

The Future of “Philosophical Counseling”: A Modest Vision *

Eric Hoffman

Eric Hoffman now divides his time between the teaching of philosophy at St Joseph's University, seeing clients as a philosophical counselor and Gestalt therapist, conducting the Essential Experience Workshop and practicing law. He served, from 1993-2000, as the Executive Director of the American Philosophical Association.

Abstract: Beginning from the recognition that "philosophical counseling" is a form of counseling and must acknowledge the extent to which it shares a framework with other kinds of counseling, this article articulates a modest agenda for philosophical counselors and the organizations that represent them. Philosophical counselors may enrich counseling more effectively from the inside, in alliance with other counselors. Respecting the experience and expertise of counselors will help other counselors to appreciate the value philosophy may have for their practice. The general search for allies, who share the sense that philosophy has value for everyday life, may lead, in connection with counseling, to greater involvement of philosophers in training programs for counselors.

I believe that, in the next few decades, people with philosophical training will contribute to the theory and practice of counseling in increasingly significant ways. I even believe that more philosophers will enter into the practice of counseling and that more counselors will gain wisdom and resource from philosophy. But the autonomous field of philosophical counseling is one that, in spite of my own sporadic and continuing efforts to help create it, I still find hard to imagine. That is, I tend to doubt that there will be philosophical counselors flooding the market, creating a substantial new option for those seeking counseling.

As with all projections of the future, this may say more about my lack of imagination than about the field of philosophical counseling. We will learn about the validity of my

* Thanks to Elliot D. Cohen and JoAnne Fischer for feedback on earlier versions of this article. Thanks also to the other participants in the panel, Samuel Zainich, Thomas Magnell, Elliot Cohen and James Tuedio, for their contributions at the session sponsored by the American Society for Philosophy, Counseling and Psychotherapy at the Eastern Division Meeting of the American Philosophical Association in December 2002.

prediction as we learn about most predictions, by experiment. I certainly think the effort to invent philosophical counseling is worthwhile. My experience, however, encourages me to be modest in my expectations about the results.

I have been seeing clients as a “philosophical counselor” for a number of years. I began doing this simply by doing it, declaring myself a “philosophical counselor,” reading what had been written about it, attending meetings of the organizations devoted to it, and inviting clients. Some have come for one session; others have come for a few sessions; and a few have come for extended periods. I have never had (nor sought to have, due to other commitments) more than three clients at any time. Nor have I turned many away; I am not giving up my day job just yet. I have also run well-received philosophy salons as part of the marketing effort. The process of marketing myself as a “philosophical counselor,” as much as my experience with clients, has been a source for my modest projections about the possibilities and limitations of the profession.

I also have other relevant experience. I have served for almost 15 years as the Assisting Conductor of an intensive workshop in which participants do personal work on their lives. The Essential Experience Workshop (EE) has significant philosophical roots, largely stoicism, existentialism and pragmatism, but it is not doctrinal in any respect. It also has significant roots in humanistic psychology. The workshop is a group process with structured exercises of diverse sorts, ranging from journaling, guided meditation, and work in dyads and small groups, to work involving body awareness, drama, art and movement. There is much more involved, including opportunities for one-on-one work

with the workshop conductor. Most fundamentally, the workshop creates a space in which participants are bathed in support and care and offered opportunities to make changes in attitude and behavior. In my apprenticeship to the workshop conductor, I have learned how to support people to make changes in their lives that are important to them. The workshop is, in my view, a form of philosophical counseling. *See E. Hoffman, "The Essential Experience Workshop: A Context for Philosophical Practice," presented to the Third International Conference on Philosophical Practice, New York, 1997.*

I will soon complete a three-year training in Gestalt Therapy, a therapeutic approach pioneered by Fritz Perls, Laura Perls, Paul Goodman and others in the 1940's and 1950's. Gestalt is grounded in phenomenological and existential philosophy, gestalt psychology and psychoanalytic theory and practice. Through both theoretical and experiential work in the Gestalt training program, as well as observation of diverse practitioners, I have come to understand and appreciate more fully what is involved in counseling.

Finally, I served for seven years as Executive Director of the American Philosophical Association, in which capacity I was able to observe and become involved in a variety of attempts by philosophers to take philosophy outside the relatively narrow box in which it is often confined. I was particularly interested in those who were focused on the teaching of philosophy and on those attempting to contribute to professional ethics and to critical thinking programs. The failures and successes in these attempts are, in my view, illuminating with respect to the prospects for philosophical counseling. All of them, like

philosophical counseling, involve an attempt to “sell” philosophy to non-philosophers, or, as I prefer to think of it, to invite people into philosophical inquiry.

