

## Research Material

# Understanding English Through Pictures: The Graded Direct Method of I.A. Richards

Brian Small

*Liberal Arts Department, Minami-Kyushu University,  
Miyakonojo, Miyazaki 885-0035 Japan*

Received October 11, 2013; Accepted January 27, 2014

With the Graded Direct Method (GDM) learners explore the four skills of language: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. *The Language Through Pictures* (LP) materials provide an organic sequence of situations with which learners discover the language. Students learn verbal and pictorial literacies while observing sentences and pictures change together in developing situations. GDM teachers and learners create situations that exemplify the use of words in statements. The statements explored in GDM classrooms have the same structure as the sentences illustrated in English Through Pictures (EP) materials. These sentence choices result from decades of work in language teaching. For the beginning learner these sentences exhibit the greatest lucidity and offer the widest utility. In properly designed situations learners see the needs for, senses in, and uses of the language's key words and structures. There is no need for the mother tongue or ad-hoc explanations. I will argue that the EP materials and GDM techniques (EP/GDM) facilitate a worthy (and necessary) education appropriate for the twenty-first century media environment. Understanding EP/GDM frees English instruction from the clutches of Commercial Coursebooks (CC) and the Communicative Approach (CA, CC/CA) and directs the venture towards an education of value in the humanities. Due to journal length constraints illustrations from EP learning materials and CC page layouts will have to wait for inclusion in following papers.

**Key words:** GDM, ESL, EFL, ELF, EIL, information design.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. INTRODUCTION</li> <li>2. DECADES OF DEVELOPMENT AND GESTALT</li> <li>3. THE DISAPPEARANCE OF GDM AND THE NEGLECT OF I.A. RICHARDS</li> <li>4. OGDEN'S BASIC ENGLISH AND LINGUA FRANCA (ELF) NEEDS</li> <li>5. PRESCIENT METHOD, ELF AND THE HUMANITIES</li> <li>6. COMMERCIAL COURSEBOOK AND COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH (CC/CA) FAILURE</li> <li>7. MEDIA, RELEVANCY, AND NEEDED ATTENTION</li> <li>8. GOOD TEACHNG REJECTS THE IRRELEVANT</li> <li>9. MEDIA, CRITICS, HEALTH, AND RELEVANCY</li> <li>10. UNIVERSAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES: SEEING ART AND SCIENCE, MATH AND LANGUAGE</li> <li>11. SEEING COMPARISONS NOT CLUTTER, DENSITY OVERCOMES COMPLEXITY</li> <li>12. NEUROSCIENCE AND COMMERCIAL ATTENTION</li> <li>13. SIMPLICITY: HEALTH AND CLASSICS</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>14. EP/GDM OVERCOMES MARKETING NICHES WITH ELF AND RESPECT</li> <li>15. LEARNER ATTITUDE</li> <li>16. CONCLUSION</li> </ol> <p>FOOTNOTES</p> <p>BIBLIOGRAPHY</p> |
|---|---|

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As an approach to teaching English as an International Language (EIL), or English as a Lingua Franca (ELF), the Graded Direct Method (GDM) is principled and purposeful. With the English Through Pictures (EP) books eliminating distraction and providing for exploration, GDM "invites direct entrance into a new language" through the "development of effective capability" for "participation in planetary affairs". GDM makes use of the Language Through Pictures (LP) textbooks and other media developed over decades by I.A. Richards and gifted collaborators. For EIL/EFL the English Through Pictures (EP) series takes learners on a journey from the most basic building blocks; "I", "You", "I am here", "You are there" on the first pages of Book 1 to Confucius asking "What to do?" and Aristotle prompting "What is our

own work?" in the last pages of Book 3.

Richards provides an 18 item list for Notes on Principles of Beginning Language Instruction "prepared... for a UNESCO conference in Paris on June 19, 1947"(Richards 1968a: 125-27). The list appears in an appendix of his paperback *Design for Escape*. This appendix directly follows the last chapter Learning and Looking that is based on a 1967 lecture at the Carpenter Center for Visual[1] Arts of Harvard University(ibid.: 93). The book begins with the observation that "things are getting worse with the world, not better" because there are not enough "effectively capable" people. He suggests that education using "the means of English", "our two chief senses, eye and ear", and a "design of instruction via... media" is "the only known way of producing enough effective people"(ibid.: 3). EP/GDM's purpose is to produce self-reliant thinkers that will better the planet, effect the world. Just before the 18 item list of principles, the last chapter of the book ends noting that "English has slipped into the position of a de facto dominant World Auxiliary." In 1968 Richards anticipated the 21st century discovery of English as Lingua Franca(ELF) by 50 years.

Richards goes on to say that English as a world auxiliary "gives us means, through better sequenced Beginning English and the graphic and pictorial instruction that should mediate it... of really showing learners how to use their minds". Compare this conception and the idea that "the sovereign incentive for all learning is the learner's awareness of his own growing power" with recent Corporate or Commercial Coursebooks (CC) in which "teenagers... are more likely to be motivated to learn English if they talk about topics in ways that really matter to them"(Ellis: 4). Developed by corporate bureaucracies CCs invite young minds into the values of niche marketing and created wants with "controlled or free"(Saslow: xi) "activity types that recur through the book"(Freeman: viii) in shopping situations. EP is a refreshing alternative to CC designers using advertising techniques to flail at what teenagers have been told is important to them Commercial techniques attempt to sell vapid (and unhealthy) notions of *Top Notch* success. The "techniques of second language instruction as designed by I.A. Richards, Christine M. Gibson and their research associates at Harvard" invite "direct entrance into a new language through joint use of verbal and pictorial notations so arranged as to make systematic study of their related detail possible"(Richards 1993: 189). EP/GDM makes use of students' "notable ability to reason"(Tufte) as learners "advance by means of a series of opportunities to compare the sequenced samplings set before them"(Richards 1993: 189). CCs depict the social comparisons that drive individuals into retail therapy. GDM depicts the systematic comparisons that drive the scientific method and uses the sort of efficient notation that drives progress in mathematics.

## 2. DECADES OF DEVELOPMENT AND GESTALT

With EP/GDM, both teachers and learners benefit from decades of iterative development. Classroom teachers have further honed the techniques of Richards and Gibson with decades of careful attention. Attending to the EP books, seeing the structure of English spiral up in

a recursive movement, impresses that the materials offer more than an opportunity to learn a new language. Close attention reveals that EP offers practice in the detailed comparison and intense seeing the drives progress in the arts and sciences. The detailed attention that EP materials have received in Japan offer teachers ways to improve the learning process for students. First published in 1955 and revised in 1971, a Japanese language handbook for teaching the first two EP books offers an antidote for errors common among today's university students. Teaching "my"("your", "her", and "his") before "a" avoids the error of learning the two words "is a" as a one-word creation "isa". Before presenting structures such as "This is a man"("This is a table" etc.)(EP1: 8-10) skip ahead to possessive structures such as "This is my head"(EP1: 11). Close scrutiny of the early stages of learning helps avoid the flailing habits that produce the sentences like "This is a my bag" and "That is a her hat"(Yoshizawa: 5-8). Today's university students say "That is the my phone" in live situations.

Teruyo Karakida provides a compact explanation of Richards's principles at work in GDM (One-day Seminar in Tokyo March 31, 2012). The rest of this paragraph is my understanding of Karakida's Japanese handout. With GDM, the mother tongue is not used. GDM teachers use situations to think on sentences. Teachers create a live-situation in which a particular sentence becomes necessary. Sentence-situations(SEN-SITS) are these unfinished live-situations that need that particular sentence for completion. Using contrasts to teach the sentences avoids the interference (rivalry) of the differing sounds, structure and meaning distributions in the mother tongue. Minimal pairs make the element taught stand out for attention. GDM teaches in 3 modes; 1) the muscles of the eye, ear, mouth and limbs 2) the images of photographs and drawings 3) letters. Words are taught first from the clearly presentable root sense and then re-worked for an understanding of metaphorical uses. Teachers present the widely usable general words and sentences and then go on to the more particular. The first words and sentences taught serve as preparation for the following elements to be taught, the following elements reinforce the previous elements already taught. Every lesson is built of 4 walls; 1) live-situation(listening, speaking) 2) photograph and picture viewing(speaking) 3) drawings 4) letters(reading, writing). Karakida's example of going from the root sense to the metaphorical uses "in"; "My hat is in my hand. -> in the bottle -> in the street, room -> in the air -> in New York -> in the East -> There are 24 hours in one day. -> The sun goes round in 24 hours. -> Make a cut in the wood. -> a change in the direction -> Now the ball is in motion."

In Japan's GDM seminars, teachers share lessons resulting from decades of experience with EP/GDM. It is a discipline and craft offering EFL/ESL teachers an opportunity for human-worthy work in the profession. Experienced GDM teachers make learner discovery of language through context seem a smooth and natural process. Designing, and enacting with learners, a lucid order of sentence-situations(sen-sits) for the discovery of language proves to be challenging in practice. It is an exacting discipline for teachers to show, not tell; to present, not explain as it is for writers and artists. The Japanese website devoted to GDM shares approaches to the teaching of "the"(Katagiri 2013) in a recent discussion. It features the

technique of Kiyoshi Masukawa, a translator that taught in Osaka over 20 years ago. He has learners come to the front of the class to work the sentence-situations that contrast “this” and “that”. The learner must point with the hand while saying “This/That is a book”, “That book is on that table”. Almost overdoing the work on “this” and then “that” while pointing sets up the situation that needs “the”. While at a distance that requires the sentence “That book is on that table” Masukawa holds the student’s arms down. Unable to do the pointing of “this” and “that” the new situation demands the introduction of “the”. GDM creates teachable moments in every lesson.

Veteran GDM teachers seem able to apply Gestalt thinking to language learning in the classroom. With a properly designed linguistic “unfinished situation” excitement mounts towards the coming but as yet unknown solution (Perls: Ch1 The Structure of Experience). This approach takes advantage of insights from Gestalt psychology and therapy: “It is a basic tendency of the organism to complete any situation or transaction which for it is unfinished.” (Perls: xxxvi, 325) The situation in which there is only an “I” and a “you” sets up such an unfinished situation by introducing a third person. Maintaining eye contact with the “you” now requires “he” or “she” to refer to the new element of the developing situation, the new person in the situation. The challenge is to choreograph situations where the need for, and meaning of, a particular sense of a word is clear. The GDM lesson is not a question-and-answer session using arbitrary dictionary definitions from word lists.

