

Controversies in Teaching (William Hare)

Michael Schleifer

Volume 3, Number 1, 1989

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1073409ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073409ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Canadian Philosophy of Education Society

ISSN

0838-4517 (print)

1916-0348 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this review

Schleifer, M. (1989). Review of [Controversies in Teaching (William Hare)]. *Paideusis*, 3(1), 26–27. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1073409ar>

© Michael Schleifer, 1989



This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

<https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/>

Érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

<https://www.erudit.org/en/>

William Hare, *Controversies in Teaching* (London, Ontario: Althouse Press, 1984). 160 pages. Hardcover: \$18.95

This book of previously published essays appeared in 1985 in Canada and the U.K. The introduction was written for this volume, and the author refers to some rewrites and says "the notes have been revised to bring them up to date, to supply certain cross references in the text, and to add further references." Unfortunately, there is little evidence of any of these new references. Most lists are limited to whatever was published up to the date of the original articles (1971-1972). The collection includes four parts in addition to the introduction entitled Slogans in Education, Aims, Teacher Education, and The Role of the Teacher.

In general, the collection of Hare's articles is of use to those who work in education faculties, particularly in foundations. Philosophers of education familiar with Hare's work will find it convenient to have all of his earlier articles published (and organized) together. It was of interest to me, for example, to see the earlier sketch of an argument in the chapter "Controversy Issues and the Teacher", which Hare later developed in his important book *Open-Mindedness and Education* (1979). The questions concerning the role of the teacher discussing sensitive and controversial issues is still quite pertinent today. These earlier notes of Hare, of course, are quite far from any kind of exhaustive or definitive analysis of the question.

A course in philosophy of education which considers John Holt's *Escape from Childhood*, and looks at notions of needs, wants, choices, paternalism and so on, could find Chapter Four of Hare's collection quite useful. The criticism is extremely detailed, however, and would not, in my view, be easy to assimilate by teachers in training, even at the masters level, *without close guidance* by professors conversant with issues in philosophy of education. One example of a very difficult contorted argument concerns Hare's worry about whether his attacks on Holt are "ad hominem". These concerns about whether arguing against a view also argues against a person are interspersed among the wider arguments concerning Holt's views on children. Separating the concerns of Hare about Holt's motives from his views about Holt on children is a formidable task.

Of interest to both teachers-in-training and professors in faculties in education are the essays by Hare (Chapters 8, 9 and 10) on teacher preparation and certification. Against those authors who wish to argue that those who can read can automatically teach reading, Hare argues persuasively that teacher preparation involves more.

Not only are there the obvious teaching-strategies, but also some familiarity with issues concerning indoctrination, open mindedness, and bias should also be part of the teacher's preparation (Chapter 8, p. 87). For those of us convinced that philosophy for teachers is indispensable, there is nothing to object to in Hare's view here expressed. Perhaps one might have expected more of a plug for philosophy than is given in these chapters on teacher preparedness.

Later in chapter 10, "Philosophy as a Vocational Handicap", Hare does bring up the specific question of philosophy in education. I found the argument more a defense against objections to philosophy, and less grounded on positive experience and findings. Perhaps this is due once again to the fact that the

chapter is dated. As noted above, the whole book suffers from the lack of more recent and less parochial references. In this case, the chapter on philosophy is restricted to experience in Nova Scotia until the 70's. One footnote refers to Mathew Lipman and "philosophy for children", but there are no references to the extensive literature which has built up over the past two decades in North America and Europe concerning the usefulness of philosophical discussions, at elementary, secondary, and university levels.

The teacher, Hare argues in chapter 12, is also a critic. What is omitted is the important recent work on the teacher as epistemologist, as researcher, as scientist, and as logician. Hare finds himself embarrassed at discussing the university professor who has no preparation for *teaching*. This is treated as a kind of exception to the thesis that being competent in a subject (say physics) should be accompanied by the ability to teach that subject. Hare's contrition at this "exception" would be less if he acknowledged that the best teachers at any level (elementary, secondary, or university) continue to treat their subject as an ongoing field of research, to be examined critically, and not as a body of knowledge to be transmitted. We should abandon the notion that there exist excellent university researchers with no competence in communicating their work to others. The best teachers--at any level--are very likely to be active researchers as well.

Among other ideals, the teacher-researcher will embrace open mindedness, the concept so well analysed by Hare in his recent work. Those hoping to find work on these subjects in this collection will be disappointed.

Michael Schleifer, Université du Québec à Montréal