8

Integrity in the Teaching of Writing

Background

The most positive development in English education during the '70s—indeed, during the whole period since World War II—originated with teachers, not with government, and spread in grassroots fashion from the bottom up instead of from the top down. The Bay Area Writing Project, now the National Writing Project, set an in-service model that has swept the country and accomplished far more good than all of the U.S. Office of Education Project English curriculum centers of the '60s put together. The astonishing success of the one and the monumental failures of the other constitute a valuable object lesson. But the success and national institutionalization bring on dangers that the Project must watch out for.

Since the mid-1960s, when I still lived in the East, I have worked off and on with the handful of devoted, veteran educators who began and developed BAWP: Jim Gray, a supervisor of English teachers at the Berkeley campus of the University of California; Albert (Cap) Lavin, a high school English department head and textbook author (and fellow participant at the Dartmouth Seminar); Miles Myers, head of the Oakland High School English department and a politically astute lobbyist and vice-president of the California Federation of Teachers; and Keith Caldwell and Mary K. Healy, two very experienced in-service leaders as well as teachers of young people. These people really know schools and really know writing. They obtained support from the University, local systems, the California Department of Education, Carnegie Corporation of New York, and—their main funding source—the National Endowment for the Humanities. They said, "If teachers are ever going to teach writing more and teach it better, they will have to practice writing more themselves." Bravo! This is how I learned to teach writing myself. Surely, a major reason that many teachers ignore, slight, or mangle the teaching of writing is that they lack direct experience with the learning issues entailed in writing. The BAWP originators said also, "The best people to teach teachers are other teachers."

They set up a summer course in which teachers wrote, talked shop about writing, and worked up a presentation they could make as consultants for other teachers during the following school year. So in the BAWP model a higher institution and local districts collaborate to set up a seeding system whereby those who have benefited from extra learning can pass on that understanding. Leslie Whipp wrote in the November 1979

issue of the *Network Newsletter* (the Project organ, published at U.C. Berkeley): "One astonishing feature of the National Writing Project model, and the major source of its strength, is that it is teacher-centered, and in two chief ways: teachers are teaching teachers, and teachers are writing for other teachers and reading and discussing the writing of other teachers."

I have taught for several years at BAWP summer institutes in Berkeley, Chicago, and Long Island, and have consulted with other projects following the model in North Carolina, Michigan, Minnesota, New Mexico, and several areas of California. Every summer new projects start up. I feel that this wonderful burgeoning shows some pent-up spirit finally finding release from the repressive environment of today. Teaching teachers to write has touched me deeply. The booklets of their writings collected after a summer session always make very interesting reading matter, because of their individual reality, and show an artfulness, depth, and personal force that are surprising only because most classrooms don't reflect these assets—surprising not least to the authors, and that is part of what touches me every time.

I place the participants in groups of three or four for the whole institute (four to six weeks). Learning to write with these partners is undoubtedly the best part of the session. They help each other get and settle on ideas during prewriting activities, think out and talk out their ideas during mid-composition, and reflect usefully on their final drafts. They learn as they never could otherwise what are the most useful ways to respond to others' writing. A remarkable relationship usually develops in these groups as they go about balancing honesty with delicacy, task effectiveness with intimacy, difference with empathy. The difficulty comes when the groups have to break up. Only through these writing workshop groups have I ever succeeded in convincing teachers of the tremendous power of small-group process.

BAWP has attempted to be eclectic, but it's never really possible to embrace all ideas and practices, if only because of practical limitations, so selection and emphasis will always occur. Project staff or invitees give presentations or assign readings on certain methods or approaches they prefer, omitting others, and when participant teachers are asked to choose early in the institute a topic to present later, they naturally come up often with pet lessons, faddish exercises, or bad conventional practices. Besides unwittingly misleading itself and others, by adopting this open-arms pose BAWP appears to endorse or push certain methods in violation of its own "eclectic" policy. The more influential it becomes, the more everyone involved in the Project's inspiring national network should work to keep the movement universal in nature, to determine what is most fundamental, not merely widespread or fashionable. My own approach is never to recommend activities with sentences or paragraphs that are not part of an authentic discourse or that don't constitute an authentic discourse. What

is universal are the kinds of utilitarian, literary, and scientific discourse practiced in our culture; the general processes for composing and revising alone and with others; and the elements of any language acquired through speaking and reading.