### 3. THE DISAPPEARANCE OF GDM AND THE NEGLECT OF I.A. RICHARDS

While sharing two words with the The Direct Method, GDM is significantly different and deserves separate treatment rather than neglect. Richards writes in the 1930s that, while observing the limits of the “Translation Method” and the “Direct Method” with a small group in Peking, they “decided upon... something which might be called ‘a Direct Method made reasonable’” (Richards 1993: 59). Over the next decades of work “with English and with Reading... [and] on second-language learning” and on the development of books and films in a variety of settings (literacy, ESL, EFL...) and languages (French, Spanish, Arabic, Tagalog...) this reasonable method of instruction came to be known as ‘Graded Direct Method’ (ibid.: 293-296). While impressive the long list of accomplishments achieved by GDM instruction (and Ogden’s Basic English that provided the base for it) is not as impressive as the purpose: “the use of elementary language-learning to induce self-reliant thought and an active, not a passive spirit” (ibid.: 61). Serious teachers will find the approach refreshing compared to the cognitive styles encouraged by large commercial bureaucracies which “tend to make audiences ignorant and passive, and also to diminish the credibility of the presenter” (Tuft 2006: 158-169). GDM offers the promise of effort- and time-savings for learners and a chance for a rewarding discipline and body of craft technique for teachers.

A quick look into language teaching surveys (Brown 1994a, 1994b; Stevick 1996, 1998) reveals that they make no mention of GDM. This limited survey of four books impress that GDM has been forgotten outside a circle of

dedicated teachers in Japan. Bill Templer deepens this impression writing that GDM has “disappeared totally from the radar screens of the EFL profession” and refers to this disappearance in the “standard works” by Crystal, Carter, and Nunan and McKay published in the years 1995, 2001 and 2002 (Templer 2005). In 2002 Terry Eagleton writes of the developer of EP/GDM: “[Richards] published some founding, now forgotten texts in modern methods of language teaching”. Eagleton also writes that the publication of Richards’s Selected Works is “an intellectual event of some magnitude” (Eagleton), beginning and ending the somewhat disparaging and inaccurate [2] account with words of praise.

I.A. Richards’s work suffers from neglect in fields other than EFL/ESL as Terry Eagleton [3] and Anne E. Berthoff [4] point out. The disappearance of GDM and neglect of Richards are a great loss to teachers and learners. Berthoff writes “Richards was one of the greatest teachers of the twentieth century... [who]... more than any other literary critic, educational theorist, linguist, or philosopher, can help us reclaim teaching as an intellectually challenging enterprise” (Richards: ix-xi). These are both convincing reasons to take a look at the materials and methods Richards developed over decades. Berthoff’s account of Richards is more respectful than Eagleton’s and her broad treatment (very helpful if not without an occasional miss) [5] is less likely to drive a teacher away from considering the EP materials, GDM, and their “forerunner” Basic English. [6]

### 4. OGDEN’S BASIC ENGLISH AND LINGUA FRANCA (ELF) NEEDS

Basic English (BE) was designed by Charles Ogden in the 1920s to address the same need and dynamic that lit up the blogosphere in 2008. Michael Erard’s article in New Scientist inspired blog posts of interest to English teachers (Newitz, Little). The recent revelations echo Richards and Ogden’s discussion of Basic. Annalee Newitz writes “I want English to be a communications tool” while at the same time professing to “relish the prospect of my language changing and becoming incomprehensible to me”. The utility of an incomprehensible communications tool is questionable. One wonders if the great writers of India (Arundhati Roy, Vandana Shiva...), Nigeria (Chinua Achebe, Chris Abani, Ben Okri, Wole Soyinka...) and the Philippines (Walden Bello...) figure in the discussion of fragmenting “Englishes”. Ogden’s Basic English is “more than a Word List... more even than an international medium, a world language of affairs... it aims at being... an introduction, for all the intelligences of the planet... to the human civilized tradition with all its riches”. As with all of Richards’s work, Ogden’s design of Basic was meant to be “an introduction which by its order, method, and lucidity, will itself supply a sound training and discipline for the mind” (Richards 1993: 58). These aims for English language education are worthier than vague concepts of “communicative competence” for the thoughtless cubicle workers, resort tourists and mall consumers featured in CC.

As helpful as Newitz’s, another 2008 blog cites Jürgen Benke of the University of Hildesheim: “The vast majority of interactions in English are between non-native speakers - as many as 80 per cent” (Little). During

World War II Richards wrote “English of some sort will be everywhere in the classrooms of the world as soon as the war ends”(Richards 1945: 11). In the same wartime publication, *Learning Basic English*, Richards writes that the need felt by “these peoples[non-native speakers]” is “not necessarily for communications with us, the English-speaking peoples. We are not quite as preponderant a part of the population on this planet as we are sometimes fond of thinking...[but for]... improved mental means of communications, with one another even more than with us”(Richards 1945: 11). While fully agreeing with the sentiment “I want English to reflect the lives of the people who speak it”(Newitz) we can also work for a mutually intelligible communication tool. Without mutual intelligibility language does not work as an instrument for communication. The rediscovery of “English as Lingua Franca(ELF)”(Graddol: 87) should lead to a rediscovery of BE along with EP/GDM. Ogden and Richards are clear on their principles of design. These principles are a good fit for rational, intelligible participation in “planetary affairs” among people working on a basis of mutual comprehension. Ogden’s BE and Richards’s GDM work at easing the task of learning language, and of using language more precisely. ELF concerns may be radical but they are not new.

While writing a chapter on “Definition” in their classic *The Meaning of Meaning* (1923) Ogden and Richards noticed that “there might be a limited set of words in terms of which the meanings of all other words might be stated”. Four years later “it was clear that a restricted English... confined to some number of words between 500 and 1,000” would be able to serve “as an adequate general medium for all affairs”. The 3 interacting principles that came out in the search for this “limited language” within “Ordinary Current English” are that it 1) be an all-purpose language, 2) “conform to current English Usage” having nothing to interfere with “a more complete mastery of English”, and 3) be “as limited in vocabulary and as simple, intelligible, and regular in syntax as is compatible with these other aims”(Richards 1993: 48-50). This is no computer-driven, brute-force frequency count to push publisher interest in perpetual reader purchases. “Basic is not just a word-list; it is a clarified system of coherent uses of its words... [with]... their arrangement in and order of maximum intelligibility and lucidity”(ibid.: 57). These are grand claims for the Basic list and materials which could use a redesign in presentation (words written in caps are hard to read)[7] and in other areas that Richards would come to see and point out later(Richards 1968a: 261-265). However the Basic approach and core concepts remain vital for ELF and the first stages of learning English. The key idea that made “the discovery of Basic English possible” was “the replacement of other verbs” by the Basic operators(Richards 1993: 54). Though he made adjustments in his view of BE later, Richards remained steadfast as far as EIL/EFL teaching is concerned, “an immensely strong case can be made for this extremely drastic restriction of verbs as a design for early stages in learning English as a second language”(Richards 1968b: 262).

Ogden’s Basic English system limits verbs to 18 “operators”. [8] This preserves the structure of “normal”, “fuller”, “complete” English. The benefits of Basic are apparent in Annalee Newitz’s example of “I walked to the store”. She suggests that the past tense has to go into the “ashcan of history” along with “native English speak-

ers”. [9] Again the precise writings of people(Arundhati Roy, Chris Abani...) from non-native English speaking countries(India, Nigeria...) come to mind. Apparently the past tense is not necessary in “most popular languages like the many dialects of Chinese” that “express” tense with an additional word such as “yesterday”. Newitz’s example is “I walk to the store yesterday”. While “-ed” endings are hard for non-natives to hear Richards suggests, more generally, that finding verbs in English sentences is hard and that “it is agreed that our verbs offer the chief difficulty to anyone learning our language”(Richards 1993: 54). With only 16 verbs, the larger difficulty of verb recognition is assuaged along with the more minor details of aural comprehension for “-ed” endings. “I walked to the store” becomes “I went to the store”. The past tense of “go” is easily distinguished from its present tense and there is no need to consider the use of “walk” as a noun or “store” as a verb. If it is important to express the mode of transportation, Basic rules might suggest adding “on foot” or “by walking” to distinguish the method from running or driving or taking a train(EP Book 2: 63). While languages in China may hang together as organic wholes without verb tense, the tenses help with effective communication in English.

In 1939 to the Royal Society of Arts Richards speaks of his experience with “higher learning studies in Chinese universities”: “My students... longed to understand Henry James, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, Katherine Mansfield and above all, Marcel Proust, while... they enjoyed only a hazy perception of the duties of English tenses, and solidly resisted any temptation to employ them”. Remarkably like Newitz’s five year old example of “I walk to the store yesterday,” his seventy-four year old example is “Yesterday, I go...”. Richards may seem harsh saying of his Chinese students that “the conditional was a meaningless form for them... You might think that fact added a certain mystery to the reading of Proust - but what was one mystery among so many?... these students... were nobly aspiring to the highest without even a modest competence in the elements”. This seems disparaging, but the next paragraph details his “other chief impression... of the extraordinarily fine quality of these students’ minds... [they] seem to me the most indomitable resolvers of clotted chaos and the most active creators of intellectual order to be seen at work in the world”(Richards 1993: 51). This is high praise from a premier poetry critic that ten years earlier writes that “the value of a passage frequently hangs upon this internal order among its contributory meanings” and that “... a mind is valuable, not because it possesses sound ideas, refined feelings, social skill and good intentions, but because these admirable things stand in their proper relations to one another... this order... and the discernment of this order... [is] necessary for understanding”(Richards 1929: 312-313). In all his activities, from working as a “teacher of elementary reading or of Shakespeare” to working as instructional designer for the first stages of EFL, Richards refused to take the easy escape and “blame ‘native stupidity’ or a low I.Q. [rather] than faulty method in teaching”(Richards 1955: 93). This formulation fortifies a teacher to work with the products of English teaching in Japanese schools.

