Hitchhiking the Labyrinth

Tom Gage

“For Tom, my much valued friend, counselor, and fellow pilgrim,”
inscribed on title page of James Moffett’s Coming on Center.

It’s late afternoon. I’m leaning deep into a mud-framed doorway. An analeptic breeze relieves me from the meat-eating sun. Sweat stings my eyes, my feet swollen but well-callused. Resting a bit, I reposition the straps of my 40-pound rucksack, while I hear a lute faintly expressing phrases. A breeze caresses my face. The music stops, but the Syrian breeze continues. I shift my weight so that air currents can creep beyond the neck of my shirt to vent below. I am just beyond my nineteenth birthday, and I am in the Jazeera, miles east of Aleppo, approaching the Tigris, bordering Iraq. “Nazeem” in Arabic is breeze—“Nazeem” accords with the flights of atonal melody in a Holy Land. The music commences again, and I follow it until tears roll down my dusty cheek. Then I think: Will I find food and lodging tonight?

Now, nearly sixty years later, a riff on violin, a Nazeem, or just a melancholy can elicit these images and feelings: the sun, sand, sounds, and joyful ambiguity of discomfort, and being alive.

More than a remembrance of times past, the year 1958-59 was pivotal. My year alone, of meeting strangers—many not speaking English—launched my life’s trajectory. After hitchhiking half way around the world, I changed from majoring in chemistry at Berkeley to several other disciplines that deepened my sense of the time frame of modernity and broadened my vistas beyond the spatial confines of the Bay Area, California, and the Western world. On return to UC, I distanced from the safety of easy grades in science courses and opted for those in threatening disciplines that required writing. In one class, the professor returned my paper inquiring if English were my native language. My failures taught me that if I wanted to write, I needed to teach English.

My path has become clearer to me now in retrospect. I view events in context: that year of hitchhiking, the optimism after JFK’s election, UC’s free speech demonstrations, protesting the war in Viet Nam . . . and meeting Jim Moffett.

From the 1960s, Jim was to become my best friend for the next thirty-five years. Two of my goals since my 2006 retirement stem from advancing what Jim and I often discussed. Specifically, I wanted to foster cross cultural fluency among students in a world...
increasingly experiencing a plurality of consciousnesses. Generally, I wanted to further Jim’s memory and work by introducing awareness of how his theory complemented pedagogy for peace building in any language. Having accomplished much toward these two missions, I address you of the Assembly for Expanded Perspectives on Learning, holding speech, in Frost’s words, “With one whose thought I had not hoped to reach./’Men work together,’ I told him from the heart,/’Whether they work together or apart.” (Frost 22).

Some outcomes of my efforts to advance cross cultural fluency include writing, speaking, and chairing conferences. One international conference, Youth Platform of the Gülen Institute of Houston, awards secondary students, and some teachers, cash and certificates of merit for writing at Congress in Washington DC (“Youth Platform”). Since 2010, more than a hundred students from thirty-eight nations and eighteen U.S. States have received recognition from Congresspersons and from ambassadors or their representatives.

This year, I published Gülen’s Dialogue on Education: a Caravanserai of Ideas; Chapter 8 features a comparison of James Moffett to John Dewey, Maria Montessori, Lev Vygotsky, Kurt Hahn, Benjamin Bloom, Jean Piaget, Albert Bandura—and above all, to Fethullah Gülen (106-118). Gülen is a Turkish imam, whose education philosophy and words resonated with Moffett’s. Those following Gülen are referred to as the Hizmet Movement, a word denoting “service.” AEPL is for Moffett what Hizmet is for Gülen, whose voice has inspired people of many languages and faiths to build, administer, and teach in schools in over two hundred nations. As Moffett, Gülen freelanced independently, functioning like Islam itself, from bottom-up, peer to peer.

I am deeply honored to be featured in the February Issue of JAEPL and to share some thoughts which derive from, and expand upon, Jim’s influence upon AEPL and on me. Since retiring, I’ve delivered more than thirty talks on four continents, at sites including USC, LSU, Temple, Yale, Houston, Texas, Toronto, Georgetown, Syracuse, Santa Clara, Yale, Mississippi, Fathi in Turkey, Erasmus in the Netherlands, Fes, Ibn Tofail, and Mohamed University in Morocco. In many of these talks, the subjects relate to Moffett’s theories. Implicitly undergirding them is a thesis generated from a conversation I had when Jim picked me up from the Los Angeles airport for a UC Irvine conference: the promise of “a global plurality of consciousnesses.”