The following article grew rather directly out of experiences helping teachers write and think about how to help others write. It seemed to me that in order to focus on the actual writing processes themselves, it was necessary to clear up, if possible, some confusion in traditional thinking about what activities constitute writing. This led to a scale of various definitions of writing that I would put on the board and discuss with BAWP classes and with my similar summer course in writing for teachers given in 1978 at the Bread Loaf School of English (Middlebury College, VT). (I seem to think in scales; there are three in this book and several key ones scattered in other writing.)

Phi Delta Kappan published this piece in its December 1979 issue. It will serve as an introduction to the final article in this book, of which it was once a portion.

A phalanx of educators from out of state recently visited the Bay Area Writing Project in Berkeley expecting to be shown how to teach handwriting. If these people work with primary school, as I suspect, they have a better excuse than the rest of us for construing "writing" overconcretely, because the age of their pupils forces them to deal with writing as drawing—and, indeed, drawing is one aspect of writing. Because it bridges between the invisible world of spirit and the visible world of matter, writing has so many aspects, covering such a broad spectrum of physical and mental activities, that it may be defined at whatever level of depth suits the profession, public, or other stakeholders such as governments, foundations, and commercial companies. And, as always, ambiguity lends itself to political, economic, and cultural biasing. At the moment, a very materialistic definition of writing pegs the teaching of it at such a low level of meaning that a dramatic expansion of the educational view of it seems in order.

At the lowest level, writing is drawing letters, but for the sake of perspective it may be worth backing down a little before going up. That is, drawing letters itself culminates a long history of using other material media, beginning with the body when used for signaling and symbolizing. But real writing began with message-leaving and mnemonic devices. One had to "say" something to someone not present, perhaps not born yet, and one had to remind oneself of something or keep track of some tally. For storing and transmitting information across time, beyond per-

sonal memory and face-to-face communication, the body will no longer serve, and external media then come into play. This kind of long-range communication or message-leaving is the essence of writing, which must have begun as one form of tool-using. Some of the first writing consisted of knots and notches for keeping score in business transactions. (A main advantage of writing still remains that the thinker can "take stock" of what he has got so far before proceeding.) But for concepts going beyond mere quantity, into the astronomical, geodetic, mathematical, historical, zoological, botanical, and metallurgical knowledge that we now know ancient civilizations possessed, a medium admitting of more complex symbolization was required.

The "prehistoric" form of writing was building. Modern archaeology tends increasingly to interpret ancient monuments such as megaliths, ziggurats, steles, obelisks, temples, and pyramids as *embodiments* of information, as repositories like today's libraries or, at least, like our time capsules. For this reason, the term "prehistoric," which means pre-writing, should strike us now as a misnomer and a prejudice, since building-in as a way of writing-in not only left records (for those who knew how to read) but evolved to very high levels of sophistication in the Nile, Indus, and Tigris–Euphrates valleys. But this sort of message-leaving was of course not the sole function of these monuments, which seem also to have served as observatories, tombs, surveying markers, initiation sites, places of worship, and other things, often all at once. One of the reasons, no doubt, why modern people have not credited ancient people with writing is that for a long time the ancients did not *single out* writing as a specialized activity but rather, in their typically syncretic way, fused multiple functions in each activity. (Millennia later, we have still not reintegrated writing into the rest of the curriculum!)[1]

The sequence from then to now probably followed a path of increasing specialization and abstractness in symbolizing. Some part of a building or monument depicted a story of past events, schematized the zodiac, or laid out steps in how to make something. Earlier, these ideas might materialize as effigies, bas-reliefs, or even key features of architectural layout, then later as pictures incised or drawn on walls or steles. Two-dimensionality is a higher abstraction than three-dimensionality, the symbols being farther removed from what they symbolize. As message-leaving specialized, it became more portable: tablets and scrolls supplanted murals and inscriptions. Then direct pictorialization yielded to ideography, wherein pictures become standardized and systematized into a consistent spatial order and lexicon and take on less concrete meanings associated with the pictures but (eventually) not themselves depictable.

[1]See, for example, Francis Hitching, *Earth Magic* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1978); Peter Tompkins, *Secrets of the Great Pyramid* (New York: Harper and Row, 1971); and Louis Charpentier, *The Mysteries of Chartres Cathedral* (New York: Avon, 1975).

Petroglyphs thus become hieroglyphs. Incision and cuneiform, the holdovers from monumental writing, give way to drawing and painting, less substantial but faster and more flexible for writing as a special activity. Cuneiform, the printing of a single wedge shape in different positions and numbers, no doubt led, however, to the acceptance of arbitrary, imageless symbols such as characterize the alphabet.