Richards’s criticism of a French Canadian boy with five years of studying English; “Him, he is equally glad, one feels sure, to see come the end of this essay because it procure him a chance to go back to his native language

and relax”(Richards 1945: 51-52),[10] first impresses as prejudice towards non-native speakers. This impression fades upon seeing that he does the same with writing from “the products of the most expensive kind of education”(Richards 1929: 292) in Cambridge. Of a Cambridge honors student he writes “This reader writes to me, ‘I visualize everything otherwise, things mean little to me,’ developing by an accident of punctuation a criticism I would not be so rude as to make”(ibid.: 128). As Yuzuru Katagiri comments in his precise Basic English writing, reading Richards requires that the “reader... give thought to what he or she is reading. It’s rewarding”(Richards 1993: xi). It is a concern for the “level of general imaginative life... when contemporary social and economic conditions betray us”(Richards 1929: 300-301) that drive these sarcastic exposures of bewilderment among both ESL/EFL learners and native-speaking “products of our present methods of studying English [who] have not learned to read”. His instructional designs from the earliest stages of reading and language learning to the latest (PhD. and Professor) stages of “training in careful interpretation” all share the same goal, to “accustom readers to distinguish between guessing at the meaning of a passage and looking for it seriously”(Richards 1968b: 255). Simply replacing “readers” with “ESL learners” and “passage” with “word”(or “structure”) provides the aim of EP/GDM. Anybody who has seen the various uses of “enjoy” that appear in the simple comments of Japanese ESL students will see the need for taking words more seriously, for developing an attentive attitude toward word use. The ability to see these same issues both at the the most basic levels of language learning and among the denizens of the highest status universities is what Terry Eagleton calls Richards’s “latent radical edge”(Eagleton: 3).

## 5. PRESCIENT METHOD, ELF AND THE HUMANITIES

In 1945, Richards prefigures what David Graddol calls “the most radical and controversial approach to emerge in recent years”. Graddol’s British Council book explains that “proponents of teaching English as a Lingua Franca (ELF)” have an approach that “squarely addresses” the way English teaching should “reflect the needs and aspirations of the ever-growing number of non-native speakers who use English to communicate with other non-natives”(Graddol: 87). The ELF sentiment echoes Newitz’s wish that English should “reflect the lives of the people who speak it” but is hard to reconcile with her joy at the idea of “my language changing... [to and beyond the point of] becoming incomprehensible to me”. Not being the language of any one person, country, or culture is good for a “World English” but the relished prospect of incomprehensibility denies the utility of a lingua franca. Mutual intelligibility is important for people aspiring to communicate with one another. The use of English for communication, even on the Internet, will have to rely on “structures of thought derived from the meaning of words”(Lapham) and “systematic exploration”(Richards 1968a: 17) of “lines of reason”(Lapham) rather than the pantheon of glossy celebrities found in CC. Developed out of Ogden’s Basic English the “self-correctible” approach of GDM, where learners check their understanding of sentence-situations with a pictorial “notation” promises to be of help in mutual comprehension, not to mention problem solving at all levels(Polya: 59).

Contact with the “scientific method”(Richards 1968a: 121) while learning English will be of help in “the rise of Internet English” with its “simple English of technical manuals”(Newitz) and the new media’s tendencies toward “joint use of pictorial and verbal [etc.] notations”(Richards 1968a: 17). In teaching and learning English systematically and experimentally, GDM offers an opportunity to learn the classics, the chance for “maturing such views”(Richards 1955: 61) as a good education in the humanities once offered. As Paul Goodman suggests in *Growing Up Absurd*, “The experimental method is classic and chastens and unites us, but it must not be taught as a laboratory exercise not in a course in logic, but rigorously applied to some real practical behavior”(Goodman 1960: 274). In 1947 Richards faced the same dangers for “exposed minds” that the Internet poses today: “communications... have suddenly expanded beyond anyone’s power to foresee the consequences... how are we to get teachers able to give their pupils any power to select from the influences to which they become ever more open?” Like ELF, the need for radical decisions about relevance to our human concern are not new.

EP/GDM offers help at a deeper level than online shopping and technological exchange. Of particular importance when using the Internet is “the critical selection of the relevant and its separation from the accidental”(Richards 1968: 17). This key skill, the aim of the humanities and literature studies, is eroding in the multimedia, multitasking environment. Nicholas Carr and Douglas Rushkoff write of the alarms sounded by neuroscientists that Internet users, especially the supposedly net-acclimated and multitasking-adept college students, are becoming “less deliberate... less able to think and reason out a problem”(Jordan Grafman of the National Institute Neurological disorders and Stroke). Rather than learning to discern the relevant we are “training our minds to pay attention to crap”(Clifford Nass quoted in Carr 2010: 140-142). This growing inability to distinguish between the irrelevant and the relevant, the empty calories from the necessary nutrition, explains the popularity of glossy CCs with their soft-drink product placements and the neglect of EP with its un-neurotic pictures and clear learning design. Teaching English as a common auxiliary language linked to the humanities as with EP/GDM offers more than the jargon, newsbites, branded colas, celebrities and shopping of the multimedia environment and CC/CA.

## 6. COMMERCIAL COURSEBOOK AND COMMUNICATIVE APPROACH (CC/CA) FAILURE

Before 1945, Richards was asking “why every major country in the world has adopted English in its school program as the first foreign language to be studied” and suggests that it is “not because other countries love us or our language especially well”(Richards 1945: 10). The reason for adoption is that people “see clearly and in hard, practical, realistic terms that they need a common language... better means of communication”(Richards 1945: 10-11). It is hard to accept that this need was forgotten for more than 50 years until Jürgen Beneke of the University of Hildesheim and David Graddol of The British Council rediscovered the vast numbers of non-native English speakers and ELF. Richards writes of non-native speaker

needs for ELF in *Learning Basic English*, a publication for native speakers of the language. For non-native speakers the need is for “improved mental means of communications, with one another” (Richards 1945: 11). This view is the same as that of the twenty-first century revelations of Beneke and Graddol. Other aspects of the need for, and teaching of, English seem virtually unchanged since Richards wrote in the first half of the last century. More than 60 years after Richards observes that “on current teaching practice, years of study don’t get most of the students anywhere” (Richards 1945: 11), Graddol writes “although EFL has become technologised, and has been transformed over the years by communicative methods, these have led only to a modest improvement in attainment by learners” (Graddol 83). *Story of Stuff* creator Annie Leonard’s statements about designs for dissatisfaction and Japanese business writer Yukio Noguchi’s admonitions not to get caught up in supply-side, industry-instigated feelings of crisis and need are relevant when contemplating CC/CA.

Graddol suggests that EFL was “designed to produce failure” (Graddol: 83). Richards noticed failure in education at all levels after “decades of experience” teaching native speakers of English at Cambridge and Harvard universities. He was “saying that these products of our present methods of studying English have not learned to read” and illustrating the observation with a PhD. and a book from “a famous university press” (Richards 1968b: 254-257). Richards managed to live and work for decades in Cambridge and Harvard without decrying George Orwell’s insight about “literary censorship in England” in remarks that were meant to introduce *Animal Farm* (Chomsky 2000: 125-126; Chomsky 1994: 88-89). Richards offers little evidence that he noticed what lead to Chomsky’s observation about a “good education” at Harvard: “the real point of the whole thing was socialization: teaching the right values” (Chomsky 2002: 238). The real point was Orwell’s “general tacit agreement that ‘it wouldn’t do’ to mention that particular fact” (Chomsky 1994: 88). Richards doesn’t seem to think that the production of bewildered and dependent individuals and not self-reliant and effectively capable people is the goal of present methods of studying English. Reflexive conformity leads to failure in learning from direct experience and observation.

The scripted conformity of Orwell’s “literary censorship” and Chomsky’s “socialization” are the source of mis-readings due to “stock response” that Richards ridicules in *Practical Criticism*. Richards is naive compared with Orwell and Chomsky. Other than claiming the prophet Amos for language study [11] the only obvious sign of “meditation on the sources of power” (Richards 1955: 203) by Richards is in an argument to include a mis-read play of Shakespeare’s (*Troilus and Cressida*) in a course of General Education [12] that includes Homer and Plato. [13] Richards seems to have forgotten the opium wars in his comparison of concern shown for the “linguistic imperialism” of Basic English with concern for “the cigarette habit [that] came into China though English-speaking people’s enterprise” (Richards 1945: 11). Almost 70 years later we have the benefit of “the critical discernment so brilliantly exercised by Chomsky... turned to more pressing linguistic tasks” (Richards 1993: 249) and to “field work in comparative ideology” (Richards 1929: 6) when the man writes of free trade, tobacco, and

the war on drugs (Chomsky 2002: 376; Chomsky 2000: 150-151). Richards’s inattentiveness to power explains how he is able to dedicate decades [14] to beginning language instruction as a way of producing “effectively capable people” without suspecting that the reigning methods of education may “have historically evolved to produce perceived failure” (Graddol 83). Orwell and Chomsky could have helped him overcome being puzzled about why his work in early education was not as well received as his work in elite literature. (Richards 1991: 14-15). Graddol’s writing suggests that non-elite English education is designed to produce perceived failure, just as advertising methods are designed to produce “perceived obsolescence” (Leonard: 11) among viewers on the squirrel wheel [15] of shopping and work. The content and style of CCs unite the perception of ESL’s design for perceived failure with the recognition of advertising’s aim for perceived obsolescence. The classroom should not contribute to commercial culture and its production of low self-esteem among potential learners. Media critic Douglas Rushkoff wonders if rather than learning from “the limited nature of our stupidities” and the fact that “few people ever commit a new and original misunderstanding” (Richards 1955: 77) marketers prefer the ease of manipulating a muddled and constantly consuming population.

## 7. MEDIA, RELEVANCY, AND NEEDED ATTENTION

Douglas Rushkoff questions today’s cognitive styles, as does Edward Tufte. Almost plagiarizing the title of Nicholas Carr’s famous article in *The Atlantic* (2008) Rushkoff quotes neuroscientist Gary Small “There’s some question about whether Google might be making us stupid. That we’re becoming less thoughtful... that we don’t slow down and go into issues in depth” (Rushkoff 2013). This inability to read (and think) slowly enough for understanding to take shape encourages the lack of skepticism that allows cursory acceptance of ineffective textbooks, warring states, nuclear power, and other triumphs of advertising bureaucracies. Jordan Grafman, head of the cognitive neuroscience unit at the National Institute Neurological disorders and Stroke, argues that the more you multitask the “more likely [you are] to rely on conventional ideas and solutions rather than challenging them with original lines of thought” (Carr 2010: 140). These concerns appear in Richards 1929 work on “the contemporary state of culture” (Richards 1929: 3) which connects the “widespread inability to construe meaning” to “stock responses” in “which usual meanings reappear when they are not wanted”.

