's The Land of Curiosity, and Richard Miller's Tony are all welcome additions to the corpus. Such approaches share the inherent strengths of Lipman's own work, but they also participate in the weaknesses. If Philosophy for Children is an exemplar of a deep and abiding attitude toward curriculum and, if such an attitude is to affect the course of education, it seems likely, given the needs of educators and the availability of alternatives, that the philosophical approach must address the school day directly. It is not clear to me that any of the approaches offered here are as effective as curriculum practices limited to IAPC materials. It is, however, clear that something like these approaches must be attempted if Philosophy for Children is to prove itself as a model for general curriculum reform. Failure of such extensions would leave the schools with only the option of the philosophical novels themselves or a plethora of atomistic and shallow attempts at the "direct teaching" of thinking skills. These last models, superficially attractive to a behavioristic and basic skills orientation common within the last twenty years, are inimical to the deeply humanistic essence of philosophical education. It would be a pity if philosophers could not structure this intuition so that it is more compatible with the needs of the schools as they now exist.

Mark Weinstein

Footnotes

1. Matthew Lipman, "The Cultivation of Reasoning Through Philosophy," Educational Leadership, September 1984, p. 8.
2. A beginning in this area is found in: Dale Cannon and Mark Weinstein, "Reasoning Skills: An Overview," Thinking, Vol. 6, No. 1.

3. Mark Weinstein, "Teaching Ethics in the Secondary School," Analytic Teaching, November-December, 1982.
4. Beatrice Banu and Mark Weinstein, Fieldston Ethics Reader. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1987.
5. For a more detailed description of the contents, see: Mark Weinstein, "A Bit More on Generalizing Philosophy for Children," Analytic Teaching, April-May, 1984.
6. M. Weinstein, J. Isaacs, and I. Ewen, "New York City's Reasoning/Thinking Skills Program," New York Supervisor, 1987.
7. R. Paul, et al., Critical Thinking Handbook: K-3. Rohnert Park, CA: CCTMC, 1987.
8. Barry Beyer, "Teaching Critical Thinking: A Direct Approach," Social Education, Vol. 49, No. 4. 9. A. Costa, Developing Minds. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 1985.

APPENDIX A

"The Baroque Marble" Leading questions and ideas

1. Dreams - Goals
2. Parental Guidance - Family Dynamics
3. Decision Making
4. Values
5. Beauty - Collections

Dreams

People have dreams but how often do they set out to accomplish these dreams? What do people dream about? Fantasies versus dreams. Are there times when dreams are harmful? What is a dream? What is a fantasy? Why do people dream?

Parental Guidance

How did Opal's family react to her dream? What was the make-up of Opal's family? Is there stereotyping in Opal's family? What was the shop owner's assessment of Opal? What was it based on? What is a Compromise? How did Opal and her father compromise? Did the rest of the family compromise?

Dreams or Fantasies

Dreams and fantasies are part of life, but are they synonymous? In "The Baroque Marble," Opal wants desperately to acquire a baroque pearl that she prefers to call "that marble." Would this be considered a dream or a fantasy for Opal?

Read over the following list and decide whether each item would be a **dream** or a

fantasy. Check the appropriate box.

1. owning a brand new 1986 Cadillac
2. becoming President of the United States
3. acquiring the most valuable stamp collection in the world
4. going on a date with Don Johnson/Heather Locklear
5. becoming a famous heart surgeon
6. dating every boy in high school
7. graduating at the top of your high school class
8. participating in the Olympics as an ice skater
9. winning the 10 million dollar lottery
10. uniting the countries of the world in peace
11. playing on a major league baseball team
12. to be the sexiest, most sought after male/female in Hollywood
13. starting your own rock band
14. inventing a cure for cancer
15. finding homes for all the homeless cats in New York City
16. visiting every country in the world
17. having limitless credit at your favorite store
18. living until you're one hundred years old

Family Dynamics - Cooperation

Opal's family realized how important owning the baroque pearl was to Opal. Each member of the family was willing to do a little extra so Opal responsibilities at home would be lightened. Because everyone in the family worked together or cooperated to help Opal, she was able to get a job to buy the antique baroque pearl.

Cooperation is a necessary part of family life. For a family to function well, all members must be willing to help.

In the following exercise, comment on whether you **agree** with the statements or **disagree.**

1. Family members should cooperate with each other when it's to their benefit.
2. Brothers and sisters should compete.
3. It is the mother's responsibility to do all the housework.
4. Children should clean their rooms.
5. Husbands should worry about supporting the family.
6. John borrowed his mother's car and did not refill the gas tank.
7. Children should let parents know where they are at all times.
8. I cooperate with my family if they would cooperate with me.
9. Whenever I'm asked to help a member of my family, I'm always too busy with something else.
10. I keep all the money I make at work for myself.

Tell whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about making decisions and why.

1. Intelligent people always make the right decision.
2. Stupid people make the wrong decisions.
3. Before you make a decision, you should carefully think it through.
4. Rash decisions cause more harm than good.
5. Parents should always make decisions for children.
6. Decisions should be made together when they affect the family.
7. Once you make a decision, you must live with it.
8. Certain decisions are harder to make than others.
9. A decision may decide your future one way or the other.
10. It's not always easy to make decisions.
11. It's not always hard to make decisions.
12. You have to make decisions every day of your life.
13. The more decisions you make, the easier it gets.
14. Some people find it harder to make decisions than other people.
15. It's easier to make decisions that affect someone else rather than yourself.

Can be used with "The Baroque Marble."

