

1997

A Tribute to James Moffett

Miles Myers

Donald R. Gallehr

Past NCTE Executive Director, Northern Virginia Writing Project

Richard L. Graves

Auburn University

Regina Foehr

AEPL Chair

Sheridan Blau

NCTE President-Elect

Follow this and additional works at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jaepl>

 *See next page for additional authors*

Part of the [Creative Writing Commons](#), [Curriculum and Instruction Commons](#), [Curriculum and Social Inquiry Commons](#), [Disability and Equity in Education Commons](#), [Educational Methods Commons](#), [Educational Psychology Commons](#), [English Language and Literature Commons](#), [Instructional Media Design Commons](#), [Liberal Studies Commons](#), [Other Education Commons](#), [Special Education and Teaching Commons](#), and the [Teacher Education and Professional Development Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Myers, Miles; Gallehr, Donald R.; Graves, Richard L.; Foehr, Regina; Blau, Sheridan; and Wagner, Betty Jane (1997) "A Tribute to James Moffett," *The Journal of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning*: Vol. 3 , Article 3.

<https://doi.org/10.7290/jaepl3ioia>

Available at: <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jaepl/vol3/iss1/3>

This article is brought to you freely and openly by Volunteer, Open-access, Library-hosted Journals (VOL Journals), published in partnership with The University of Tennessee (UT) University Libraries. This article has been accepted for inclusion in *The Journal of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning* by an authorized editor. For more information, please visit <https://trace.tennessee.edu/jaepl>.

A Tribute to James Moffett

Authors

Miles Myers, Donald R. Gallehr, Richard L. Graves, Regina Foehr, Sheridan Blau, and Betty Jane Wagner

A Tribute to James Moffett

Regina Foehr, AEPL Chair

Introduction

A visionary and trailblazer, James Moffett recognized and wrote about trends in education long before others even considered their possibilities. With sterling scholarship he bridged learning theory and common sense practice. He helped us to see how ancient wisdom and modern philosophy can inform each other and teaching and learning, and he articulated concepts that we knew to be true even though we were unable to articulate them. A master at seeing connections and helping others to see them, he changed our thinking about education and our professional and personal selves.

In his typical trailblazing fashion, James Moffett was AEPL's very first member. A member of the AEPL Advisory Board, he also served as featured speaker at the first AEPL conference and at other AEPL events. It is, therefore, a special honor and privilege to devote this opening section of *JAEPL* to pay tribute to James Moffett, our *original* member, colleague, and friend.

Each of the writers in this tribute to James Moffett knew Jim personally and professionally. Each was invited to contribute an informal article or personal narrative about him.

Remembering James Moffett

Miles Myers, Past NCTE Executive Director

The news was a shock. I had talked to Jim about two weeks before, and he seemed much better. Then about a week before he died, he left a phone message asking me to call. He had missed the NCTE convention again. I had heard his name for the first time many years ago when Tom Gage suggested, "You should read Jim Moffett's monograph, *Drama Is What Is Happening*." This monograph, which later evolved into *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* and which changed my teaching of composition, was my introduction to James Moffett. I met him sometime in the 1960s after he left Phillips Exeter, when he came to Oakland High School to watch me teach. He was working on his *Interaction: A Student-Centered Language Arts and Reading Program* series, later putting one of my classrooms in a movie describing this series. The series, which was published as a collection of large activity cards, irregular sized books, games, tapes, all sorts of classroom materials organized around the principles of his *Student-Centered Language Curriculum, K-13*, was disliked by textbook

salesmen because it was too heavy to carry around. I still remember an *Interaction* salesman huffing and puffing up and down the steps of Oakland High to deliver two sets of the *Interaction* series. (My principal looked at the pile of stuff and asked, “I thought you were getting an English series, Miles.” “Well,” I said, “Let me get back to you after we figure it out.”)