Richards, in his treatment of stock responses, muses that “if we want a population easy to control by suggestion we shall decide on a repertory of suggestions it shall be susceptible to and encourage this tendency except in the few” (ibid.: 294-295). Using an approach taken from psychology, Richards is writing in 1929 about the “protocol writers,” made up mostly of Cambridge University students. The “protocol” writings are about their responses to a variety of unsigned poems. As our “repertory” of “conventional ideas and solutions” is increasingly limited it is harder and harder to be “challenging with original lines of thought” and do what Kenzaburo Oe quoting Simone Weil urges - to become “attentive people”. EP/GDM is

the result of decades of effort at designing exercises to extend the “span or grasp of attention” and encourage the development of self-reliant thinkers (Richards 2004: 80). These efforts are as relevant in today’s Internet age as they are in any other age.

In today’s attention-amputating media ecology Richards’s realizations are essential for education. Good math teachers also exhibit Richards’s principles which drove the development of GDM. The same exacting discipline [16] in obeying “a fundamental of design” which is “Cut out the distracting” (Richards 1968a: 13) is seen in straightforward math textbooks. In 1964 Richards comments that “What is distractive is commonly what teachers have learned from publishers to call ‘attractive’ (Richards 1993: 237). One imagines that he would be shocked to see not only current textbooks, but the ease with which teachers can “automagically” [17] generate equally distracting materials with computers and office software. Conscientious teachers seem to viscerally reject the irrelevant and distracting.

## 8. GOOD TEACHING REJECTS THE IRRELEVANT

Serge Lang’s mathematics books warrant comparison to EP materials. Like Charles Ogden and Richards with vocabulary in the first stages of English, Lang and Gene Murrow see that “pruning” (Lang 1983: xxii; Lang 1971: x) is necessary in mathematics. The two math teachers share with Ogden and Richards a faith in learners and an aim of developing analytic reasoning. In *Geometry* Lang and Murrow write: “We believe that most young people have a natural sense of reasoning. One of the objectives.. is to develop and systematize this sense”. The plain, black-and-white math textbooks by these authors feature line drawings (like EP, strong figures on an empty ground) which seek to “bring out clearly all the important points which are used in subsequent mathematics, and which are usually drowned in a mass of uninteresting trivia” (Lang 1983: xx). They focus on “differences that make a difference” and are concerned with the “organic sequence” (Richards 1993: 219) of math studies: “The inclusion of these topics relates the course to the mathematics that precedes and follows” (Lang 1983: xx). Lang’s observation regarding theorems could be applied to vocabulary; “I am always disturbed to see endless chains of theorems... without any stress on the main points. As a result, students do not remember the essential features of the subject” (Lang 1971: x). I am always disturbed to see endless lists of vocabulary... without any stress on the most necessary words. As a result, students do not remember the essential features of the language. Studying long word lists resembles the memorization of trivia, unconnected to overall comprehension the memories are useless for developing effective capacity. Vocabulary lists trivialize the language and the learner.

Trivia, in addition to its other dangers, curtails comprehension of the essentials of English. Japanese university students with well-worn dictionaries and book-marked vocabulary books on their desks respond to “How are you?” with “How are you?” They display the “rivalry” or “interference” of stock Japanese phrases used in greeting situations. These students write of their impressions of class with “enjoy,” as a single word or in a sentence

which reveals no understanding of the different forms the word takes when working as a verb or an adjective. Like Richards, math writer Lang appreciates the intrinsic incentive for learning; “it should be a source of pleasure to understand why a mathematical result is true” (ibid.: xi). Language learners should enjoy seeing for themselves how a word works in a situation. Like Richards, Lang thinks children should be given more opportunities for mental development. Richards sees future successful reading of Shakespeare dependent on successful first steps in reading. These initial steps in education encourage more confident exploration and less desperate guessing. Glossy CCs discourage independence from commercial offerings and encourage more desperate consumption. Lang, like Richards, wants to get an early start with learning processes which will make advanced studies possible: “what better practice is there with negative numbers than to introduce at once coordinates in the plane as a pair of numbers, and then deal with the addition and subtraction of such pairs, component wise? This introduction could be made as early as the fourth grade, using maps as a motivation” (ibid.: x). Comparisons of thoughtful teachers’ approaches and thoughtful media criticisms reveal common ground. These comparisons should inform our choices as teachers. Sane practices in other fields reveal relevancies for the field our own craft.

## 9. MEDIA, CRITICS, HEALTH, AND RELEVANCY

It is no surprise to find helpful relevancies in the writings of critics, whether of literature like Richards or of media like Rushkoff. For the critic “after all, relevancies are his lifelong study” (Richards 1955: 16). On today’s media environment Douglas Rushkoff cites Cliff Nass, director of Stanford University’s Communication Between Humans and Interactive Media Lab, that multitasking college students are “terrible at ignoring irrelevant information. They’re terrible at keeping information in their heads nice and neatly organized” (Rushkoff 2013). For learners and teachers immersed in this media environment, the coherent design of EP/GDM is a great help. With situations and sentences in “their arrangement in an order of maximum intelligibility and lucidity”, EP/GDM is a response as necessary today as it was in the 1920s (Richards 1993: 57). Today’s “hopeless little screens” [18] are smaller and more ubiquitous than ever. Richards comments in humanistic education and the mass media are easily applied to the branded texting and social networking services today.

Richards writes of the mass media: “for well-known and chiefly technical reasons, Radio, TV and the screen propagate most successfully the most superficial, the most facile, and the least educating elements of a culture” [19] Like the information streams reflexively checked every few minutes today, for six decades attentive critics have noticed of commercial-driven media that with “no time for what they present to be deeply pondered, thought over, returned to and considered afresh... it rarely is worth such reconsideration”. Instead of “the things which received the most lasting and recurrent attention” as “continuous shaping forces” of culture we are exposed to “incessantly shifting play of light and confusing impacts” (Richards 1955: 62). The classroom should not further attempts to cut notches into learner minds with confusing impacts and irrational icons (Saslow, Ellis, and Freeman).

What are these classic things of value in every culture that might “help in seeing life steadily and seeing it whole”(Richards 1955: 62), and are any of them present in current coursebooks (CC)? A quick glance at coursebook product placement (for a textbook example see the 2 liter soft drink bottle in Ellis: 21 and shopping cart and shelf in Freeman: 51) reveals that, rather than avoid distraction they extend confusing impacts into the classroom. Rather than provide self-reliant learning strategies CCs corrupt classrooms with commercials: full of celebrities and soft-drinks they are malnourished collections of vacant heads and empty calories. The books are devoid of humanistic concern for exposed minds and exploratory learning. Rather than amplify the top iconic impacts(Saslow, Freeman, Ellis) of “the most superficial, most facile and least educating elements” of the mass media, classrooms should provide opportunities to explore deeper, universal ways of seeing. Universal values of the humanities should inform choices in teaching method and instructional materials.

### **10. UNIVERSAL DESIGN PRINCIPLES: SEEING ART AND SCIENCE, MATH AND LANGUAGE**

Bringing to mind Richards’s *Poetries and Sciences* Edward Tufte writes “Science and art have in common intense seeing, the wide-eyed observing that generates empirical information”. Tufte suggests that “The principles of analytical thinking (and thus analytical design) are universal - like mathematics, the laws of Nature, the deep structure of language - and are not tied to any language, culture, style, century, gender or technology of information display”[20](Tufte 2006: 9) The information design expert’s work applies understanding of human perception, an understanding based on work in art and science. One application of this understanding is the muting, or complete removal, of distracting background elements such as grids(Tufte 1990: 58-64) and stereotypes(ibid. 34). Tacky newspaper graphics and PowerPoint slides, both emanating from what Tufte calls a corrosively corrupting “pitch culture”, furnish the shallow (bad) examples for analysis (ridicule) in Tufte’s books. His worthy examples “are widely distributed in space and time”(Tufte 2006: 10) and suggest that, like Serge Lang in mathematics, a 20th century teacher and literary critic may have hit upon universal principles for “instructional engineering”. Richards is deeply concerned with the principles of “intellectual rectitude” (grounded thinking and relevance). Over the decades he discovers a design for teaching that, with “minimal contrasts”, shows the “differences that make a difference”(Tufte 1990: 65). Minimal Contrast is one of the key words for explaining EP/GDM. Minimal Contrast, what Tufte calls “the smallest effective difference” in GDM is the pairing of words or sentences in which their differences are clearly seen in context. The materials and method encourage the teacher to become a choreographer of contexts that present rather than explain the language.

The austere design of the *Language Through Pictures* materials come to mind as Tufte explains: “Many of our examples suggest that clarity and excellence in thinking is very much like clarity and excellence in the display of data. When principles of design replicate principles of thought, the act of arranging information becomes an

act of insight”(Tufte 1997a: 10). Yuzuru Katagiri notes that Richards goal was to replace habit with insight. The one-page units of meaning in EP allow the learner to develop insight into the workings of new words as the sentences vary in the developing situations. Only the relevant elements of the situation appear in the line drawings. Like recent writers of books on office presentation software(Atkins: Reynolds) Richards was acquainted with channel theory (the eye and the ear working together). Unlike recent presentation gurus, Richards forgoes the gloss and his “pictorial literacy” reflects the “core principle of graphical analysis”(Janert) revealed in a book about free software.