I have taken every opportunity to further Jim’s ideas. At the Asilomar conference on “Inhabiting & Expanding the Common Ground,” I chaired and opened the program opened with Thomas Jefferson’s assertion: “He who receives an idea from me, receives instruction himself without lessening mine; as he who lights his taper at mine, receives light without darkening me.” An apt quote to suggest what Jim—when I first met him in the 1960s—had conceptualized as a system of educating for life.

Much of what follows deals with how our friendship resulted in γίγνομαι or gignomai, the Greek verb for a magicking forth of personal achievements as Jim and I hitchhiked the labyrinth of active learning. Gignomai identifies learning that is growth and possessing, as in acquiring skills and applying strategies of performance. From the roots of gignomai, through the bole of history into the branches of English flower words like “gene,” “genius,” and “gentle.” Much of my gignomai resulted from experiences teaching, at all levels, here and abroad, under the influence of Moffett and others.
How did it all start? In September 1961, I had a job teaching at an inner city school in Oakland. For the two years after my return from the Near East, I had been a Kemper Insurance scholar. Each summer I’d worked in the San Francisco office as an underwriter on Montgomery Street. Kemper, personally, offered to extend a scholarship for law school, so long as I accept a position as an apprentice, as the administrative assistant to the president of that company in Chicago. But how would a grad from Marxist Berkeley fit in the Chicago insurance world?

I began teaching English and speech that academic year in Oakland for a $4,800 salary, instead of Chicago’s lure of $7,000. The first year teaching was desperate. But I met teachers who encouraged me to attend NCTE and California’s affiliate annual conferences, especially at Asilomar. Asilomar was where Jim Gray launched the National Writing Project. And here, at this site, I met Jim Moffett, clearly the most remarkable rhetorician of the century.

Moffett’s canon divides among the spiritual and secular. The latter I sum up as the United Field Theory of the language arts. Let me address the latter first—having to do with discourse and art—which results in composing speech or written discourse (orders of knowledge that include What is Happening, What Happened, What Happens, and What Should/Shouldn’t Happen), as well as the appreciation, or valuing of beauty, the reading of literature, or viewing art.

Then I will address three events that crystalized Jim’s practice of spiritual disciplines, which in turn complement the United Field Theory and make up the whole of his System.

**What Is Happening?**

Inner speech figures forth What is Happening as we stumble along in life. Writing inner speech manifests predominantly in utterances of the present simple and present progressive in the English language. These tenses instantiate *in media res*, from the instance of perception and conception, when thought becomes language. “Drama is What is Happening,” as Jim observed in his *Teaching the Universe of Discourse* (60-119).

For example, my prelude of being stranded in the desert is a double vision of me, a semi-literate kid in the Jazeera, to now as a point of time, a retrospect over a half century. It is descriptive discourse in a dramatic mode, the present simple and present progressive signaling What is Happening. The reader asks, “What is Gage doing in Syria?” My rhetorical choice elicits ambiguities: will this episode lead to trouble, given the writer is a youngster who appears alone in the Muslim world? But that which you are reading is exposition, two modal stages—a procedure and a “taking effect”—bridging across the spectrum of Moffett’s “Universe of Discourse.”

Our inner thoughts are just scintillae of meanings. They can result in a silent chuckle or a tear on a dusty cheek, with counter-thoughts moderating. Our inner speech is I/Thou, attuning both consciously and nonconsciously with the self, which approaches the public stage in speech and writing. What agency in our mind moderates this inner speech? Moral intuition, God, or Foucault’s tyranny?