When Jim and Jan moved to Berkeley, Jim was a regular at writing project institutes (We taught together one summer.), a participant in our battles over behavioral objectives in PBS (Program Budget Systems, not Public Broadcasting Systems), a contributor to numerous CATE and NCTE workshops, and an off-and-on member of Berkeley groups of school reformers. In the 1970s, Jim got interested in silencing the mind as a way to enrich what one knows. It’s as if he got all that talking going in schools, both internally and externally, and then decided enough is enough. He and Jan started a sort of ashram at his house on Spruce Street in Berkeley, and Celest and I would go there every Saturday morning to do our Prana Yoga exercises, led by Jim and his co-teacher, Pingula. We were meditating, turning, breathing, stretching, sitting yoga style, standing on our heads. Jim could stand on his head for thirty minutes, I swear. (Celest asked me, “Why can’t you do that?”) I was always behind in my breathing homework (Miles, did you finish 2 repetitions of 20 breaths? No! I answered.), and Jim kept pushing books in my direction (“Jim,” I stated, “those yogis in those books do not seem to have to work.”).

His last NCTE convention was in 1994, the last of our three public conversations at the NCTE convention, sponsored by NCTE’s Commission on Composition. For my generation, Jim Moffett was our most important thinker about the teaching of writing in K-12 schools. Today, he is a very important thinker about new directions in K-12 school rethinking—harmonic learning and the relationships of body and mind, an emphasis on the individual, the internal, the space away from work and politics. He is, finally, a deeply missed friend.

Reading Jim Moffett

Donald R. Gallehr, Director,
Northern Virginia Writing Project

When I first read “Writing, Inner Speech, and Meditation,” I knew I needed to reread it to understand it. It is a rich essay, with one embedded sentence after another and numerous connections to composition theory and literature. The 52 footnotes alone constitute a course of studies in writing and meditation.

I was intrigued by the first sentence of the essay: “Writing and meditation are naturally allied activities.” I, and a number of others, used this essay as a map to explore this alliance further. Particularly helpful to us was Jim’s description of how we watch, direct, and suspend inner speech:

Both writing and meditating *watch* inner speech. We see this in the gazing of children, and later in their journal writing, mapping, and free writing. In meditation, this is called witnessing.

Both writing and meditating *direct* inner speech. We see this when we narrow and develop a subject. In meditation, this is bringing the mind back to a point of concentration.

Both writing and meditating *suspend* inner speech. After focusing on one point, we suspend inner speech to relax the mind—to give it a rest. In meditation, this is silence.

We all know that education fiercely separates “church and state,” and Jim could easily have written about meditation from a secular point of view, the way many do in such fields as sports, drama, music, business, and medicine. Instead, he acknowledged his own training in an Ashram and described the mystic traditions, both ancient and modern, that gave birth to meditation. This essay is a rock-solid theoretical foundation, and Jim helped us to build on it through his work with AEPL—through his work on the Advisory Board, as main speaker at the first AEPL Colorado Conference, and through the publications of AEPL members, including *JAEPL* and *Presence of Mind*.

I, like many others in AEPL and NCTE, came to know Jim also as a friend. In 1985 he ran a Writing and Meditation Institute at George Mason, and in 1991 an Institute on School Reform. Both times he stayed with my wife and me at my home in Warrenton, Virginia. All who met him know that, in addition to being a courageous scholar, he was a wonderful human being—just as straightforward and compassionate in person as he was in his writings.

In “Writing, Inner Speech, and Meditation” Jim wrote: “Teachers can give no greater gift to their students than to help them expand and master inner speech.” He inspired many of us as individuals, and our profession as a whole, to develop our own inner speech and to make the connection between writing and meditation. We are indeed fortunate to have known him.

Jim, We Hardly Knew You

Richard L. Graves, Professor Emeritus,
Auburn University

Jim, we hardly knew you.

You were taken from us before we were ready. So much more we could have learned from you. So much more you could have taught us. We listen for the sound of your voice, but all is still. Now we ask ourselves: What are those unspoken truths that remain with you? We listen and wonder.

Morning: A thin yellow finger moves across the horizon. Darkness is everywhere, but now it recedes before the coming light. Here in this sandy land, among these trees, in this silence, which is broken only by the sound of birds, the light awakens all. Light defines the landscape and warms the earth. This is a sacred moment.

When we get together it should always be like it is in Colorado. Everything is informal. Our words are honest. We listen with open hearts and open minds. You were there, Jim, and we listened to you. We heard your words, but more, we sensed a presence beyond the words. One morning you taught us how to go beyond words, how to enter another world, in the purity of sound. We remember. We remember.