Richards’s (and Tufte’s) principles seem simple, but are exacting to apply. In a field other than Lang’s mathematics and Richards’s language, Phillip Janert restates the simple but exacting idea “the core principle of graphical analysis: Plot exactly what you want to see!”. Instruction designers, whether in the field of math or language, wrestle with the same issues; how to present the “essential features” for learners to discover and remember. As in the fields of math and language, a craftsperson looking for lessons from data will search for “the form that brings out its most important features most clearly,”(Janert: 274) bringing to mind the choices of Lang from among theorems and the choices of Ogden/Richards from among words. Data analysts may even realize that the crucial feature is not the data itself “but the difference between two data sets, so that we should plot this difference instead,” bringing to mind the use of pictures in EP. Textbook designers with the aim of learning are concerned not with the picture itself (and the products placed in it) but with the differences between pictures in a sequence (and the language working in it). Textbook page design should bring out the language’s “most important features most clearly.”

### **11. SEEING COMPARISONS NOT CLUTTER, DENSITY OVERCOMES COMPLEXITY**

EP1 teaches three tenses at once with four pictures on a single page. The confusion and clutter seen among the future, present progressive, and past tenses in the minds of EFL learners is probably due to failure of instructional design, not due to attributes of the English language or foreign learners. The four-picture, one-page narrative design of EP exemplifies that “the point is to find design strategies that reveal detail and complexity – rather than fault the data[language] for an excess of complication”[21](Tufte 1990: 53). Getting this complexity (three tenses at once) into one eye-span is in keeping with principles of information design and human perception. “Visual displays rich with data are not only an appropriate and proper complement to human capabilities, but also such designs are frequently optimal”(ibid.: 50). For learning tenses “the task is contrast, comparison, and choice... [so] the more relevant information within eye-span, the better”(ibid. 50). Both in the field of close reading and interpretation, and in the field of literacy and second language learning, Richards was always concerned that learners see for themselves. So it is no surprise that his iterations produced “high-density designs... [which] allow viewers to select, to narrate, to recast and personalize data[language] for their own uses”(ibid.: 50). Recasting and personalizing the situations and sentence structures



from the EP pages is what teachers and learners do with GDM. The control of the language is given over to learners not to publishing corporations and education ministries.

Language-thin, forgetful textbooks move learners toward ignorance and passivity, and at the same time diminish the credibility of the teacher and school.[22] A key point in Tufte's work is the importance of getting all the relevant information, no matter how complex and dense into one eye-span. Since Tufte's examples, arising out of universal principles of analytic thinking, span vast ranges of space and time it is not surprising that, immersed in the humanities - universal studies of relevance to the human concern, Richards writes in a similar vein in 1924. Twenty years before EP1, *Principles of Literary Criticism* features a complex diagram with the disclaimer: "The essential service which pictures can give in abstract matters, namely, the simultaneous and compact representation of states of affairs which otherwise tend to remain indistinct and confused, is worth the slight risk of misunderstanding which they entail"(Richards 1930: 117). Regardless of the effectiveness of the "diagram, or hieroglyph" depicting "the experience of reading a poem" in this early work he shows an early grasp of the issues seen in modern data visualization work. The EP1 pictures are effective. They are designed for self study but they help teachers design contexts (a sequence of situations) that put words to work in sentences. The four-picture pages focus on the relevant elements most in need of attention for growth of the language in learners' minds. EP/GDM provides training in comparison and relevancy.

EP page elements are relevant because they show how sentences change with pictures of a changing situation. Contemporary coursebooks (CC), both international and Japanese, feature "adventitious jolly-up or sugar-coating." They bury the "essential features" in commercial trivia (glossy pictures of popular music, movies and fashions) and "secondary elements". CC designers must be incapable of going back to Coleridge to see that it is the joy of analytical reasoning that motivates learning. It is "the pleasurable activity of mind excited by the attractions of the journey itself" that motivates; not the titillating bits of celebrity placed on a page like snacks into a performing dog's mouth. Sounding like recent Alfie Kohn, Richards quotes Coleridge and Hobbes to support his point; "the sovereign incentive for all learning is the learner's awareness of his[or her] own growing power"(Richards 1968a: 25-26). It is not the extrinsic allure of consumer goods and fashionable consumption in CC, but the intrinsic pleasure of growing mental powers that motivate decent learning in the classroom. EP helps with the "critical task of diagnosis" needed to overcome the "sense of helplessness" resulting from the intentionally disorienting effects of commercial culture. CC can not help orient learners in the language while perpetuating a gape-mouthed view of individual consumers enthralled in a global Gruen Transfer.

## 12. NEUROSCIENCE AND COMMERCIAL ATTENTION

Recent neuroscience questions how aware multitaskers are of their mental powers. Rushkoff asks "what does it mean if we multitaskers are actually fooling ourselves into believing we're competent when we're not?"(Rushkoff 2013) One answer for the classroom is

that it makes learning more difficult. Learner's may feel that they can communicate in English after mastering "It's not my thing" or "I would never wear that" from CCs but what are they actually able to say with those structures? The neuroscientists quoted in Rushkoff and Nicholas Carr's work present the effects of our media ecology as a global Gruen Transfer. The disorienting Gruen Transfer technique developed out of the shopping mall introduced by architect Victor Gruen in the 1950s. Originally meant to address needs once met by a community's functioning Main Street, the shopping mall came to provide an environment for marketers to discover ways of confusing consumers. Shoppers at the mall "stimulated by sound and light... were distracted from their daily worries". This raises questions about CC modeling their approach on and presenting the features of shopping malls(Ellis, Freeman, Graves).

With CC, stimulated by gloss and color, learners are distracted from the essential features of the language. Like fashion magazines, touch tablets, and the search engine experience, CC are not designed to facilitate close reading and deep learning. CC reflect commercial-driven culture and its "ecosystem of interruption technologies"(Corey Doctorow quoted in Carr 2010: 91) on the Internet. Mall researchers working for what architect Victor Gruen came to call "fast buck promoters and speculators" use video cameras to find ways "to disorient consumers". With cameras it was possible to identify the moment when "the jaw dropped, the eyes glazed over, and the shopper's path through the mall became less directed... when a person changes from a customer with a particular product in mind to an undirected impulse buyer"(Rushkoff 2011: 78-79). Mall tenants may prefer confused consumers(Rushkoff 2011: 79) and marketers thoughtless multitaskers(Rushkoff 2013) but can teachers settle for materials that encourage gape-mouthed learners to be undirected and impulsive, ignorant and passive?(Tufte 2006: 169) Commercial driven and manipulated development is not compatible with the humanistic vision of the self-regulated mind able to make judgments about relevancy, to participate in and take control of the self-governing society.

"Memory consolidation" and decent learning are not attained by extending the undirected "cool consumer worldview"(Edmundson) from the shopping mall and on-line browsing into the classroom with coursebooks. After talking with neuroscientists and interactive media researchers Rushkoff concludes: "We're not just stupid and vulnerable on-line - we simultaneously think we're invincible." Encouraging the gape-mouthed stupidity seen on CC pages is not conducive to learning. The on-line attitude of invincibility has "massive carryover"(Rushkoff 2013) into the classroom. As a teacher of the humanities at the University of Virginia notes of students in 1997, meandering in malls, skimming over screens, and coasting through coursebooks deprives learners of opportunities "to acknowledge what would be their most precious asset for learning: their ignorance"(Edmundson). Incompetence and the desire to overcome it should be an incentive in education. Learning requires time, attention and effort, all of which require worthwhile content.

Seeking to avoid an "unhealthy terror of... ignorance" Richards put his trust in a "direct approach"(Richards 1955: 61). Richards's approach to teaching and learn-

ing is always responding to the question “How self-correctible can we become?” (Richards 1968a: 43). He developed a way to offer the benefits of an education in the humanities and “the study of Literature” through teaching second languages, through “the design of an organic introduction to English” (Richards 1955: 98). Richards is encouraged by changes in “morale”. As mentioned above, David Graddol sees little improvement in “attainment by learners” undergoing EFL/ESL that has been “technologised” and “transformed over the years by communicative methods” (Graddol 83). Richards writes of effects in “the baffled student of English who suddenly finds him[her]self able to use it” (Richards 1955: 98). He sees these effects as comparable to those hoped for from the “deep enough and leisurely enough familiarity with” Literature (ibid.: 61). These effects, the hoped for “peculiar benefits[, are] a steadying of judgment, an enhancement of responsiveness and understanding, a heightened sympathy and self-control” (ibid.: 98). The benefits are all worthy, necessary goals as we attempt to teach and learn, consolidate memories and grow schema, in the midst of a hyperlinked, global Gruen Transfer. Rather than contributing to the distractions and irrelevancies, classrooms and coursebooks should contribute to comprehension and contemplation. This is more than a matter of tighter memories and deeper learning. Contact with actual experience rather than commercial gloss is a matter of mental health.

### 13. SIMPLICITY: HEALTH AND CLASSICS

The no-nonsense pages of Serge Lang’s Mathematics books and the clear designs of Richards’s EP materials reflect Gestalt Therapy author Paul Goodman’s evaluation of other classics: “the Greeks were in many ways psychologically and socially healthier than we. They write with a sharp foreground against an empty background because this is un-neurotic perception; a good Gestalt has an empty background undisturbed by repression” (Goodman 1962: 240). It is no surprise that EP’s spare pages should bring Goodman’s comment on Gestalt and perception to mind. Ogden (1926) and Richards (1930) write of Gestalt psychology from the 1920s. Richards is motivated by mental concerns very different from those of the neurotic, disorienting consumerism of CC.

During his early career in Literature, Richards writes “the critic is as closely occupied with the health of the mind as the doctor with the health of the body” (Richards 1930: 35). Provocations for Gestalt thinking on muted (or removed) distractions occur while comparing EP pages with the aggressively compartmentalized pages of colorized coursebooks (CC). Edward Tufte’s battle against the irrelevant comes to mind while contemplating possible redesigns for CC: “Here various secondary elements are redesigned in accord with the idea of minimal contrasts. Based on universal ideas of figure-ground, ... hierarchical layering, and content-driven design, the strategy of the smallest effective difference applies to all display technologies...” (Tufte 1997a: 74). Irrational content makes CCs irredeemable for education but this “idea of smallest effective difference” provides another standard for judging teaching materials.