Teachers of Moffett’s system often begin by assigning students to write from inner speech. Many who know and thrive on his theory, and those who habitually practice its
pedagogy without knowing the source, still miss the next, all-important step of his fundamental sequence: after having students write in present simple or progressive, assign them readings from collateral literature, works that approximate the students’ genre. Have them read a masterful version of “What is Happening,” such as Eliot’s “Prufrock,” once they have recomposed a personal moment of relative impotence—or read Updike’s “A & P” after describing the immediacy of an event from their last summer. Or ask students to compose an op-ed about their frustration with politics, then read Zola’s “J’Accuse!” A point of entry to a writing task is best conceived from the self and then affirmed in form and eloquence by a master. But too, too many teachers do it the other way around and then complain because they have read so many stumbling attempts in papers after reading Keats’ “Ode to Autumn.”

**What Happened?**

For the sake of order, let’s shift to What Happened, Moffett’s next structure of knowledge. Narrative reporting, in contrast to recording What is Happening, covers beginning, middle, and end as the reader comes in synch with the writer’s prior *gygnwsko*—which is knowledge linked to mastery and erudition. I attended the 1973 Spring Asilomar Invitational, a conference divided into trifurcated strands: Moffett’s system, brain research, and modes of perception. I looked forward to hearing speakers that included Jim, the artist Jean Millay, and people from the Institute of Noetic Science, created by astronaut Edgar Mitchell after returning from moon travel to assess what the USSR was so engrossed in—parapsychology and telepathy. Some time ago, Fran Claggett, a longtime AEPL member, suggested that the following episode might have fostered the origins of AEPL.

Friday night’s initial event featured Ms. Millay performing *Light Sculpture*, her debut having only recently been featured at New York’s Guggenheim. On stage, she appeared with an Alphaphone Brain Analyzer octopused upon eight areas of her scalp. The machine displayed her chemo-electric waves in colored lights in an adjacent Plexiglas-sheeted box. Like a pinball machine, this boxed monitor documented stages of her relationship with her environment along a spectrum of stances from I/It to I/Thou. Red dots signaled beta waves of numeracy, as she computed fractions. Purple dots signaled the alpha waves of her literacy, as she processed lines of Verlaine’s poetry. Green measured her theta waves, while she enjoyed a recording of her husband accompanying Ravi Shankar.

Over the weekend Jim and I experimented with the electronic octopus while first reading aloud, thinking, meditating, reading silently, listening, and speaking. By the end of the conference, many—including writing research and literacy experts, Miles and Celeste Myers—followed Jim and Jan Moffett to their Berkeley home for a session of hatha yoga, based on what we all learned from the *Light Sculpture* performance and our own experiments in reading chemo-electric waves.

The narrative of how my personal survival in the Fertile Crescent transformed my education and this narrative of the English Asilomar Spring Conference both denote two singular Happenings in my life that in retrospect exemplify pivotal shifts toward maturation, towards the realization of *gygnwsko*.
Let’s get plural, moving from psychology to sociology.

What Happens

What Happens has to do with recognizing the important generalizations we make about personal experiences. In the early 2000s Bruce Novak chaired another AEPL conference, “Returning Wisdom to Education,” at Mt. Madonna, California. Bruce provided conference participants with an event that inaugurated a host of generalizations, explicit and implicit. A featured presenter at the conference was Brent Cameron, a Canadian educator and architect whose work focuses students on their life generalizations (135-147).

I remember sharing a chalked stone with a well-loved AEPL participant, Gabriele Rico. Our stone linked with others arcing in a Fibobacian chrysalis-like curve, which Cameron had drawn outdoors. Brent asked each participant to occupy the stone nearest their year of age. Then, he asked us to find the chalked circle closest to the most formative year of our lives. I moved from our first stone to “21,” representing the Syrian desert. Gaby moved to stone “5,” the year she and her mother endured Allied Bombings when fleeing Germany. On our formative stone, all were to share. My neighbor at “21” matched my travels abroad with her initial trip on LSD. Finally, we returned to our age stone. Looking back, I realized how a sequence of the years’ experiences in one’s life aren’t a numerical line, but an arcing, ever expanding sweep from the inner circle of experiences during elementary and middle school. I saw an instance of What Happens as I connected personal images of a latchkey childhood—torn shirt, school trouble—to images of my mother working as a secretary in the neighborhood where Huey Newton co-founded the Black Panthers, images of hitchhiking in the Middle East, and images of shaking hands with a 29-year old Martin Luther King, Jr., after hearing him speak at Wheeler Auditorium. A generalization about what formed my educational philosophy emerged, leading to my current interest in Fethullah Gülen and the Hizmet Movement. Like stakes of a picket fence or the incremental stops of a bus itinerary, each year along a person’s labyrinth includes cul de sacs, right and wrong choices, or opportunities expanding radially to now. A year’s experiences embed so much more than just a second year in college or a year closer to a driver’s license. Cameron’s chalked chrysalis on asphalt enables one to encounter, through I/Thou chiming with fellow travelers, how education, as the Department of Education puts it, is “a post-experience good.” Or as Frank Pinner writes:

>Undergraduate college students do not expect that their understandings of the world will change, that their beliefs will be altered, that old interests will be replaced by new ones, that on the day of the graduation they will be —as human beings —quite different from the freshmen who entered the university four years ago. They attend the university not as the truly religious transforms person attends to worship, for the sake of an experience which will transform; but rather as does the average Sunday churchgoer, for the sake of social conformity and from habit. (948)

Pinner’s abstraction documents Moffett’s System shift from singularity to generality, like the rhetorical shift from the narrative of a fable to the implications that lead to the fable’s concluding moral. And here, I must also call attention to how his System includes at

1. Editors’ Note: See Gage’s YouTube discussion of this point at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FdTeFjsM4-I.
each order of knowledge modes of art, or genres of literature (and explicitly, a pedagogy requiring the teacher to assign writing tasks first, and then readings in literature, not the other way around!). What is Happening complements the genre of drama and What Happened the genre of story and novel. The fable bridges the two, which bears first on singularity and then on generality.

When the focus shifts to What Happens, the discourse pluralizes, language nudges thought—or if you prefer, thought nudges language—beyond specifics to generalizations. The syntax sometimes includes imperatives, sometimes conditionals, such as “If this, then that.”

Let me advance another example of What Happens from the following biographical sketch.

I grew up balancing poverty with imagination. My mother moved us ten times. My brother ran away at age fifteen. But we had an unusual family history. Captain Bill Jones, my great grandfather on my father’s side, had made Andrew Carnegie a steel czar. He managed Carnegie’s most productive steel mill. Carnegie filched patents for some of Jones’s many inventions. At my school library during lunch one day, I found out about Captain Bill Jones’ inventions and learned how Carnegie had benefitted from them. The Captain’s daughter Cora was my only living grandparent. I learned more about the Captain during a single phone call with my grandmother—the only contact I ever had with her.

I had a story to tell. But I knew that I had to master writing, and my grades weren’t indicating success. Through classes in science, I began to sense achievements that connected me to my great grandfather, the Captain, and by graduation I was earning nearly all “As,” except for the “B” in English. In college, I took as many science classes as I could, to balance lower grades in other subjects. But eventually, I switched to English because of my interest in writing. And in 2013—following a career focused on education, linguistics, and writing—my book *American Prometheus: The Steel Genius Who Made Andrew Carnegie* won two silver awards at the New York Book Expo. The generalization: if you have a story to tell, sometimes you have to wait until you know you can tell it right. Gygnwsko.

**What Should Happen/What Shouldn’t Happen**

From What Happens to What Should Happen—or the obverse, What Should not Happen—the order of knowledge shifts from generality to suasion, argumentation, exhortation, and legislation. Implicitly, stories from my youth elicit a host of propositions, but under close inspection just as many alternatives or refutations emerge.

As first theory and then pedagogy, it bears repeating that Jim crafted a series of assignments for students to write about what they know, as a precursor to reading works in the genre of literature that is similar to what they just composed (1992). Moffett believed that the subjects of student discourse must commence with what the student knows but the teacher doesn’t. The point of entry is best from the self and then affirmed in form and eloquence by a master—not the other way around, or you’re not following Moffett. Moreover, there are two major principles:
• What ought Happen? To write is to inform the uninformed.
• What ought not Happen? Under compulsion, to write to inform the already informed, i.e.,
  the teacher, who holds up the grade like a Damoclean sword

In educational institutions, the latter is nearly always the case. The student writes to
the teacher’s *gignoskw*, an I/It stance that usually leads to bad writing, lack of elaboration,
namedropping instead of authentic research, and obliging the teacher’s bias.