The healing. The laying on of hands. The sacred oil, from a holiness church. The words. The prayers. The spirit that moves in this place, invisible, like unseen fingers. . . . Who is the healer? And who is being healed?

Did you know, Jim, that you were the first member of our assembly? When the announcement was made, you were the first to send a check, the first to enroll. Sometimes I think we ought to call ourselves the Jim Moffett Society, for you embody all that we stand for, all we believe in. You really are our Number One member. Always will be.

What is the spirit that creates a man like Jim Moffett? When he was a child, could anyone have predicted the pattern and direction of this life? Were the seeds of his spiritual depth present even then? What is this spirit that moves among us, moves within us, connecting, guiding, bringing energy and light into our lives?

Jim Moffett spoke the truth of his heart, even though in speaking he risked misunderstanding. He was a giant among us, an explorer who blazed new trails into uncharted worlds. We knew Jim Moffett as friend, teacher, and spiritual guide. We honor a man whose influence will live on long past his lifetime. We honor a wise and gentle man who willingly shared his gifts with us.

We grieve his passing, but the celebration of his life is so much larger than our grief. He would want it this way.

Thanks, Jim. You have blessed our lives. Your words and your spirit live in ours still. You will always be a part of us.

Memories of James Moffett

Regina Foehr, AEPL Chair

The week Jim Moffett died I received in the mail a manuscript he had sent of his latest book, one he had spent most of a lifetime writing. In telephone and electronic mail conversations Jim had asked me to read his manuscript and serve as agent for its publication. This book, he explained, was his metacognitive analysis in recent years from his writings of a lifetime. And, although as I write this article, I have only just begun to read the 425-page manuscript, I can see its initial title, *Writing to Heal*, he has changed to *Growing Up Sober*.

Though Jim and I had talked by telephone several times earlier in the year, our friendship began at the 1994 NCTE Convention in Orlando. Our previous telephone conversations had been initiated by an article he had submitted to *The Spiritual Side of Writing: Releasing the Learner's Whole Potential*, a collection that I coedited with Susan Schiller (1997). These conversations quite naturally always turned to other topics—to our shared Mississippi heritage where I had grown up and Jim had spent several formative childhood years, to views on spirituality, to his deep concern about the universal neglect of children in our world. But at this convention, our paths crossed rather frequently because of Jim's leadership and high visibility. And visible he was. Tall, California suntanned, and wearing a rust Indian suede leather vest over simple blue, cotton shirts, he cast a rare and curious mystique, which became more present to AEPL as the week progressed, allowing us a glimpse into the mystery and paradox of Jim.

Jim exemplified paradox; he was simultaneously simple but complex, innocent yet wise, playful and serious, shy but courageous, and reticent though bold. In one of his presentations his amusing stories of his friend and mentor, an East Indian yogi, made us laugh out loud. Then midsentence, he'd turn our laughter and our consciousness upside down, spinning us into sudden insights with their poignant truths. He tricked us, at one level made his friend seem foolish, then showcased his genius in brilliant simplicity, raising our consciousness in the process. His friend was the classic "wise fool." So was Jim.

When I say Jim Moffett was an archetypal fool, I'm not being irreverent. I mean it as the highest compliment. I am, however, aided in this insight about Jim by Carol Pearson's discussion of archetypes in *Awakening the Heroes Within* (1991). Pearson discusses archetypes as the ego states from which we operate at different times in our lives: "warrior," "caretaker," "orphan," "fool" and so forth. Although we move in and out of these various states as circumstances and our moods call us to do, we tend to function primarily from some dominant states. When Jim attended a convention workshop I gave on archetypes, took Carol Pearson's archetypes test, and scored high in the archetypal "fool," I suspected then the potentiality for a friendship with Jim—after all, who doesn't like someone who's willing to risk looking foolish. Not surprisingly Jim also scored high in archetypal "sage." As all of us workshop participants shared our dominant archetypes, Jim openly shared his, too, and gave me permission to do so.