EP fosters “un-neurotic perception” of the language. Attention to the “secondary elements” damns CCs produced by corporate bureaucracies, both Japanese and in-

ternational. According to Tufte, the elements to be muted or removed include “...grids, meshes, rules, underlines, frames, boxes, compartments, codes, legends, highlights... fills defining areas and surfaces” (ibid.). This listing of secondary elements accurately describes CC pages. CC texts are not designed to make learning intelligible or clarify the language. “Muting these secondary elements will often reduce visual clutter - and thus help to clarify the primary information” (Tufte 1997a: 74). The primary task of a book designed for learning English is to clarify the language. A “design for failure” rather than clarity, for frantic purchasing rather than exploratory learning drives the “communicative approach” (Walcott: xi) and the “Notional/Functional” (Oshiro: 24) syllabi of CC. This explains the lack of content and neurotic style of the glossy products of corporate bureaucracies.

William H. Walcott, like Ken Oshiro, uses the work of Brumfit and Wilkins in attempts to explain the “communicative approach” (CA) and its “view about syllabus design and justifications” (Walcott: xii). As with the EFL textbooks themselves, reading the theoretical justifications is of great help in understanding *The Principles of Literary Criticism*: “...everybody knows the diminution of energy, the bafflement, the sense of helplessness, which an ill-written, crude, or muddled book, or a badly acted play, will produce, unless the critical task of diagnosis is able to restore equanimity and composure” (Richards 1930: 236). [23] Muddled approaches to language learning produce this same sense of helplessness, fitting for a “philosophy of futility” (Bakan; IMDb). Keeping in mind “at least, nine features which are central to the principles of communicative language teaching” (Brumfit’s formulation in Walcott: xi) while overwhelmed with CC secondary elements makes helping learners difficult.

The overly intricate lists link the communicative approach and its compartmentalized CC to Tufte’s questioning of PowerPoint “Why should the structure, activities, and values of a large commercial bureaucracy be a useful metaphor for our presentations[or our teaching]?” (Tufte 2006: 191) A quick look at any colorful English textbook (CC) casts doubt on the idea that CA and the “notional syllabus” has made communicative publishers “able to organize language teaching in terms of content rather than the form of language” (Wilkins quoted in Walcott: xii). Clothes shopping and fast eating contexts are “the most superficial, the most facile and least educating elements” of corporate globalization. What are the principles driving commercial elements into the classroom? Apparently CC designers see the purpose of classrooms as preparing students for fast food franchises and fashionable clothing stores - situations where language competence is not a great need. With CC designs the work of teachers is readying students to staff the cubicles of transnational business, to consume in global retail chains and to eat in airport food-courts. Connecting CC texts with CA theoretical underpinnings requires seeing “created wants” as “the needs of the learners” and the meeting of “synthetic demand” (Chomsky in Bakan; IMDb) as among the “tasks which are important or essential to their everyday existence” (Walcott: xi). On CC pages advertising, product placement and celebrity are apparent. Helping to further this comparison of CC/CA to EP/GDM, Walcott also writes about Wilkins distinguishing between synthetic and analytic approaches.

GDM falls under neither the synthetic nor the analytic approach. With GDM, learners see complete sentences in appropriate situations. It is not a synthetic approach where “the job of the language learner is that of re-synthesizing language which has been segmented into smaller pieces to encourage ease of learning”. This formulation differentiates vocabulary list memorization from teaching the entire language at once, a distinction that is impossible to avoid. With the analytic approach “learners are exposed to great variety of language structure and are assisted, via gradual approximation, to pattern their language performance more closely to global target language”(ibid.:xiii). Richards speaks of the failures of this approach in 1939 when he is just starting with Basic English and teaching in China. The principles that determine the developments of his ESL/EFL pedagogy are apparent six years before the publication of the first EP book. He speaks of the justification for reducing the number of verbs to sixteen for the first stages of learning ESL. The number of verbs is reduced so that “the range of their uses... can be clearly distinguished and ordered... selected systematically and given... [as]... suited to the learner’s needs”(Richards 1993: 54). This “syntactically lucid” approach aids learner autonomy because “you can only know just what you are doing if the words you are dealing with are very few”(ibid.:55) and of course we “learn by doing” and by seeing what it is we are doing. This sensible approach is clearer than the “notional” approach where learners have no notion of what it is they are doing while they, perhaps, are shopping. Annie Leonard’s *Story of Stuff* may help orient learners as to what it is we are doing: wasting our time and the planet while disoriented by glossy pictures and the “incessantly shifting play of light and confusing impacts”. CCs do not provide for an analytic approach to learning regardless of jargon such as “communicative” (given the health ramifications of CC content and style, why not “communicable”?) and “analytic” in their “theory”, titles, and introductory catch copy.

#### 14. EP/GDM OVERCOMES MARKETING NICHES WITH ELF AND RESPECT

Richards’s experience with “the best young Chinese minds”(Richards 1993: 52) at a university in Peking leads him to reject what Wilkins calls the analytic approach: “In brief, you cannot really help a learner if you allow him to attack the language on too wide a front”(ibid.: 55). While the CA, its notional syllabus and “analytic approach” are not conducive to learning they are successful in positioning “the learner as an outsider, as a foreigner; one who struggles to attain acceptance by the target community”(Graddol 82-83) and in providing a permanent employment policy for native speakers as they “assist... in the gradual approximation”(Walcott: xiii) of “the target language [which] is always someone else’s mother tongue”(Graddol: 82-83).[24] This approach is fitting for the tacky tourism and crass commercialism of CCs, and explains CCs’ chartjunk contempt for the learners and the language(Tufte 1990: 34): “The learner is constructed as a linguistic tourist - allowed to visit, but without rights of residence and required to respect the superior authority of native speakers”(Graddol: 83).

In contrast with CC/CA and in keeping with ELF needs, this is Richards in 1947, writing of ‘The Responsibilities of Teaching English’, on the language chosen for the first stages of English learning: “In actual use

it becomes, in the minds of the learners with different interests, needs, and contacts, a central shared body, a common stem”(Richards 1955: 97). Keeping the focus on discovering the language and learning strategies avoids the intricacies and circularities of questions such as “Can we afford to be relevant?”(Stevick 1980: 117); the question only arises by imagining atomized students as gape-mouthed and drowning in the corporate globalization of commercial culture. Pictures in CCs feature remarkable numbers of gape-mouthed individuals, revealing the corporate view of and target for the intended audience. Rather than agonizing over the choice of CC for consuming teenagers, cubicle workers, or jet-set tourists(Ellis; Saslow; or Freeman) envisioning collective engagement in planetary affairs through ELF overcomes the intricacies of pitching to various niche markets.

Richards’s approach, GDM/EP, healthily steps past the bureaucratic intricacies of CA scrambling to meet a bewildering variety of perceived needs spanning niche marketing in time and space. GDM is “language-centered”(Katagiri: 39). GDM teaching and learning of the first stages of English meets ELF needs. The “central shared body, a common stem” answers to needs of the sort hinted by the Graddol- and Erard-inspired blogger’s comment regarding the evolution of variously unintelligible Englishes. We do not consider the instruments used in mathematics as the dominant notation(Polya: 134) on the planet, or consider math’s notations for problem solving as a form of imperialism. Katagiri cites Paul Russo stating that Richards means the materials to be general enough to avoid offending foreign cultural sensitivities(Katagiri: 141). Richards sees “verbal and pictorial languages... as notations for representing situations”(Richards 1968a: 120-121) which makes his, and Ogden’s work come to mind when reading that “some underlying documents will supply the grammatical glue for these diverse Englishes, the way Koranic Arabic does for the world’s diverse Arabic spin-off tongues”(Newitz). Maintenance of some sort of intelligible integrity will be helpful for users of a lingua franca.

With GDM “an apprehension of the structure of English can be paralleled by a pictorial sequence”. Analogous to the way math has an intelligible notation that serves it users regardless of cultural backgrounds and varying needs, Richards’s use of notations in the learning of ESL encourages “the application of methodical intelligence to language teaching[, learning and use]” and discourages a great number of “the wasted boy-girl hours now being spent in language learning”. This again parallels the work of Richards with that of Serge Lang. Richards writes that “the first stage of English is... a comprehended structure... analogous to a body of elementary mathematical knowledge... incomplete... but supporting and controlling whatever ensues.” He sees this “surprisingly compact” beginning stage of “about 500 words” to be “not... theoretical knowledge: an affair of rules, but concrete skill: a body of understood practice”(Richards 1955: 97). This approach is also in accord with educational reformer and Gestalt therapist, Paul Goodman’s recommendations for learning the “classic” experimental method. Richards saw the goal of teaching language not as producing a better theory of language, but as encouraging better conduct of language(Richards 2004). Better conduct in thinking, learning and teaching requires an attitude of respect for the human mind’s ability to learn.

## 15. LEARNER ATTITUDE

In spite of impressions left by his, at times, sarcastic delivery Richards has faith in students' ability to learn. His work over most of the 20th century strives to show that "there is no such thing as 'difficulty' in the abstract" (Richards 1993: 56). The teacher's work is "to provide opportunities for an extension and refinement of skills which are inexplicably, unimaginably and all-but-triumphantly, successful already". This is true of "the pupil, however stupid and inert he[or she] may seem" (Richards 2004: 18) while immersed in an echo-system of commercial distraction. With "organic sequence" Richards takes his analogy from embryology. The whole determines the parts, earlier steps determine later steps, and vice versa. Some things have to happen before others for healthy growth.

Richards put an early understanding of "path dependency" to work in beneficial applications. In a 2004 book, economist Juliet Schor explains, while discussing a conversation with a "thoughtful advertiser", what path dependency means: "what we do today affects our behavior tomorrow" (Schor: 184). What students learn today affects what they learn tomorrow. Learning is accumulative. Talking with Schor the "thoughtful advertiser", a conflicted single mother repeatedly forced back into the "monstrous" advertising industry says, "There's the problem of kids' palates that never get exposed to healthy foods and thus never develop a taste for them." Product placement in teaching materials featuring fast food and soft drinks do their part in contributing to global epidemics of obesity and diabetes. Other parallels with CC/CA come to mind. "Introducing young children to unhealthy food... can undermine their ability to maintain a healthful diet over the long run" (Schor: 184). Exposing learners to muddled materials containing an unintelligible "variety of language structure" may undermine their ability to maintain "the intrinsic excitement" of learning in the long run.