Another episode of my Middle Eastern *gignomai* may explain why I am conjugating
Moffett’s Orders of Knowledge with my earlier personal Happenings, which also influ-
enced my commitment to multiculturalism.

1959: I got a ride with a Korean, a decorated columnist of the *Seoul Times*. Mr.
Moon earned the equivalent of his nation’s Pulitzer for frontline coverage of the United
Nations two-year peacekeeping efforts in Korea, a war that killed nearly as many GIs as
the ten-year Viet Nam War. When we got to Greece, we were entertained by a retired
military man who’d served during the UN’s Korean conflict. After we had dessert at the
home of this former head of the Hellenic division in Korea, he announced that the next
morning we were to pick up two university students at Syntagma Square for a week’s
tour of the Peloponnese. General Daskaroulous’ students were Korean adoptees. So my
week in Greece was in Korean.

It would be easy to advance the following propositions of What Should Happen or
Shouldn’t Happen. For such a Grand Tour, one should travel under the guidance of a
specialist in European cities and environments, one who could enrich the Korean stu-
dents’ *gignomai* on topics such as Greek culture’s ability to withstand the onslaughts of
modernity; Greece’s population, pollution, and traffic; Greece’s art; or Greece’s influ-
ence the spirit of Western civilization. But this order of knowledge—if it were not pre-
presented in Greece itself, amidst Greece’s richness of cultural and historical artifacts, but
in a typical educational context that was informed only by accountability-driven cost-
benefit analysis—it would require the teacher to assume an I/It stance in herding the
Korean students towards predetermined outcomes. Such a typical educational context
would also dismiss the opportunity to invite Korean students to bring their knowledge
their own culture and history into comparison with Greece’s.

The Should/Shouldn’t Happen therefore includes curriculum development in which
education engineers risk turning *gignomai* into a Procrustean bed of miseducation that
ill prepares students for gaining unique insights through multicultural connections
(Taleb 2007). Moffett’s theory and pedagogy fosters *gignomai* by allowing I/Thou attun-
ing with students to share in their writing to inform the less informed teacher about
their unique lives. From this point, appropriate literary selections (or other kinds of
texts and objects of art) can highlight stylistic choices in genres for students to become
autonomous writers.

Jim distilled it down to the following:

I gradually disentangle myself from my sole point of view and learn to speak about
myself, first, as if I were another person (objectification), then about others as if they
were myself (identification), and finally about others without reference to myself
(transpersonalization). Put another way, I evolve from passion to compassion to
dispassion. (1995 593)
Those critical of Moffett’s theory and pedagogy assert that his ideas encourage permissiveness and avoid responsibilities to prepare students to write in the register of other academic disciplines. Also eliciting harsh criticism was Moffett’s conviction that a writer needed stillness or dispassionate spirituality to reinvigorate the mental acuity so necessary for centering thought. But the sensitive reader of this system will also discern beyond the Unified Field Theory of Discourse and Art, to observe how Jim accommodates a refraction toward inner discipline, a realm that includes much of what he published in his last works.

**Spirituality: Complementarity of the System**

I have asserted that Moffett’s United Field Theory constitutes but one half of his System. He wrote, “Thought that is not spiritual is intellectually inferior because it is too partial” (*Universal Schoolhouse* 43). Jim’s spiritual disciplines include methods to attune to creative thinking and ethical action, which also parallels the core of Gülen’s education philosophy.

To limit teaching to I/It delivery of information results in γιγνώσκω, or gignwsko, which is also the Greek verb for passive, non-critical learning. On the other hand, spirituality, unrelated to any religion but heightened by mental disciplining, enables teaching from an I/Thou stance that yields gignomai, a type of learning that is so much more transformative in terms of developing and refining moral behavior. Teaching is more than getting students to perform for some remote audience, as they anonymously hustle toward “accountability.” Teaching is engaging in mutual learning with students who have unique names and identities. That’s how I acquired literacy and taught it, thanks to Moffett.