Philosophical Counselors Are, First of All, Counselors

I am hardly the first to suggest that philosophical counseling as such may not have much of a future. Ignoring the simplistic and misguided critics of philosophical counseling, I want to align myself initially with what J. Michael Russell has said on this subject in his two articles, “Philosophical Counseling Is Not a Distinct Field,” *International Journal of Philosophical Practice*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Summer 2001) and “The Philosopher as Personal Consultant,” *The Philosophers’ Magazine*, No. 3 (Summer 1998). I would summarize what I take to be his main thrust as follows.

None of the bases that have been offered to distinguish philosophical counseling from psychotherapy succeeds in making a clear or clean distinction. The most often used basis for making this distinction involves a rejection of the “medical model.” Therapy, it is said, is a process in which mental or emotional dysfunctions are diagnosed and treated. Philosophical counseling, by contrast, does not diagnose and treat; rather, the philosophical counselor engages the client in dialogue about his or her issues with an aim toward clarification and, perhaps, resolution. This distinction may also suggest that philosophers work *with* healthy people on *their* problems rather than treating patients, viewed as unhealthy and unable to solve their own problems.

Russell argues, I think correctly, that this distinction fails to differentiate philosophical counseling from a wide variety of established forms of psychotherapy. He names Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow and William Glasser, as well as Fritz Perls, as having clearly rejected the medical model of psychotherapy. We seek, for example, in conducting the EE Workshop, which is much influenced by these writers, to be clear that it is not “therapy” but “education.” Yet, this distinction is not easily maintained. Therapy, at its best, is educational, and education, at its best, is therapeutic. When, as often happens, therapists refer clients to the workshop, they have goals for their clients’ work that they see as available through the workshop. Whether these goals are “educational” or “therapeutic” would be hard – and probably unimportant – to say.¹

Gestalt has been crystal clear from its inception on rejection of the medical model. The initial description of Gestalt, in Perls, Hefferline & Goodman, *Gestalt Therapy: Excitement and Growth in the Human Personality* (Dell New York 1951), made clear that the authors’ concern was not narrowly “therapeutic” but sought to establish principles and methods for growth and development generally. “The Gestalt outlook,” they say in the Introduction, “is the original undistorted natural approach to life.” While this claim is philosophically controversial, it expresses the clear conviction that Gestalt aims at excitement and growth and only incidentally at the “treatment” of “illness.” For this reason, Gestalt associates itself with creative expression, adventure and experiment; it views psychotherapy as a process of meeting clients in ways that help make them aware

¹ Thomas Magnell argued, in his Presidential Address to the American Society for Philosophy, Counseling and Psychotherapy, that philosophical counseling partakes of an educational model rather than a medical model. I think that the attempt to give a positive frame to philosophical counseling as opposed to simply rejecting the medical model is a step forward, but I do not think the distinction will bear the weight of specifying what is unique about philosophical counseling.

of how they may be preventing themselves from living more fully. With awareness, clients may choose to make change. Gestalt was an early advocate of an asset-based, rather than a deficit-based approach, an approach now being championed by advocates of “positive psychology.” See M. Seligman, *Authentic Happiness: Using the New Positive Psychology to Realize Your Potential for Lasting Fulfillment* (Free Press New York 2002).

Gestalt therapists have long practical experience with the counseling process and have struggled with such “medical model” ideas as “diagnosis,” and “treatment,” which are alien to Gestalt. See, e.g., J. Melnick & S. Nevis, “Diagnosis: The Struggle for a Meaningful Paradigm,” in E. Nevis (ed.), *Gestalt Therapy: Perspectives and Applications* (Gestalt Press 2000). Humanistic psychology and cognitive therapy fought the battle against the medical model at least a generation ago.² While the requirements of insurance reimbursement impose a cynical pragmatism on many therapists, my impression is that philosophical counselors say nothing new in rejecting the medical model. Russell, himself a psychoanalyst, seems to agree. In fact, since this criticism is largely a reinvention of the wheel, the passion for this argument sometimes bespeaks a suspicious ignorance of the field in which “philosophical counselors” aim to participate.³

In fact, I suspect that if philosophical counselors ever become eligible for insurance

² Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy, which is perhaps most often associated with philosophy, is also self-consciously “educational” and rejects the medicalization of the therapeutic encounter. See the web site of the National Association of Cognitive Behavioral Therapists at <http://www.nacbt.org/whatiscbt.htm>.