Shrewd and observant people point to a "path dependency" over generations that has been undermining the ability to follow a narrative, to read well, and to learn well. Richards was born just as advertising began to degrade language use and attention spans. His school teachers were still products of attentive reading. His decades of experience attempting to train stronger attentiveness and better reading started in the 1920s. Neil Postman writes in 1984 that the path of linguistic and mental degradation began in the 1890s with the "non-propositional use of language" and the "massive intrusion of illustrations and photographs" as advertising came into "its modern mode of discourse" (Postman: 60). Later, Norman Mailer drives the argument along writing that the path is paved with not only the misuse of language and photographs in newspapers but also with commercials on television. With the clutter of commercials amputating "any interesting story... the child comes to recognize that concentration is not one's friend but is treacherous... attention... [is] turned inside out." The advertising techniques and commercial content of CCs offer no help for the process of learning or the maintenance of health.

Richards found a way to present a narrative using only seven letters of the alphabet. Instead of teddy bears as ir-

relevant secondary elements (in the JHS Sunshine Course or Ellis: 60) page seven of EP1 uses bears to make intelligible by contrast the words "it", "they", "we", "here", and "there". The appearance of bears has a reason other than cuteness. The few secondary elements that appear on the EP page are muted. There is a thin black horizontal rule across the top of the page. The other two perpendicular lines on the page are dotted lines lightly separating the four, sequenced pictures. EP meets the standards set by today's information design critics. Unlike stereotyped and junky CCs, the stick-figure drawings of the EP materials present a strong figure against an empty ground. The EP presentation is healthy. LP materials are conducive to the process of learning and maintenance of mental health. In contrast, colorful picture-filled materials (CCs) reveal a different attitude toward learners.

Richards's attitude toward learners and language is similar to Edward Tufte's refusal to disdain audiences and information. Edward Tufte comments on information displays produced with the office software products of corporate bureaucracy. "Lurking behind chartjunk is contempt both for information and for the audience... Credibility vanishes in clouds of chartjunk; who would trust a chart that looks like a video game?" (Tufte 1990: 34). Viewing English learning materials from the last decade or so we might ask who would trust a textbook that looks like a fashion magazine? (Saslow 44-51; Freeman 76-81) EFL coursebooks and Japanese JHS texts are heavy with pictures. "Pictures, of course, more pictures and yet more pictures have been the somewhat blind recourse of troubled educators for decades" write Richards and Christine Gibson in a 1957 issue of *English Language Teaching*. "Cosmetic decoration... distorts" and is unable to make up for an "underlying lack of content" writes Tufte (1990: 34) of data charts. The same is true of language learning books - the glossy pictures distort perception of the language and are unable to make up for lack of content.

In the 1970s Douglas Lummis writes of the ideology and humiliating content of "English Conversation" in Japan. He sits in a small class of five female office workers and is embarrassed "to have the impoverishment of ... [his] culture flaunted before people who have reason to know what true culture looks like, especially when there are so many other things in the world so much more worth talking about" (Lummis: 1-2). The shopping situations in CCs and the hot dog stand on the cover of a JHS textbook (*Sunshine 2*) show that the intervening decades have not changed much: "these endless accounts of trips to the drugstore, the supermarket, the drive-in movie, and the hamburger stand" have been merely updated with accounts of food courts, gentrified streets, tourist resorts and clothing stores.

While EP features a clothing store in Book 1 on page 81, there is no product placement of branded goods. Close reading of the book reveals that the clothing store page illustrates the word "get" for the second time. Page 71 illustrates the root sense of "get". This use is widened from taking something from another room to cover buying something in a store on page 80. The situation also serves to present "old" and "new" in a clear comparison among dresses and pipes. The situations present language at work in support of learning not debilitating social comparisons support of the most superficial and least educating elements of commercial culture. The thirty to forty

years since Douglas Lummis writes of Japan's "English Conversation" have simply globalized "America's cultural wasteland". Lummis goes on to mention that, in this surreal world of English Communication, "while there are a few teachers who try to do their job conscientiously, it is generally accepted this isn't necessary"(Lummis: 1-2).

## 16. CONCLUSION

Working towards an education in the humanities with the EP books allows a conscientious teacher to avoid humiliation, to "reclaim teaching as an intellectually challenging enterprise" and to regain an ethos of craftsmanship. Reading Richards brings to mind words from the 1911 book, *Craftsmanship in Teaching*; "to the true craftsman the work that he is doing must be the most important thing that can be done"(Inche in Bagley). Training with GDM teachers in Japan impresses that the conscientious teacher has a design for escape from the degrading commercialism of CC/CA in the ESL/EFL profession. This is the saving grace of EP/GDM: "as you go on with your work, as you increase in skill, ever and ever the fascination of its technique will take a stronger and stronger hold upon you. This is the great saving principle... the factor that keeps the toiler free from the deadening effects of mechanical routine"(Inche in Bagley). CCs make it easy to go through the motions with a technologised communicative approach while contributing to the global Gruen Transfer of corporate commercialism. Having been designed for failure the communicative approach will not disappoint with "attainment by learners". EP/GDM offers the opportunity to make an effort, become a competent choreographer of contexts to help learners to discover the language in a sequence of sentence-situations. The classroom can be a place of "perceived failure" and "created wants" or intrinsic excitement and intellectual growth. Pictures can be a corn syrupy additive to empty content or elements of a pictorial notation making use of comparisons and reasoning abilities.

Length constraints dictate that this paper be a broad stroke treatment of EP/GDM in comparison with CC/CA. This must be a first paper in a series. This treatment of GDM and the contemporary issues it addresses demand detailed comparisons and graphic illustrations of EP/GDM's design principles in contrast to CC/CA's muddled clutter. Further development and illustrations of the points raised here will have to wait for following papers. The arguments demand one eye-span comparisons of the "un-neurotic perception" encouraged by the EP's clear line drawings with the commercial disorientation encouraged by CCs "confusing impacts". Sharing this "critical task of diagnosis" with learners will contribute to their morale as the criticism clears both learner and teachers' minds of the sense of helplessness resulting from the extension of advertising and its inhumane view into classrooms.

## FOOTNOTES

1. Seeing this later connection with the Visual Arts provides strength to the connections among Richards's ethic and works with Edward Tufte's more recent writings on information design and data visualization. The outlook and insights spanning decades are remarkable similar. Recent blog writings by a data

visualization expert comment on a classic in the information design field; "A striking and often overlooked finding in this work is the fact that the group of participants without technical training, "mostly ordinary housewives" as Cleveland describes them, performed just as well as the group of mostly men with substantial technical training and experience. This finding provides evidence for something that I've long suspected: that visualizations make it easier for people lacking quantitative experience to understand your results, serving to level the playing field. If you want your findings to be broadly accessible, it's probably better to present a visualization rather than a bunch of numbers. It also suggests that if someone is having trouble interpreting your visualizations, it's probably your fault"(Messing). If students are having trouble with learning from instructional materials, it's probably the designer's fault.

2. Eagleton's review is of a selection of writings taken from the years between 1919 and 1938 before Richards made the jump from criticism to education. However the views of experience and society misunderstood in Eagleton's article support the design of the EP materials and GDM approach, as Berthoff mentions in her comment that "basic principles of early experiments in practical criticism are discernible in designs Richards was working on forty years later". One example will suffice. "What Richards would need to appeal to here, as with the model of the liberal state, is how far the fulfillment of one's own desires may involve the frustration of other people's...though Richards occasionally gestures in this direction, his model is too individualist to accommodate this social dimension"(Eagleton; 8-9). An early(1925) work, that reads remarkably like Nicholas Carr's recent(2010) book on on-line reading's effects on attention, Richards gestures broadly "We have to recognize that man is a social being, that only by a dehumanizing fiction do we regard him as an individual, and thus that moral questions put in such terms contain a contradiction"(Richards 1935; 41). Similar juxtapositions could be made with Eagleton's treatment of Richards on experience and communication with the books *Principles of Literary Criticism* and *Practical Criticism*.
3. "Of all the great 20th-century critics, I.A. Richards is perhaps the most neglected"(Eagleton: 1)
4. "Despite the accuracy of his sense of what it is we should account for and take account of, Richards has long been neglected."(Berthoff: x)
5. Berthoff dismisses *Principles of Literary Criticism* as a "behavioristic" account that Richards never "disowned but quickly put aside"(Berthoff: xii), which is what he did with the first sentence of the book. Hugh Gaitskell makes an appearance in Berthoff's own helpful selection of Richards writings(ibid.: 12) but with more detail a 1993 selection put together by Yuzuru Katagiri and John Constable. In his 1970 lecture to the American Academy of Arts and sciences, revised and printed in *The Written Word*, Richards explains his reason for modeling that first sentence on the architect Le Corbusier's "A house is a machine to live in." Richards felt that "you should use

a book as something that could perhaps assist you in thinking... trying to see what such and such meanings might be”(Richards 1993: 286-289). He cites with pride Hugh Gaitskell, the head of the British Labor Party in 1959, pointing out that he learned “principles of intellectual rectitude... from the book.” Richards’s account in *Principles of Literary Criticism*, like his collaborator Ogden’s 1926 account in *The Meaning of Psychology*, is closer to *Gestalt Psychology* than behaviorism. Exploring both books makes one regret that Kohler’s apes are not as well known as Pavlov’s dogs. If Kohler’s work and its insights for problem-solving, or heuristics (Polya: 134), was lost to the muddle of exam-based (debased) education, at least Ogden’s conclusions drawn from Pavlov’s overwhelmed and withdrawn dogs would be more helpful than current schooling’s behavioristic (grade score-driven) elements so effectively criticized by Alfie Kohn (1996). The Gestalt concept is important for an understanding of GDM.