Jim’s regimen included no specific religious affiliation but honored all spiritual traditions that find their roots in a universal metaphysic. His first level of contemplation and attunement begins with “visualizing by closing eyes and imagining an object,” proceeding then to deeper, topical meditation (“Writing, Inner Speech” 236). Through rigorous, practiced, and scheduled observation, one advances to self-witnessing. Stilling the mind by suspending inner speech approaches an emptiness more receptive to deep thought. This regime is similar to what the art historian Hans Belting suggests happened at the onset of the Renaissance, an epistemological training that he calls The Gaze (297-98). Jim repeats and elaborates on this regime in many of his publications, e.g., *Universal School House* (173-74); *Coming on Center* (121). Also see “Markov Thought Chain.”

Moffett’s interest in spiritual regimen dates back at least to when we first met. In 1961 Jim had just published “Turning Language Upon Itself,” a review of Alan Watts’ *Psychotherapy East and West*. A turning point occurred when Jim passed up a beer at an Oakland archery range in fall 1971, telling me: “I’ve decided to roll back the years.” He gave up smoking and drinking, and became a vegetarian. But three events in particular document Jim’s shift toward inward exploration: (1) The onset of national behavioral objectives, when Jim walked out of the 1969 Tri-University Conference in Indiana (see “Misbehavioral Subjectivities”); (2) The founding of two ashrams, one in 1973 and one in 1976.
Moffett’s Walk-out and Afterward

The Moffetts joined us in Mendocino for a weekend shortly after he’d walked in disgust out of the Tri-University Conference. I had been hearing rumors about teachers being required to write student behavioral objectives for a pilot project of the State Board of Education. At the national level, NCTE and the DOE co-sponsored the two-year Indiana project to implement an English and reading component for education, as part of President Lyndon Johnson’s “Systems 70s.” Johnson misguidedely extended to all federal departments the questionable success of an accounting system innovated by Robert McNamara, the Secretary of Defense. U.S. education still struggles from this federalization.

That Mendocino weekend with our families led to Jim and me, with Ken Lane, to appear before the California State Board of Education in Los Angeles to stop a pilot PPBS, using behavioral objectives, being implemented in the California K-12 schools. Our efforts to suspend implementation at the elementary and secondary levels lasted until the 2000s when higher education meekly complied without a whimper from professors to write anticipated student outcomes.

Violence over Literacy

Four years later, a board of education near Jim’s wife, Jan’s hometown, was shot up when attempting to adopt several textbook series, including Jim’s Interaction and America Reads, of which I was a co-author. Interaction was so ahead of its time: a most remarkable textbook; methods and multimedia program; with writing prompts for individuals, groups, and whole class; anthologies of literary genres as collateral readings, scaffolded from students’ rhetorical modes to literary appreciation; cassettes accompanying readings for students with reading troubles; and in-service staff development video tapes demonstrating for teachers how to orchestrate the System. Hostile parents with fundamentalist bias clashed with a newly elected board committed to progressive education. Textbook publishers under fire flew a number of authors to West Virginia to support adoptions. Jim’s testimony surprised many for he argued for more inclusive adoption procedures, seemingly to concur with locals, but not with their violence. Moffett felt that these parents had a right that had been denied.

Soon after, Houghton Mifflin abandoned the Interaction Program.

The Moffetts’ Ashrams

In 1973, Jim and his family joined mine at a Hindu wedding in the Montclair district of Oakland. Jim met a well-known swami, who would for some years help the Moffetts. They organized their first ashram west of Benbow in Humboldt County, where they taught meditative routines more rigorous than the Transcendental Meditation that Jim had introduced to me during the summer of 1972.

In 1976, the Moffetts and the swami founded a second ashram at a more convenient location in Mariposa, only fourteen miles from Yosemite. I spent many visits with them and often ashram-sat when Jim taught at Middlebury in Vermont. Much of my success at Humboldt State University derived from our many conversations. During a week visit, Jim asked me to read a 710-page manuscript that he’d been drafting for some time.
With day trips up Yosemite Falls, I read over several nights the incredible tome. For me this draft included Jim’s latest and perhaps most important work. Exegesis, apocrypha, exoteric, esoteric, agnosia, and cross-cultural fluency. It was all there. But such a volume failed to entice all of the publishers that usually competed for Moffett’s work. So Jim acknowledged marketing constraints and decided to break it into three separate books. He realigned the discussion to develop chronologically out of the Kanawha County debate, beginning with what became Storm in the Mountains, published by University of Southern Illinois Press. Jossey-Bass in San Francisco published The Universal School House, and Heinemann, Harmonic Learning: Keynoting School Reform.