³ It is, of course, useful to continue to criticize the medical model and the overuse of drugs that accompanies it. Lou Marinoff’s *Plato, Not Prozac* (New York HarperCollins 1999) makes this point admirably from the title to the conclusion. My suggestion, however, is that we should join with others who criticize the medical model and the overuse of drugs from within the counseling world. See, e.g., Elio Frattaroli, *Healing the Soul in the Age of the Brain: Becoming Conscious in an Unconscious World* (New York Viking 2001). Philosophical counseling will be strengthened, not weakened, by an alliance with Freudian analysts like Frattaroli or others who share our perspective.

reimbursement, they too will adopt the same cynical pragmatism; the purity of this criticism of the medical model may derive as much from impotence as principle.

Russell emphasizes – and this is the hope for philosophy in this arena – that philosophy provides training that is at least as good for counseling as psychology or medicine.

Philosophers tend to develop a number of skills (in dialogue, in conceptual clarification, in the framing of meanings) that may be very useful to a counselor. Such skills and knowledge may be at least as useful to a counselor as the skills and knowledge gained in psychological or medical training, viewed as fields of theoretical knowledge.

Philosophers plainly have much to contribute to counseling. *See, e.g.,* T. LeBon, *Wise Therapy* (New York Continuum 2001); E. Cohen & G. Cohen, *The Virtuous Therapist: Ethical Practice of Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Wadsworth 1998).

As Russell notes, however, theoretical training is the lesser part of what a counselor requires in any case. Practical training and supervision are far more important than abstract knowledge, or even mastery of skills and virtues of the theoretical arts, when it comes to learning to counsel. Counseling is a practical art and one involving personal relationships. It is learned, as Aristotle pointed out with respect to all practical arts, mainly by habit and practice, not theory and texts. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1103a15.

Russell concludes, and I agree, that philosophical counseling is not a separate and distinct field. Where two people meet privately with the mutual intention, reinforced by

payment, of addressing issues in the life of one of them through talk (and associated action), a framework exists within which other distinctions are comparatively minor. The use of “philosophical” resources and methods as opposed to other ones may be significant in some ways, but philosophical counselors are, first of all, counselors. They have much more in common with therapists than they have differences.

Philosophical Counseling Can Enrich Counseling More Effectively from the Inside

I am, I think, less impressed than Russell with the typical skills of philosophers as counselors and more concerned than he is about some of the ways philosophy and counseling are dissonant. Because it is an essentially critical and theoretical discipline, whose product is often a doctrine expressed in a text, “philosophy” may not translate in any obvious or immediate way into utility for the practical problems that a client may present. The pursuit of valid generalities has its value, of course, but that value may be more like the value of science than it is like the value of counseling. The process of criticism, theory construction and evaluation that is characteristic of philosophy threatens not only to be unhelpful but to be affirmatively alienating and destructive. Indeed, as my therapist friends regularly and accurately point out, “philosophical ruminations” are often (though, of course, not always) a symptom of an emotional problem.

This is why, I think, advocates of philosophical counseling are properly at such pains to characterize philosophy as a process involving dialogue. We seek to isolate elements of the processes of philosophical inquiry that resonate with the processes of counseling; the particular focus on dialogue goes back to Socrates. *See, e.g.,* P. Grimes & R. Uliana,

Philosophical Midwifery: A New Paradigm for Understanding Human Problems with Its Validation (Hyparxis Costa Mesa 1998); S. Schuster, *Philosophy Practice: An Alternative to Counseling and Psychotherapy* (Praeger Westport 1999). This is a reasonable strategy, and we may have some success in this respect, but it is an uphill battle. (It was certainly an uphill battle for Socrates.) Much of philosophy, both historical and contemporary, emphasizes other aspects of philosophical inquiry – doctrines and generalities – than those that resonate with counseling. Moreover, those outside the field in the culture at large – our market – see mainly the aspects that make philosophy and counseling seem dissonant.

My experience in the marketing of “philosophical counseling” bears out this point. Some clients have come to me because of referrals from others who know me or from my role in the EE workshop; often they have come in *spite* of my being a “philosophical counselor.” I have been made aware of resistance from many in my community to “philosophical counseling.” The sense is that it is “too intellectual” and thus either too threatening or too irrelevant (or, strangely, both) for a vulnerable person with a real life problem.