The archetypal fool within is the playful part of the self, the ego state that thrives on self-expression, whose desire for self-expression outweighs the fear of "looking like a fool." The internal risk-taker, it is also the part of us that likes to have some fun. It's the court jester in ancient kingdoms who gets away with what others would be hanged for. It's a shape shifter, seeing and presenting the world through new eyes. Jim's internal fool, it seems to me, gave him originality and the courage to publish his ideas which leaped beyond canonical boundaries of their day. His *Universal Schoolhouse*, (1994) offers a re-conceptualization of education as both a catalyst and an oasis for spiritual awakening and transformation within the student and society. But this concept was no more outrageous when it was released in 1994 than was his groundbreaking integration of "Writing, Inner Speech, and Meditation," in 1981 (*Coming on Center*). Jim's example evokes the internal "fool" or "clown" or "natural child" in others, giving them

the courage to express their original ideas and to explore the unconventional.

In academia, we too often take ourselves too seriously and don't look at the lighter side, sometimes even fear reprisal if we explore the unconventional or write what we really believe. We favor instead the safety of tradition. When Jim and I talked about his willingness to follow his intuition beyond the safety of established boundaries--to write, for example, on unconventional topics--he always modestly downplayed any particular courage. He seemed to think he simply enjoyed a freedom of expression as an independent writer that institutional affiliation would have denied him.

Sometimes I watched Jim appearing to suppress laughter when there was no obvious reason for laughter. (The archetypal fool within is irrepressible.) As Langston Hughes reminded us, though, sometimes we laugh to keep from crying, integrating the tragic and sublime. As any wise fool would do, Jim seemed to integrate it all.

Jim's humorous side made correspondence with him and his wife, Janet, fun—not that any of us pursued lengthy correspondence, just notes and letters here and there, and then e-mail in the last year. Jim's handwritten notes on Jan's handmade stationery showed her whimsical side, too, and always included his appreciative commentary on her art. I've heard him tell with a smile of how they had met on the steps of the Harvard School of Education. Together the two of them reminded me of two kids—in bright-eyed exhilaration eager to experience life. At least, that's my image of them the last time I saw them together in seemingly boundless energy dashing out the cabin door after our first AEPL conference in 1995. They were on their way back down the mountains to catch their flight—their early morning freedom and lightness of heart, the prize for a rigorous but successful conference that had featured Jim.

Jim was able to laugh at himself too, for example, in his story about himself as a high school English student in Ohio where his family had moved from Mississippi after the war. He chuckled as he told it, still amused these many years later at the memory of it and his behavior at the time. He told of how he used to gaze deliberately out the window seeming indifferent during class. Then when called upon, he would spin sharply around to face the teacher, giving the right answer. We both laughed at his adolescent behavior, recalling our own students' transparent games in our classes in subsequent years. Then at my query regarding his journey from simple roots to an ivy league education, he told of how as a high school senior he had been awarded one of Ohio's two Harvard scholarships from a Harvard recruitment program extended to every state.

But it was after sharing a panel on Spiritually Open Pedagogy at this conference that I came to know another side of Jim, his prophetic side. After the panel, he made a simple prophetic statement to me in the most direct but natural way, followed by the words, "But you know that." Earlier in the week, he had done and said the same thing, spoken the same words, followed by "But you know that."

Though I had heard his words but forgotten them the first time he said them, the second time, he had my attention. And though I had no intellectual reason to know the truth of his words, somehow, at some deep internal place, I knew the truth of his words. Seeing Jim's way of honoring his own intuition or inner know-

ing and expressing it personally and in his writing has given me the courage to honor intuitions, particularly in professional matters and choices.

Jim's example has opened doors for all of us within the academy. A revered scholar on mainstream educational issues, Jim also courageously opened and led the way for further exploration through his leading-edge writing and thinking on topics far from mainstream. Jim Moffett was truly a hero on a difficult journey into uncharted territory. And even though I have shared some memories of him primarily through the mono lens of only one archetype, Jim's complexity was obvious. Fortunately for us all he has left yet another legacy, his awaiting manuscript, promising to shed more light on his many dimensions—and vicariously our own—as he made his way through the journey of *Growing Up Sober* and *Writing to Heal*.