APPENDIX B

"The Lost Soul" Discussion Questions

1. Why do you think the prisoner in the story forgot who he was?
2. Do you think his forgetfulness is genuine?
3. Why did James Hartley, the prisoner, scream "This ain't ME!" at the last minute of his life? Who did he think <u>it</u> was? Contrast this with Descartes' absolute certainty that saying or thinking "This is me!" proves it.
4. Suppose James Hartley was really guilty of murdering his wife and children <u>and</u> suppose he has also completely forgotten everything. Should he be executed?

<u>Discussion plan: Responsibility</u>

The question of James Hartley's responsibility raises the general question of a person's responsibility for his actions. The most usual answer is that a person is responsible for what he does when either he does it intentionally, understanding what the consequences will be, or he does it carelessly without considering what he was doing and he <u>should</u> have known better. Often the degree of responsibility is coded to the seriousness of an action. Killing someone, even accidentally, carries a greater weight of responsibility than breaking a window, even intentionally.

In the following situations, describe whether the circumstances would tend to increase or decrease the responsibility of the person performing the act.

1. John knocks over the lamp while dancing.
2. Mary rolls over and breaks the glass while sleeping.
3. Jane vomits on the sofa while drunk.
4. Tom crashes the car into a lamppost while drunk.
5. Sue uses obscenities at her mother during an argument.
6. John hits his younger brother who is annoying him while he is studying for an important test. The brother is seriously injured.
7. A three-year-old child sets the house on fire while playing with matches.
8. A sixteen-year-old sets the house on fire while smoking in bed.
9. Your mother cleans your room and throws out a prized possession.
10. Your father tells your boyfriend that you had a great time at the party last night, but you hadn't gone with your boyfriend.

Exercise: Did you blame the right man?

In each case, argue that the individual ought or ought not be blamed.

1. In tenth grade, they discover that you had cheated on a ninth grade regents.
2. You are in graduate school and they discover that you shouldn't have been permitted to graduate from college because you hadn't satisfied a physical education requirement.
3. You participated in a gang rape at sixteen; you are now thirty-four and happily married.
4. Your boss discovered that you had served time in prison and decides to fire you from the job that you have been successfully performing for the last five years.
5. A politician running for office is discovered to have been a member of the KKK as a youth.
6. A high school principal performed in a classic porn film while in college.
7. Your present wife discovers that you had been arrested and treated for child abuse in a former marriage.
8. Your present husband discovers that you had been a prostitute before you married him.

A philosophical exercise

Memories are both things that happen in our minds and things that are, supposedly, indicators of events that happened at some other time. This raises important issues as to the reliability of memory as a source of knowledge.

1. If you think you remember, do you have a memory?
2. Are only true memories real memories?
3. If no one remembers an event, did it happen?
4. How can we tell whether what we think happened, happened?
5. Would at least some memories have to be true if memories are to be useful as a guide to the past?
6. Could memories be useful if they were only occasionally correct?

7. How do written documents and other artifacts interact with memories?
8. How does causal knowledge, knowledge of how the world works, interact with memories?
9. Are memories of events, or do we also have to remember how to do things?
10. Is 'memory' and 'remembering' the same as used in question 9?

APPENDIX C

Lesson: Early immigrants in America (two periods)
Aim: To discover reasons for early immigration to America

Thinking Skills Aim: To develop the ability to analyze motives using different perspectives

Historical Skills Aim: To understand and use primary sources as an indicator of circumstances and attitudes

Period 1

Procedure:

1. Letter from Hans to Carl is on the board.
2. Before students read source material, the following questions are asked as a review:
   a. What is a primary source?
   b. Why is a primary source valuable in the study of history?
   c. What clues might tell us that a piece of data is a primary source?

   In addition, the following questions might be asked in light of the thinking skills aim:
   d. How does what a person says reveal their thoughts, attitudes, and values?
   e. Can people today understand the thoughts and feelings of people in other places and times?
   f. How can we check if our understanding is correct?
3. Do Now: Students answer the following question in writing at their desks:
   Suppose you lived in Europe in 1700. List three reasons why you might not want to go to America.
4. Discuss "Do Now."
5. Read Hans' letter on board aloud. Explain why it is most likely a primary source. Ask the following questions for discussion:
   a. How would you describe Hans' life in Germany?
   b. Do you think he was happy there? Why?
   c. Do you think he was unhappy there? Why?
   d. Why do you think he chose to come to America?
6. Compare the competing reasons in "Do Now" and "Hans' Letter."
   a. If you were in Hans' place, would you decide to come to America?
   b. Which reasons would be more important to you? Why?

c. If you were Hans' child, how would you feel?
d. Do you think Hans' wife would feel the same way he does?

Homework: Write a letter giving your best reasons for going or not going to America in 1700.

Period 2

Procedure:
1. Students are given contrasting primary sources (account of Gustav Vasa and letter of Gottfried Mittelberger).
2. Students read Mittelberger.
3. These questions are the basis for discussion:
   a. Is this a primary source? Why?
   b. What is Mittelberger telling us in his description?
   c. Why is he unhappy about his experience?
   d. Would you be unhappy for the same reasons?
   e. Do you think he might make the voyage if he knew how hard it would be?
   f. What are some reasons why you might make the voyage even if you knew it would be the way he described it?
4. Students read Vasa.
5. These questions are the basis for discussion:
   a. Is this a primary source? Why?
   b. How is Vasa different from Mittelberger?
   c. How are the two voyages the same? How are they different?
   d. How do you think the slaves felt about their voyage? How did they show their feelings?
   e. Why were they treated so cruelly?

Summary Activity: How do their individual circumstances determine each of the three persons' attitudes toward coming to America? If you were each one of them, knowing what you know about the long-term effects of coming to America, would you say that each of them should or shouldn't have come?

Homework: Write a letter to any one of the three authors telling them why you think they should or shouldn't come to America. Make sure that the letter addresses each individual's special circumstances and perspectives.