On the other hand, there are those who have sought me out because they themselves have a “philosophical” background of some sort, ranging from a long commitment to Taoism to a year of work on a masters degree in continental philosophy. These latter clients already share the sense that philosophy is supposed to be useful in life circumstances; they are pleased to find a “philosophical counselor.” It is almost as if philosophical

counseling were a sort of pastoral counseling for adherents of the philosophical faith. I am not aware of data that bears on how big this market might be, if this is in fact our market. It seems clear, in any case, that “philosophical counseling” will tend to flourish or wither with the reputation of philosophy in the community at large. This suggests that it will be important, among other things, for philosophical counselors to contribute to an enhancement of the reputation of philosophy. I will return to this point.

We are left, I think, with a two-fold task in making philosophical counseling plausible. One is to develop a conception of philosophy that is both fair to the reality of philosophical activity and that highlights the aspects of philosophy that resonate with counseling as opposed to those that are dissonant. In this respect, I think, philosophical counselors tend to emphasize Socrates, the stoics, the existentialists and others, including Asian philosophers, whose work is more obviously connected with living a human life than with understanding alone. *See generally* A. Howard, *Philosophy for Counselling and Psychotherapy: Pythagoras to Postmodernism* (MacMillan 2000). The other part of the task is to communicate this aspect effectively so as to create and meet demand for “philosophy” as an aspect of counseling. *See, e.g.,* L. Marinoff, *The Big Questions: How Philosophy Can Change Your Life* (Bloomsbury New York 2003); E. Cohen, *What Aristotle Do: Self-Control through the Power of Reason* (Prometheus 2003). This two-fold task, particularly the second part, is a daunting one that involves work not only with the general public but with counselors, who are, in my experience, suspicious but open to persuasion, and with philosophers, who are often more critical and less open.

Some cautionary tales may be relevant. I suspect that others involved in philosophy in colleges and universities have also heard tales like the following. One area of the college or university develops the idea that its program requires an “ethics” component. This might be a medical or nursing or journalism school, a business program or an engineering department. Philosophers get wind of this proposal and present themselves, with some plausibility, as the “experts” in this area. The details vary, but philosophers are given some opportunity to plan or teach or train for the program. After some period, usually with some bitterness, the philosophers are excluded from the process and the doctors or nurses or engineers take over the ethics curriculum themselves. Usually, the philosophers can be heard to say that those others just don’t get it and care more about their turf than about truth and competence. From the other side, the grumbling is that philosophers seem to be arrogant and know-it-all and unable to appreciate the theory or practice of the discipline into which they have blundered. Similar stories are told about philosophers in critical thinking programs.

There are, of course, other stories with different endings. Sometimes philosophers are successful in participating with those in other disciplines in the development of a professional ethics (or critical thinking) curriculum. My experience is that success depends crucially upon the philosophers’ willingness to really learn about and respect the autonomy and integrity of the other discipline. In fact, success often depends on really learning the other discipline on its own terms. While professional philosophers are sometimes ready to mourn these poor souls who have “given up” philosophy in favor of something else, there is, I think, growing appreciation, even among professional

philosophers, of those who have succeeded in bringing philosophical ideas and resources into new areas.

The lesson I draw for philosophical counseling assumes that it faces similar challenges in its attempt to invite non-philosophers – both counselors and clients – to make philosophical inquiry an element of their practice. As with professional ethics and critical thinking, it is unlikely to have much success if it approaches non-philosophers – in this case counselors – in a fundamentally “critical” – that is, arrogant and know-it-all – manner. There is some evidence that this has been the approach of some philosophical counselors at times. The main point they begin with is that therapy is a failure and that philosophical counseling overcomes the causes of that failure – *e.g.*, the medical model. My sense is that we will do better to learn more deeply and practically what successful (and unsuccessful) counseling looks like and hence to learn where philosophical insights and methods can enhance practice.

This is plainly a more modest approach than many advocates of philosophical counseling would take. Some would declare that philosophical counseling is somehow different in kind from psychotherapy (however vague the distinction) and insist on inventing philosophical counseling new out of philosophical resources alone. My experience is that this tends to yield an embarrassing reinvention of the wheel at best and an insulting ignorance and disrespect for wise, knowledgeable and experienced therapists at worst.