So although children today may be regarded as starting to write by drawing graphic symbols for sound symbols, this historical summary reminds us that just as early man worked his way up to the alphabet, so may the child—and for good reason. Most psychologists, even of variant schools, would probably accept the capsulized form in which Jerome Bruner once characterized stages of children's mental development as enactive, iconic, and symbolic—the respective acting out, depicting, and abstract representing of thought. Just as "prehistoric" man began to write before we give him credit for it, so children start writing some time before we think of some of their activities as writing. Learning to symbolize begins with mimicry and pantomime and the other signifying behavior that we call "body language"; accumulates the external, three-dimensional media of collaging and modeling and constructing; refines these to the two-dimensional media of stamping, imprinting, drawing, and painting; then proceeds to ordering pictures into a story and to drawing and sequencing the geometric shapes that comprise letters. All this sets the stage for the stunning moment when two independently evolving symbol systems come into conjunction—one vocal and auditory, the other manual and visual.

Rising on now through the spectrum of writing definitions, the next level above letter-drawing or *handwriting,* to use the school term, is the *transcribing* of speech sounds. Transcription comprises spelling and punctuation, which respectively render vocalization and intonation (stress, pitch, and juncture). They shift speech from an oral to a visual medium, and because they are basic to literacy are misleadingly called "basic skills."

From here on up the scale the issue is how much real authoring is occurring. We may start with direct *copying* of a text, a teaching method practiced in some times and places in Europe on grounds that it imprints spellings, punctuation, vocabulary, and sentence structures. We have only to reread Melville's story "Bartleby the Scrivener" to appreciate the practical importance of the amanuensis before the invention of the typewriter and the ensuing technology of copying. Perhaps we should place stenography a shade above copying on the writing scale, since the interpretation and translation of speech sounds requires more thought. Both result in writing, but in neither case does the "writer" create the content or necessarily even understand it. As a former French teacher I can attest to the value of the dictée, however, for second-language learning, where the lit-

eracy issue of matching written symbols with spoken words naturally looms as large for the learner of any age as it does for the small child with his native language.

Paraphrasing seems to mark the point of shifting from copying or transcribing toward some degree of authoring. It can range from barely changed quotation to significant shift in vocabulary and sentence structure that indicates much interpretation. But to the extent that a second party summarizes a text as well as rewords it, we are into précis or résumé and hence into the more extensive interpretation that selection and reduction entail. These French terms betray the origin of the same old-world pedagogy that underlies the copying method. Actually, the précis is intended to elicit comprehension, not interpretation, and reflects the frank avowal of traditional French schooling that a youngster should only take in until age eighteen because he or she is not ready before then to do original thinking. Though unavowed in this country, this attitude clearly operates powerfully throughout the entire curriculum.

It is impossible to understand the teaching of writing in America if one does not realize that, in one form or another, from first grade through graduate school, it serves mostly to test reading. In elementary school the main form of writing is the book report, which becomes dignified in high school and college as the "research paper" or "critical paper," then deified in graduate school as the "survey of the literature" in the doctoral dissertation. The real goal of writing instruction in the United States is to prepare for term papers and essay questions (although secondary and college teachers increasingly fall back today on multiple-choice "objective" tests, partly because "the kids can't write"). We have always been far more interested in reading than in writing, so much so that writing in schools has hardly existed except as a means to demonstrate either reading comprehension or the comprehensiveness of one's reading. Because writing produces an external result, it is a natural testing instrument if one wishes to regard it so, whereas the receptive activity of reading leaves no traces outside. Using writing to test reading, then, seems the perfect solution to an institution so bedeviled by managing and monitoring problems that it resists student productivity tooth and nail and regards testing as the solution to everything. Writing about reading quite effectively kills two birds with one stone.

So we have geared the teaching of writing in this country to the level of quotation and paraphrase, précis and book report. Students are to be told to, not to tell. Since even regurgitation entails some interpretation and synthesis by the reader, it is fair to accord to this level of "writing" some degree of authorship. But surely school practices of writing about the reading represent minimal authorship. In any case, wouldn't educators do well to ask constantly how much authoring their writing program

honestly calls for and how much it truly aims to teach writing for the sake of writing? It is certainly very true that the degree of authorship is relative in *any* kind of writing. Even great professional writers usually incorporate into their thought and work, at some level of assimilation, the thoughts and works of others. But their kind of taking in and giving out exists for them to have more to say, not to prove to others' satisfaction that they have done their homework. Authoring ought to be construed, it seems to me, on a rather tough criterion of originality if only because the less a learner imitates or borrows, the more he has to do his own thinking, regardless of how much he may read.