Each of these publishersnegotiated with Jim to massage out much of the integrity of what I had read, to ramp up profits and dilute the genius of the original. Storm became a cause célèb about censorship and teaching, to contribute to the culture wars in the US—the opposite of Jim’s mission. School House was narrowed to accommodate the home school market. Harmonic Learning failed to reach those beyond Jim’s fans.

Since my retiring, I’ve attempted to realize some of what I read that summer in Mariposa. Many of the more than thirty classes taught for Humboldt’s Osher Lifelong Learning ultimately derive from Jim’s 710-page draft. Also from Harmonic Learning, I’ve organized and implemented cross cultural fluency (57-63) in more than thirty teamed classrooms of schools in California and Nevada with students in classrooms in Nigeria, Egypt, China, Morocco, France, and Indonesia. As of 2014, the flagship classrooms of Mark Hertz at Six Rivers Charter School, Arcata, California, have sustained units in cross cultural fluency for fourteen semesters.

Chartres

In 1984, Jim picked me up at LAX. Cruising down the freeway, we discussed my experiences and his recent work. I’d just returned from completing a Fulbright year teaching at Syria’s Aleppo University, while next door the dozen-year civil war raged in Lebanon. Now the war has shifted to Syria. Jim was acquainted with my former student from Humboldt who as a professor taught at the University of Beirut, until 1987 when he with three others were taken and chained to a floor for five years in Lebanon’s Beqaa Valley. Jim acknowledged barbarism but analyzed the violence as insular communities hanging onto mono-identities—clans inclined to belligerence, then compelled to brutality in tribal desperation to withstand the effects of Western media and civilization cannibalizing their way of life.

“Human kind is evolving towards a plurality of consciousness,” he reflected. Jim believed in rational optimism, asserting that it could not get worse but only get better—though incrementally (see Ridley). Our job as teachers is to facilitate this progress, in spite of centrifugal violence.

In 1996, my wife and I were planning for a North African Christmas in Tunis, with a dogleg stay over in Paris, to visit Chartres. Two months earlier, I’d visited the Moffetts in Mariposa. At the ashram, we sipped fresh coffee that Jan had placed on a coffee table that was a millennium old, an asymmetrical labyrinth of redwood burl. Years ago Jim had bought the slab in Fortuna. He had worked it into a table, with glass overlaying the pocketed patterns of tree rings. Discussing the Moffetts’ earlier visit to Chartres, Jim
offered to introduce us to a friend, Marvin Miller, a renowned scholar of the Cathedral. On December 17, the day before our flight left, Jan called to say that Jim, terribly ill, wondered if Marvin had affirmed the appointment at Chartres. She passed the phone to Jim, and we talked briefly, his voice weak as he confessed that he was facing a trip to the hospital. Three days later, he passed away.

Within a week, my wife Anita and I met with Miller at Chartres. We walked the lines of the cathedral’s labyrinth, cut into the floor during the 12th century. Just days later, in snow, we landed at Tunis International. We learned that our flight path had just crossed over the greatest mass murder since WWII—the deliberate drowning of Muslim refugees seeking sanctuary in Sicily (Hooper). What would Jim have made of this horror? Of 9/11? Of Fox News?

He would insist upon dispassionate critical thinking, arrived at after passion and compassion. Jim would work to help students acquire gignomai, and above all, tolerance of the Other.

Jim did not live long enough to know of the dire threats our planet is experiencing, essentially caused by humankind. Hitchhiking the labyrinth now in post-retirement, I improvise, doing what I can to further Moffett’s System. I hope that the world’s students, working among themselves, will learn to advance a plurality of consciousnesses to protect this earth that we only have on loan.
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