To summarize, it is my suggestion that we befriend therapy (broadly conceived), look for allies, and do our work from the inside rather than from the outside.⁴

How Philosophers Might Contribute to Wiser, Deeper, More Effective Counseling

I have an image of the relation of philosophy and counseling that guides my projections. I see philosophy, which, in some sense, invented and developed (secular) counseling in the first place, as confronting a younger, more vital field that has far surpassed it in breadth and experience. Like parents who continue to believe that they have greater capacity or wisdom, even when everyone else sees that the child is more experienced and accomplished, philosophy sometimes seems too desperate to reclaim the field from which it has been away too long and which has developed far beyond its philosophical origins. Wise parents in these circumstances, parents who have achieved some mastery of their egos, will seek to learn from their adult child. Philosophy will have to set aside its pride of origination and learn to listen. In fact, I believe that development of the skill of “philosophical listening” is generally crucial to the success of philosophy outside the academy. Moreover, counseling may be the best of all places in which to develop the concept and practice of “philosophical listening.” I fear, however, that philosophical counselors often come with the attitude that they have much to teach and little to learn.

⁴ I should not be misunderstood as suggesting that philosophers have cornered the market on arrogance. Psychiatrists and psychologists, among others, certainly share in this human failing. There is, however, a special sensitivity philosophers need to have to the ways in which raising basic philosophical issues of meaning or ethics can appear to challenge and confront others in a way that may be unhelpful. Philosophical inquiry may place a strain on relationships of which the philosopher may be unaware. Socrates has been an object lesson on this score from the beginning of Western philosophy. He continues to inspire attention from those who want to see philosophy as a way of life. See, e.g., A. Nehamas, *The Art of Living: Socratic Reflections from Plato to Foucault* (University of California Press 2000); R. Shusterman, *Practicing Philosophy: Pragmatism and the Philosophical Life* (Routledge 1997); P. Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault* (Blackwell 1995).

In a genuine encounter between philosophers and counselors, philosophers will find, I believe, many ways to contribute. Counselors will welcome curious, respectful philosophers to the fold. Inviting counselors into philosophical inquiry (in the right context, in the right way) may then deepen counselors' understanding of their practice. The most natural connection, I think, is with those who train counselors, since they are often the ones who most feel the need for more theory. The emergence of philosophers interested in counseling will provide therapists and trainers of therapists with interaction and exchange with people exemplifying philosophy and not merely with texts. The role of philosophers in training counselors is thus likely to be an important development in the near term. See L. Matz, "Philosophical Counseling for Counselors," Vol. 1, No. 2, *International Journal of Philosophical Practice* (Spring 2002).

There are already training programs specifically for "philosophical counseling," though they are modest. See the website of the American Philosophical Practitioners Association at <http://www.appa.edu/>. Perhaps there will soon be graduate programs in "philosophical counseling," but here I begin to grow wary. Someone whose main training is in philosophy, even in the dimensions that resonate with counseling, will still need supervised "clinical" training as well. As far as I know, there are, as yet, no clinics or programs of practitioners who could supervise students in "philosophical counseling." Nor are there agreed upon approaches that could form the basis of a practical training that others elsewhere could rely upon. To the extent there are philosophical counselors, training is likely to be accomplished through a system of entrepreneurs and apprentices

rather than through an institutional structure. To the extent an institutional structure is possible, I wonder whether it might not be more promising to seek to develop a philosophical counseling track in, say, a social work school, or otherwise to build on existing training in counseling, rather than to start from philosophy alone. Again, development of cooperation between philosophers and therapists will be crucial.⁵

Aside from the direct training of “philosophical counselors,” it will be useful to seek to influence the institutions of “philosophy.” Philosophers are at a significant disadvantage in dealing with the general public because most people encounter philosophy, if at all, only in college. It is therefore viewed as appropriate only for sophisticated adults.

Moreover, because the profession is largely confined to higher education, it generally rewards research over teaching and service and otherwise suffers from the norms of its exclusive higher education context. In this respect, philosophical counseling organizations should seek alliances with those teaching philosophy in K-12; with those who champion philosophy teaching as a worthy profession in itself; with those, like bio-ethicists, who have succeeded in creating an external place for philosophy; and with those who otherwise seek to invite everyone to philosophy. Such an alliance may help increase the community of those who already appreciate the value philosophy might have for living a fully human life. It may also make more visible those aspects of philosophy that resonate with counseling.