The next-highest conception of writing emphasizes *craft*—how to construct good sentences, paragraphs, and overall organizations. Everyone respects craftsmanship, no less in writing, surely, than anywhere else, but if the question of genuine authorship is finessed, then such an approach results in a mere carpentry course. For the very reason that they are assuming that content will be supplied by books or lectures, schools have taken it for granted. The only problem is how to cut and fit. Naturally allied to the emphasis on reading and general student passivity, formalism dominates the teaching of writing, by which I mean forming the language only without nearly sufficient concern for developing the thought. This level of writing instruction does deserve the name of "composition" for the very reason that it features construction—selecting and arranging for maximum effect—but it fastens almost hypnotically on the surface level of language, at which thought *manifests* itself, and blandly stops short of the long internal processing that must go on to engender something to manifest.

At its best the crafting approach to writing can help a student see alternative and better ways to say what he has in mind, but without at least an equal emphasis on finding and developing subjects of his own, and the clear primacy of purpose over form, the "writer" ends by carpentering clichés to make the sentence or the paragraph or essay form come out right. At its worst, the approach loads a student with prescriptions and proscriptions that no serious writer could ever follow and still keep his mind on his business, and even degenerates into what I call decomposition—manipulating grammatical facts and labels as information, memorizing vocabulary lists, and doing exercises with isolated dummy sentences. Language parts are tools of the craft, right? But they must not, of course, be mistaken for the craft itself.

Well-meaning teachers try hard to make the crafting approach work by assigning "provocative" or "open" topics for the content and "creative" exercises in sentence-combining or in rear-loading of sentence modification. These valiant efforts can look successful within the narrow notion of authorship taken for granted in our schools today. But when

writing on demand for a grade in an institution, how provocative and open really is "We have met the enemy and he is us," the topic of the 1978 College Board's English Achievement Test and a fair sample of topics that teachers of the craft tradition might assign (and might think appropriate because it comes from a comic strip, *Pogo*). Reporting as a reader for this exam, James Gray, head of the Bay Area Writing Project, found "mechanical paragraphs masquerading as organized essays" and "overgeneralizing, posturing, and earnest moralizing."[2] Since the crafting approach represents about the highest point on our spectrum that the teaching of writing would have attained in the schools from which these college-bound students derived, Gray's description seems a fair indication of the most we can expect from a concept of writing so unbalanced between language and technique, on the one hand, and thought and purpose, on the other. After all, how much does being allowed to make up your own sentence combinations or sentence modifications amount to in the bigger picture of rendering thought into writing, even though the exercises may seem like fun compared to grimmer alternatives? For a final commentary on the crafting emphasis, I invoke the greatest thinker of our century, who said in the preface to his *Relativity: The Special and General Theory* that when the intent is to get ideas across, "matters of elegance ought to be left to the tailor and the cobbler."[3] Einstein's ability to communicate clearly to the layman the most difficult ideas of our time certainly ranks high among his achievements.

The notions of "writing" so far reviewed, none of which honor full authoring, smack suspiciously not only, as I have suggested, of institutional convenience (usually beyond the control of teachers themselves) but also of a materialistic framework that inevitably biases schooling and anchors the teaching of writing at inferior levels of any scale aspiring to excellence. In fact, it is the materialism that places the institution over the individual, form over content. Specifically, it shows in a favoring of more *concrete* definitions of writing, as transcription or carpentry; in the *superficial* view that spelling and punctuating are basic skills, instead of thinking and speaking; and in the *analytic* isolation of language units as curriculum units (the phoneme, the word, the sentence, the paragraph). Generally, the materialistic bias of our culture practically forces us to prefer the visible domain of language forms, which linguistic science has so well delineated, to the invisible domain of thought, which is still a scary can of worms. But teachers have no business preferring either and have no choice but to work *in the gap* between thought and speech. Writing is a

[2]James Gray, "Twenty Minutes of Fluency—A Test," *The National Writing Project Network Newsletter*, volume 2, number 2, March 1979, p. 12.
[3]Albert Einstein, *Relativity: The Special and General Theory* (New York: Crown, 1961), Preface, p. v.

manifestation of thought, but, however tempting, we cannot deal with it only as it finally manifests itself visually in writing or even audibly as speech. Too much precedes the physical sounds or sights for teachers to take up only at these forms.