On Jim Moffett: A Reflection and Memoir

Sheridan Blau, NCTE President-Elect

One of the most embarrassing features of professional life as an educator is that of having to endure the great changes in fashion that sweep through the educational community and dictate teaching practices and curriculum content for a few years, until one fashion is replaced by another. The changes are embarrassing not because they represent change, but because the changes they embody so clearly represent mere changes in fashion or opinion or swings in a pendulum of sentiment rather than any real progress in professional knowledge or insight into the way learning takes place. In fact, the one constant in the educational fashions to which school policy makers regularly try to submit teachers and curricula is that no version of reform or return to basics (for that seems to define the swing of the school pendulum) ever calls for any teaching practice or curriculum content that would demand anything like authentically intensive and focused thinking about substantive matters.

Jim Moffett's theory and practice, on the other hand, never changed with the fashion of the times. He never swerved from a focus on thinking, and on a curriculum that demanded increasingly sophisticated thinking on the part of students within every program of study and from grade to grade. Not that he participated in any way in the recently fashionable critical thinking movement (though people interested in critical thinking could look to Moffett for a theory of thinking) nor made the mistake ridiculed so soundly in Hirsch's most recent book, calling for a curriculum that would teach ways of thinking in place of intellectual substance. No, Jim's articles and books advocated for thirty years or more an approach to teaching the English language arts that called upon students to engage in reading and writing and speaking tasks through which they would learn the *processes* of effective composing and for which they would conduct the

investigations and research—acquire the substantive knowledge—that would allow them to read, write, and speak knowledgeably.

Jim's work constitutes the best refutation I know of to Hirsch's half-baked assertion that an interest in intellectual processes entails a de-emphasis on content knowledge in a discipline. Jim's first principle in teaching writing, for example, using workshops to help students produce satisfying and rhetorically effective pieces of writing, was the principle of plenitude. Students should never be asked to write for publication or for the submission of a complete paper, until they know more about their topic than they could cover in a single writing assignment. The problem for any real author, he often reminded us, is to select and order what he knows from a body of knowledge much more vast than can be communicated in any single piece of writing. Writers write from plenitude, from an abundance of experience and knowledge, not from scarcity. Only in schools are writers expected to produce written documents from scarcity. Jim's workshop approach to teaching writing therefore emphasized the role of investigation and research or "looking it up" as the key step to be taken before "writing it down."

I was about to say that we need Jim's wisdom now more than ever, when the best ideas of progressive educators are under attack, merely for their association with progressivism. But the truth is that the ideas that Jim spent his professional life adumbrating and illuminating for language arts educators have always been the ideas we have most needed as correctives to educational trends and fashions that pose simplistic answers, slogans, and teacher-proof techniques for problems that demand no less than the most thoughtful, creative, and intellectually well-informed responses on the part of classroom practitioners. No one was a stronger advocate than Jim for the principle that writing teachers must first be writers, just as literature teachers must first be powerful and experienced readers. His attention to method in teaching was always exploratory and the outgrowth of inquiries he urged all of us to conduct on how we might classify the actual kinds of writing that are read by readers in real communities, and what sorts of investigations had to be conducted in order to produce an instance of each type of writing that a reader would value reading.

Jim was, of course, himself, encyclopedic in the range of discourses he commanded. He was thoroughly conversant with the canonical texts of the British, American, continental, and classical literary traditions and read widely in science, philosophy, linguistics, and religion. I was always surprised by how much he kept up with current literary theory and how masterful he was in appropriating, explaining, and challenging contemporary theoretical formulations. He was also exceptionally ready to read new ideas and encounter new theories, about literature, about learning, about history, linguistics, science, the arts, and religion. His books reflect the breadth and depth of his learning and offer entirely original and generative perspectives on the English language arts curriculum, on teaching writing and literature, on the nature and goals of education and the aims and obstacles to learning, on cultural conflict in education, on educational policy and the education of the soul, and so on.