⁵ Some philosophers have become interested in practicing philosophical counseling, and others have become interested in studying the practice of psychology and psychiatry, but there is, as far as I know, little communication among these branches. See, e.g., the web site of the Association for the Advancement of Philosophy and Psychiatry at <http://www3.utsouthwestern.edu/aapp/> and the dialogue between Lou Marinoff and Christian Perring recounted in *The Philosophers' Magazine*, No. 19 (Summer 2002).

Bridging this gap in the present culture will be difficult. Much of what passes for “philosophy” outside the academy properly embarrasses professional philosophers. Yet, there are also important riches outside of professional philosophy that may be important tools for philosophical counseling.⁶ I was struck recently by an account of “philosophy” offered by Ken Wilber, a provocative and thought-provoking philosopher, who is, as far as I can tell, virtually unknown among “professional philosophers,” though he is popular and influential in the world outside the academy. In the Preface to a book on his work, he writes,

Philosophy, to have any meaning at all, must sizzle with passion, boil your brain, fry your eyeballs, or you're just not doing it right. And that applies to the other end of the spectrum of feelings as well. Real philosophy is as gentle as fog and as quiet as tears; it holds the world as if it were a delicate infant, raw and open and vulnerable.

F. Visser, *Ken Wilber: Thought as Passion* (SUNY Press 2003). “Philosophy” is inevitably a contested term, and Wilber’s conception, connecting philosophy with passion rather than with reason, might resonate more with counseling than many conceptions that prevail in the academy. *See also* J. Lachs, *In Love with Life: Reflections on the Joy of Living and Why We Hate to Die* (Vanderbilt 1998). Perhaps “philosophy” itself should be viewed as a client, suffering from a variety of inhibitions and self-limitations, yet eager to experience passion. One challenge to philosophical counseling is to meet with this client and support philosophy’s revitalization, its capacity to sizzle and to become vulnerable, surely parts of a fully human life.

⁶ The Open Court series of books on philosophy and elements of popular culture – including, so far, *Seinfeld*, *the Simpsons*, *The Matrix* and *Buffy*, *the Vampire Slayer* – may contribute to this development. Some may interpret this literature in an unflattering light as a case of over-interpretation and even of pandering, though I tend to think that almost any attempt to deepen people’s experience is helpful and worthy. A more difficult problem is to acknowledge and assess philosophy outside the academy, particularly philosophy, largely associated with religion and spirituality, that does not await the interpretations of professionals to make it “philosophical.”

Russell ends his *Philosophers' Magazine* piece by cautioning philosophers not to timidly “await permission” from psychologists to enter into counseling. My cautions might be understood as counseling timidity, so let me clarify. I think that philosophers inclined to counseling with a philosophical base should just do it. Let a thousand flowers bloom. I hope, of course, that they will proceed responsibly. Responsibility, as I have emphasized, means not only joining with other philosophical counselors, but also joining with counselors and philosophers who share some of the same values, rather than focusing only on what we criticize and reject.

To my knowledge, at the present time, there are few, if any, who are making a living purely at “philosophical counseling” (independent of a college appointment, writing, yoga, hypnotherapy, running a retreat center or a license in psychology or social work). This may change and there may be a real, independent field of “philosophical counseling” in the next decade or two into which practitioners may be trained and supported. I think it is more likely, however, that people otherwise trained in counseling will begin to receive certifications as “philosophical counselors” among other certifications, much as people receive certifications in couples counseling, addictions, eating disorders, body work, etc.

A very few entrepreneurs will be primarily philosophical counselors. They will sustain themselves, I think, in idiosyncratic ways, more connected to their specific qualities and referral bases than on the basis of being “philosophical counselors.” Lou Marinoff has

suggested that there will be more philosophical practitioners than academic philosophers before the end of the 21st century. I agree that philosophers and philosophy will find more space within the counseling world in this century, but I do not think it will take the form of legions of trained “philosophical counselors.” Rather, modeled on bioethics, we may create some institutes and training programs where philosophers will teach and write about, as well as practicing, counseling. We will make philosophical resources and wisdom more easily accessible to counselors and more valued than they are at present. But the counselors will not, for the most part, identify primarily as philosophers or even as “philosophical counselors.” That’s my prediction about where our efforts are likely to lead. In the meantime, let’s try to invent philosophical counseling and see what happens.