But how can we get at the writing process before it materializes in these forms? Answering this teaching question brings us to the top of the spectrum of writing definitions, where schools should be operating. Educators would do best, I submit, to conceive of writing, first of all, as full-fledged authoring, by which I mean authentic expression of an individual's own ideas, original in the sense that he or she has synthesized them for himself or herself. True authoring occurs naturally to the extent that the writer is composing with raw material, that is, source content not previously abstracted and formulated by others. Teaching aimed this way would emphasize subject matter lying easily at hand within and around the writer—firsthand content like feelings, fantasies, sensations, memories, and reflections, and secondhand content as drawn from interviews, stored information, and the writings of others to the extent that the writer truly re-abstracts these in his own synthesis. Insisting on maximum authorship should stave off the construing or treating of writing as only some sort of transcription or paraphrasing or verbal tailoring from ready-made cloth. (Behind the basic meaning of "author" as "adder" lies the assumption that a writer has something unique enough to add to the communal store of knowledge.)

Presupposing true authorship, the highest definition acknowledges that *any* writing, about whatever personal or impersonal subject, for whatever audience and purpose, can never comprise anything but some focused and edited version of inner speech. When writing, one writes down what one is thinking—but not everything one is thinking at that moment and not necessarily in the form that first comes to mind. What the writer transcribes is some ongoing *revision* of inner speech, which is itself some verbalized or at least verbalizable distillation of the continually flowing mixture of inner life that psychologist William James long ago named the "stream of consciousness." The writer intent on his subject presumably tries to narrow down drastically for the moment his total field of consciousness—shuts out most things and concentrates on one train which he has set in motion at will and tries to sustain. This means that to write one must control inner speech and not simply let it run at the behest of normally interplaying stimuli. We could say that composition begins with this attentional selectivity except that, at the time of writing down thoughts, a writer stands at the mercy of prior rumination about the subject as it will surface in the inner speech that spontaneously presents itself for further composition. We had best include as composition the whole continuum of inner processing that determines what will

occur to the writer about the subject focused on. A person cannot write something he cannot say at least to himself—think—but he also keeps recasting a subject in his inner speech, perhaps long before he knows he will write about it.

The chief reason for defining writing as revision of inner speech is to ensure that writing be acknowledged as nothing less than thinking, manifested a certain way, and to make sure that it is taught accordingly. In addition to the more commonly accepted possibilities of revising what one has already written down, two less familiar teaching issues emerge—the immediate one of how best to set conditions for tapping and focusing inner speech at the moment of writing down, and the long-range one of how best to develop the highest quality of inner speech so that when one sits down to write, the thought that spontaneously presents itself offers the best wherewithal for the more visible and audible composition that will follow.

Compactly recapitulated, the ways in which writing may be defined array themselves in this way, reading upward from most material and external to most authorial. Lower definitions are lower not because false but because insufficient.

- Revising inner speech—starts with inchoate thought.
- Crafting conventional or given subject matter—starts with given topics and language forms.
- Paraphrasing, summarizing, plagiarizing—starts with other writers' material and ideas.
- Transcribing and copying—starts verbatim with others' speech and texts.
- Drawing and handwriting—starts with imagery for sensorimotor activities.

Writing consists of not just one of these activities but of all of them at once. All definitions are correct. When people write, they are simultaneously *drawing* letters, *transcribing* their inner voice, *plagiarizing* concepts and frameworks from their culture, *crafting* their thoughts into language forms, and *revising* the inchoate thought of their inner speech. None are wrong, but failing to include all is wrong. Nor is it true that the learner begins at the bottom and works his way up. From the outset, lettering needs to be connected to meaning, to the symbolizing of inner speech, as when the small child watches while a helper writes down his story for him or her as the child dictates it and then literally retraces the writing. All these definitions apply all at once at all stages of growth. Older students who say they have nothing to write have simply spent all their school days copying, paraphrasing, and fitting given content into given

forms and never have had a chance to see themselves as authors composing their inner speech toward a creation of their own. The scale does correspond to an order of increasing difficulty for both the writer and the teacher of writing. Small wonder we're tempted to lop off the top!