Whenever he visited our Writing Project in the summer (and he did so virtually every summer for 18 years), he would do a workshop in two parts. The first

part addressed the perennially refractory problem of helping students move across the gap that divides personal or expressive writing from expository or transactional writing, while the second half of his presentation was focused on whatever new book he was writing or new topic he was exploring in his own research and thinking. Our teachers found both parts of his presentation equally valuable, and I personally found every one of his presentations over the 18 years of his annual visits to be a cherished moment in my own intellectual life and in my own development as an educator. For his part, he always found something new to learn while he was here. In the early years of his annual visits he became an expert on Chumash Indian cave paintings (of which we have excellent examples in the mountains above Santa Barbara), and then on Chumash culture and religion and California mission history and so on. He loved to hike in our mountains, and even in the last visits—even after he was weakened by illness—he managed to take hikes with me down the canyon behind my house to see the rock formations and examine the varieties of plant life native to the hills and canyons of the particular micro-environment where I live. No companions for a hike were ever more interested or companionable for me on the trails I love to hike than were Jim and Jan Moffett.

Outliving Jim Moffett

Betty Jane Wagner, Director,
Chicago Area Writing Project

I never thought about outliving Jim Moffett. My most salient impression of him was as a man of great strength. He gave up smoking and drinking long before most of us in my generation gave a second thought to health, and he and Jan were vegetarians and meditated and practiced yoga decades before it became fashionable, at least here in the Midwest. He lived as he thought and taught—with stalwart integrity.

Jim was indeed a paragon of integrity, but, in my experience, he was full of contradictions: His mind was sinewy and rugged, but his manner unassuming and almost bumbling. Wise, but off-hand in his dictums. His views iconoclastic, but his response to the clichés and conventional thinking of his students, warmhearted and generous. Unmoved in his convictions, but a good listener. Unbending, but willing to negotiate. Walking away from offers for professorships that most of us would have leapt at, yet forever committed to changing the climate of intellectual life in schools at all levels. Serious of purpose, but full of wit.

The summers he came to the Midwest to conduct Chicago Area Writing Project Summer Institutes, he arrived not with an academic's but rather with a rancher's hands and tan; and his laconic, unpretentious leader's stance quickly settled the more jittery of the teachers who were our summer fellows. Jim simply amazed

them with his power. Typically, by the middle of the first morning, the teachers were awe-struck with the quality of the writing they had already produced, and several of them called me to exult over the miracle that had occurred. The second summer one of them begged me to let her come back and visit the first day of the institute to see what in the world it was that Jim did. She watched closely, but she still didn't know how he got such good writing to happen. She did know that in his quiet, almost clumsy, way he communicated without question his unswerving faith in the participants' ability to produce powerful writing. And produce they did.

I first knew I was in the company of an original and ground-breaking thinker when I got my hands on the 1968 edition of a *Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum, K-13: A Handbook for Teachers*. At the time, I was pretentiously teaching a course called "Theory and Methods of Teaching Language Arts" at National College of Education, now National-Louis University. This required preservice course for elementary teachers paradoxically defined *language arts* as everything but reading. All of the texts of the era were prescriptive with obligatory chapters on handwriting, spelling, grammar, punctuation, book reports, and sometimes speech training.

In Jim's *Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum* I found the first comprehensive text I could use. As I read it, I recognized how oral language was the basic saddle or ground that connected all of the peaks around me—writing, reading, thinking. So I wrote this Mr. James Moffett, who was then at Harvard. And, to my amazement, he wrote back. And I wrote again. Before I knew it, I was part of the dialogue that resulted in the *Interaction* curriculum; then, before I had time to catch my breath from that overwhelming project, he asked me to help him revise *A Student-Centered Language Arts Curriculum* for the 1976, then the 1983, and finally the 1992 edition. This quarter-century dialogue with Jim has profoundly shaped and sharpened my thinking.

Jim was constantly talking about his vision for the future. He was always on a quest for a better society. Like Thomas Jefferson, the great visionary who conceived of this nation, Jim Moffett invariably had his sights on the culture we *should* create. Jim's vision of *the universal schoolhouse* reminded us of Jefferson's original vision of the University of Virginia, an academic village paid for by the public where the best minds of the age would be gathered to talk about ideas. He did not want any religion to control the curriculum, nor did he believe in matriculation or graduation or degrees. Anyone from any walk of society could simply come and freely learn.

Jim also dared to look into metaphysics that were not part of the established paradigm. As he put it, it is now *au courant* to talk about paradigm shifts, but it is still taboo to create one. Jim reminded us that "the very founders of modern science—Newton, Bacon, and Descartes—were so steeped in the esoteric doctrine that half of what they said has been passed over in embarrassment by those moderns who do not realize that physics cannot be disembedded from metaphysics" (1991, p. 835). There is more to be discerned from the nonmaterialist world than we have dreamed of, and Jim never wanted us to forget it.

Jim's abstract for the talk he had planned to give at the NCTE Research Assembly on February 23, 1997 in Chicago began:

The state should no longer determine curriculum. Instead, public education should show learners how to customize each [one's] own curriculum by choosing what and how to learn from the total array of resources throughout a whole community, which becomes a universal schoolhouse for all ages and purposes and at all times.

What started 25 years ago with *Interaction* (1973) as a way to organize schools to allow for maximum student choice and ownership, became in Jim's vision a way to organize a society so maximum learning occurred. Because the whole community was the schoolhouse, learning could happen in any venue: offices, labs, farms, shops, factories. Opportunities for apprenticeship, internship, community service, job training, retraining, cross-age tutoring, and continuing adult education were automatically fostered. His vision was to decentralize teaching, so that literacy was a one-on-one, self-perpetuating culture that was not dependent on the professional, except in the role of setting up programs run by nonprofessionals. Like Jefferson, Jim wanted pedagogy to be thoroughly populist. Only *that* was consistent with a thorough-going democracy.

Jefferson wrote in one of his hundreds of letters to his colleague and antagonist John Adams, "I believe in the dream of the future more than the history of the past." Jim had the same belief. Like Jefferson, Moffett was a visionary and a prophet. Both turned their backs on institutions and power and returned to the land. Without the trail that Jim hacked out, I doubt we would have had by now the robust movement within the NCTE that's reflected in the *Journal of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning* (JAEPL).

Jim's greatest contribution to our profession was his intuitive perception of the wider context in which any discussion must be couched. He illuminated: 1. the concept of writing as a revision of inner speech; 2. reading comprehension in the context of a broader connection with the world; 3. the rise of the Christian right as a manifestation of the nation's spiritual hunger; 4. the world of school in the broader vision of a society where school as a separate locale for learning does not exist; and 5. the universe of discourse in language in the context of the direct knowing that transcends words. Working with Jim was like following a dance partner whose right foot firmly kept the beat of the rhythm of teachers everywhere while his left was kicking wildly into outer space!

Whenever, in our profession, developments emerge that have integrity and cause learning to happen, you will find that Jim was there first. All during the dark days in the '70s when behavioral objectives dominated the curriculum, we were always heartened by the knowledge that somewhere in the world Jim Moffett was tirelessly urging us to resist this trivialization of learning. What he told us resonated deeply with our own experience as teachers and with our dreams for our students. He fearlessly forged ahead and also graciously watched our profession struggle to catch up with the sheer sanity of his vision.

It is hard to imagine wandering into the darkness of the future without his light to guide us. His death is an immense loss to our profession. I know I shall miss him very much. If there is a dimension in the cosmos where spirit transcends body and language, I'm sure Jim's consciousness is there communing with all of us teachers on this side of the dark veil that separates us. ☹

Selected Bibliography of Works by James Moffett

- Moffett, James. (1966) *Points of view, an anthology of short stories*. New York: New American Library.
- Moffett, James. (1967). *Drama: What is happening?* Champaign, IL: NCTE.
- Moffett, James. (1968, 1973, 1976, 1983, 1992). *Student-centered language arts curriculum, grades k-13. A handbook for teachers*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Moffett, James. Ed. (1973). *Interaction: A student-centered language arts and reading program*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Moffett, James. (1981). *Active Voice, a writing program across the curriculum*. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, James. (1981, 1988). *Coming on Center: Essays in English education*. Boynton-Cook. (includes the essay Writing, inner speech, and meditation). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, James. (1983). *Teaching the universe of discourse*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Moffett, James. (1988). *Storm on the mountain: A case study of censorship, conflict, and consciousness*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Moffett, James. (1991). Current issues and future directions. In J. Flood, J. M. Jensen, D. Latt, & J. R. Squires (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teaching the English language arts* (pp. 827-838). New York: Macmillan.
- Moffett, James. (1992). *Harmonic learning; Keynoting school reform*. Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook.
- Moffett, James. (1994). *Universal schoolhouse: Spiritual awakening*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.