Teachers with whom I have used this scale of definitions in workshops have said that they found it very useful. It should help a teacher place his or her approach and to decide if change seems called for. In which sense or senses am I teaching writing? Is that what I mean to do? If not, why am I teaching this way? If not, how would I have to change my classroom practices to teach writing as I think I should? The scale should help also to think about that old bugaboo, evaluation. For each definition here there correspond criteria mostly irrelevant to the other definitions. Do the standardized tests by which my students' "writing" or "composition" ability is judged do justice to all these definitions, to writing as a whole? Am I teaching writing by one definition and assessing it by another? Am I operating by certain definitions and my colleagues or superiors or constituency assuming others? And—where do "basic skills" and "minimal standards" fall on this array?

The ambiguity of the word "writing" not only creates tremendous confusion about teaching methods but makes it possible to plug in any meaning that suits any motive. Prevalently, most schools are teaching something else and calling it writing, in a version of "let's don't and say we did," which receives perfect support from tests that measure something else and call it writing. Nearly all the stakeholders in the teaching of writing have reasons for wanting to interpret it as "mechanics" or decomposition or book-reporting or carpentry. All of us, in and out of school, have tacitly conspired to lobotomize writing, precisely because, if undertaken seriously, it threatens to be dangerous, unmanageable, and untestable by current cheap instruments. Everyone senses, quite rightly, that real authoring would require radical changes in student role, classroom management and methods, parents' and administrators' heads, evaluation, and the whole atmosphere of schooling.

And yet the public is now claiming to want improvement in the teaching of writing. Since this interest and the ensuing funding were inspired by low test scores, college complaints, and popular reportage, we needn't wonder long about where on the scale just sketched the notion of writing in question falls. Never mind. Some interest and funds have appeared, and this should be taken positively. But it is important that educators try to hold this trend to the highest conception of writing, the one that has the most educational value, and the one that works because it stems from meaning and motive. Otherwise the current support could, like most of the title money of the Great Society programs, end by locking in even more tightly the errors of the past.

The processes of writing cannot be realistically perceived and taught so long as we try to work from the outside in. The most fundamental and effective way to improve compositional "decisions" about word choice, phrasing, sentence structure, and overall organization is to clarify, enrich, and harmonize the thinking that predetermines the student's initial choices of these. We must never forget, no matter how much a technocratic mentality and an uncontrolled educational–industrial complex bully us the other way, that the heart of writing beats deep within a subjective inner life that, while neither audible nor visible at the time the most important action is occurring, governs all those choices that a composition course tries belatedly to straighten out.

What teaching methodology does this highest definition imply? As regards the immediate circumstances of actually getting something on paper, the definition indicates: the providing of audiences and of opportunities to grasp the various purposes of writing; individual choice of subject, form, and time; the arraying and illustrating of the entire range of kinds of writing in the diverse modes of discourse; the use of partners and coaches with whom to talk over and try out ideas before and during written composition, in order to aerate and revise inner speech across successive versions; the teaching of meditational techniques for knowing, focusing, and controlling inner speech;[4] and the interweaving of writing with other media, arts, and disciplines so that all these forms of knowing remain in natural relations with each other, providing warm-ups and follow-ups for writing and offering it as one among alternative ways to discover, develop, and render the mind.

As regards the long-range development of inner speech, the highest definition implies any means that will exercise thought itself. Enriching, refining, sharpening inner speech require, throughout all the school years: various and plentiful thinking activities as embodied in many games, practical problems to solve, imagining, and dialectic with others; much experience in small-group process where all sorts of good conversing can be practiced—task talk, topic talk, improvisation—that when internalized will become part of individual thinking; copious and wide-ranging reading as can occur only when students can individually select their own reading matter from a huge array of all sorts; rich physical and social experience with the things of this world, so that inner speech has much to reflect from the outside. The more that thought benefits from the cyclic turning over of outer and inner experience, outer and inner speech, the less revision will the actual writing phase of composition require. Deepening and clearing thought undercuts the familiar writing problems.

If we concentrate our forces on fostering the highest development of inner speech, we will automatically not only teach excellence in writing

[4]See "Writing, Inner Speech, and Meditation," pp. 133–181.

but lift other subjects along with it into a new learning integration, for the quality and qualities of inner speech determine and are determined by all mental activities. Reading or writing "across the curriculum," the "core curriculum," "teaching the humanities," and so on will all take care of themselves. We have to consider writing in relation to the rest of the curriculum. Because inner speech is the matrix of spontaneous discourse that can be composed in any direction and that reflects any externalities, it allows us to integrate all discursive learning.