6. There is a pdf article available on the Internet, *Empires of the Mind* that accuses Ogden of strangeness (perhaps warranted) and of imperialism (probably unwarranted). Richards writes about the charge of “Cultural Imperialism”, that the “vociferous cries” are not from “these countries [China, Japan, India, Malaya]” but “from sensitive souls in New York or London” and explores the word and Churchill’s use of “empires of the mind” (Richards 1968b) as an exercise in interpretation in another writing. I have not had the chance to read Ngugi Wa Thiongo on the issue but a line from Richards 1970 lecture on “The Written Word” to the American Academy of Arts and Science is relevant. About the “vast numbers who... are faced with learning English as a new language,” he asks “learning it... for what?” Keeping in mind world-wide massive protests directed at corporation-driven globalization and World Bank-enabled dams in India (Aravinda) his conjecture suggests a decent motivation for teaching English. Why do people learn EFL? “Might part of the answer be to compete with and defend themselves from native English speakers?” (Richards 1993: 299) In 1945 Richards was able to quote an Indian newspaper “The Hindu (Madras)” to the effect that meeting non-native speakers halfway with Ogden’s design for an international language is “For the Anglo-Americans... a call for self-conquest and the service of others.”
7. Edward Tufte quotes Josef Albers; “Without going into comparisons and the details, it should be realized that words consisting of only capital letters present the most difficult reading - because of their equal height, equal volume, and, with most, their equal width”. Albers judgment of all-caps follows this explanation; “The concept that ‘the simpler the form of the letter the simpler its reading’ was an obsession of beginning constructivism... This notion has proved to be wrong, because in reading we do not read letters but words, words as a whole, as a ‘word picture.’ Ophthalmology has disclosed that the more the letters are differentiated from each other, the easier is the reading”. He goes on to recommend serif letters as easier reading than sans-serif. The moral that Tufte derives for an “information display strategy” from Albers 1963 writing is that we strive not for simpleness but; “what we seek instead is a rich texture of data, a comparative context, and understanding of complexity revealed with an economy of means” (Tufte 1990: 51). This moral supports Richards’s stick-figures in EP, they are an economy of means to reveal three key English tenses in a “comparative context”. Richards’s decades long concentration on the “comparings” necessary for “comprehending” resulted in a timeless classic for English teaching and learning.
8. On the Basic English word list of 850 words the first 18 words of the first “operations” column are “come, get, give, go, keep, let, make, put, seem, take, be, do, have, say, see, send, may, will” (Richards 1968a: 69-72)
9. Has anyone explored possible parallels with Deaf signers from Deaf families? Oliver Sacks in *Silent Voices* mentions the importance of the small percentage of native sign language user in Deaf communities. Most Deaf people have hearing parents. Their degree of exposure to a living language fully available through their eyes varies widely with their access to Deaf schools and the Deaf community in general. English is not essential for linguistic development among hearing people as sign language is for the Deaf but there may be some parallels to learn from in comparing the situations.
10. This exercise of critical sarcasm is also available online through an extensive site dedicated to Basic English (<http://ogden.basic-english.org/lbe4.html>) The example of delayed dictionary English from a Japanese student forming a sentence for a fire situation is amusing as well. (<http://ogden.basic-english.org/lbe4.html>)
11. However in claiming Amos as the patron saint of “our two great causes: (1) the use and (2) the study of language” (Richards 1968a: 32-33) he brings to mind Chomsky’s treatment of Western mandarins in intellectual circles and media industries as “false prophets” and a “bought priesthood.” With all his work on translation and his proximity to the world of Cambridge it will be interesting to see if Richards ever considered the word “prophet” in the Bible that Chomsky mentions as a questionable choice for an obscure term. Maybe seer or poet or even intellectual will be found more fitting, but I have yet to read Richards’s *Mencius on the Mind* or Coleridge on *Imagination* which he describes as adventures in interpretation.
12. “What is now being called “writing across the curriculum” was for him “general education in a free society” (Berthoff in Richards 1991: xi).
13. Chomsky condenses Allan Bloom’s *The Closing of the American Mind*: “Here are the great thoughts, the great thoughts of Western Civilization are in this corpus; you guys sit there and learn them, read them and learn them, and be able to repeat them” (Chomsky 2002:233-234) Just as I.A. Richards’s *How to Read a Page* was a response to *How to Read a Book* by the Allan Bloom of that decade (Richards 1991: ) Chomsky writes that any body that has “every thought about educations... knows that the effect

of that[enforcing vast reading lists] is that students will end up knowing and understanding virtually nothing”(Chomsky 2002;234) an observation and problem that Richards tried to address early on in his work with Cambridge readers in the 1920s.

14. “[Richards] broke his life on the rack of international misunderstanding in his forty-year effort to establish Basic English as a universal means of intellectual communication.”(Vendler 1989)
  15. Paul Goodman writes of Organization Man rebelling with books in the 1950s. Six decades ago “Mini-bureaucrats in pitch culture” see society as a rat race. At the same time an economist(Galbraith) observing from outside the closed organizations suggests that no one has admitted the intention of modeling society on the squirrel wheel. One wonders what their reactions (Goodman’s, Galbraith’s and Richards’s) would be to Annie Leonard’s pictorial interpretation of Victor Lebow’s design for the economy as revealed in *The Waste Makers* (Packard 1960: 34-39). *Growing Up Absurd’s* Paul Goodman, as a “man of letters” seeing himself, as Noam Chomsky does, as part of the humanistic stream from at least as far back as the Enlightenment, serves as a bridge to understanding Richards. While Paul Goodman and Noam Chomsky do not seem to have dedicated effort to beginning level education like Richards(and John Dewey and Bertrand Russel) the humanistic conception of education connects these thinkers. Paul Goodman’s suggestive comments to explain Veblen’s style may go some way to explain Berthoff’s and Eagleton’s complaints about Richards’s style. “But we know from overwhelming common experience that the implicit censorship of social condemnation leads to important reticence or various dodges... An amusing example is the delicious periphrastic style of Thorstein Veblen which, it has been held, he concocted in order that his students might not have any simple radical proposition for the professor to report home to papa!” The concern with “intellectual self defense”(Chomsky) for “minds [which] are now more exposed than ever before” and the realization that “Goebbels and his gang learnt much from American advertising techniques”(Richards 1955: 65) reveal the ground shared in common by Richards, Goodman and Chomsky in spite of their disagreements over linguistics(Goodman 1971: 8, 124-131; Richards 1968b: 65-105).
  16. The 1911 book *Craftsmanship in Teaching*, like Richards’s work, helps in reclaiming teaching as a human-worthy calling. The book provides a useful view of genius in the context of the classroom. “One of the most skillful teachers of my acquaintance is a woman down in the grades. I have watched her work for days at a time, striving to learn its secret. I can find nothing there that is due to genius,—unless we accept George Eliot’s definition of genius as an infinite capacity for receiving discipline. That teacher’s success, by her own statement, is due to a mastery of technique, gained through successive years of growth checked by a rigid responsibility for results. She has found out by repeated trial how to do her work in the best way; she has discovered the attitude toward her pupils that will get the best work from them,—
- the clearest methods of presenting subject matter; the most effective ways in which to drill; how to use textbooks and make study periods issue in something besides mischief; and, more than all else, how to do these things without losing sight of the true end of education.”(Inche in Bagley)
17. In *Beautiful Evidence* Edward Tufte displays Peter Norvig’s parody of Abraham Lincoln’s Gettysburg Address. It was produced with PowerPoint. Tufte further informs that the “AutoContent” feature was described in *The New Yorker* as “a rare example of a product named in outright mockery of its target customers”(Tufte 2006: 172-173) The “AutoContent Wizard”, states the software’s Wikipedia page, “was discontinued in PowerPoint 2007”. The killing of AutoContent is a victory of the sort that George Orwell cites in his classic 1945 essay. Commonly read in English composition classes, “Politics and the English Language” offers hope: “Silly words and expressions have often disappeared, not through any evolutionary process but owing to the conscious action of a minority. Two recent examples were EXPLORE EVERY AVENUE and LEAVE NO STONE UNTURNED, which were killed by the jeers of a few journalists...” Orwell prescribes that “it should also be possible to laugh the NOT ‘UN-’ formation out of existence...” and provides a note for personal improvement “One can cure oneself of the NOT ‘UN-’ formation by memorizing this sentence: A NOT UNBLACK DOG WAS CHASING A NOT UNSMALL RABBIT ACROSS A NOT UNGREEN FIELD.”(Orwell 2003) This prescription is particularly fitting as Tufte quotes Orwell and adapts him to the Internet age just as teachers should do with Richards. Tufte paraphrases Orwell’s statement: “The English language becomes ugly and inaccurate because our thoughts are foolish, but the slovenliness of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts.” for today: “PowerPoint becomes ugly and inaccurate because our thoughts are foolish, but the slovenliness of PowerPoint makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts”(Tufte 2006: 181). Parallel paraphrases and are applicable to CCs.
  18. The phrase “hopeless little screens” is from Leonard Cohen’s song “Democracy Is Coming”, as he sings about people getting lost in that hopeless little screen, TV.
  19. For a contemporary discussion of new media with limitations on the length of content(texting) and span of attention(SNSs) see Michael Albert’s blog entries about “Internet worries” and civilization(Albert 2010).
  20. Richards concerns for a humanistic or ethical conception as a counterbalance for reckless progress (of a certain kind) in science (technology) and his goal of increasing the numbers(ratio) of effectively capable people can be seen in grass roots struggles against inhumane development strategies throughout the world. Journalist and expert on arsenic contamination Kazuyuki Kawahara writes of a 1987 symposium held in the Japanese village of Toroku deep in the mountains of Miyazaki prefecture. Many years of grass roots activism sought redress for decades of arsenic pollution

and the typical corporate and governmental cover-ups that followed. Teruo Kawamoto, a figure in the Minamata struggle says “Throughout the world science is rioting, dazzling with high technology while the pollution of the environment and destruction of human bodies is verifiably progressing. You can’t but think that the world is headed towards destruction. What brought about these conditions: the fault is that philosophy has not kept up with science. Don’t we all have to share, put our wisdom together and give birth to a true human philosophy?”(Kawahara: 222). Just as Tufte looks for universal principles in analytical reasoning and information design, and Richards searches for the ideal order to efficiently organize and comprehend meanings, grass roots struggles throughout the world see core patterns to learn from. In the documentary movie *Crude*, lawyers for an oil corporation blame infant deaths on indigenous hygiene to deflect responsibility for toxic oil spills. Officials in Miyazaki prefecture blame livestock deaths and mushroom harvest declines on farmer ignorance. Original inhabitants of India’s Narmada river valley refuse to defer to official records in place of reality and are called “illiterates”(Aravinda). Richards’s decades of efforts to further close-reading and comprehension among the elite, and more effective pedagogy at beginning stages for all people are ever more necessary today with the increasing velocity of our descent into destruction. It is time to revisit his *Design for Escape* through a “world English”, “exploratory” education and mass media.

21. Tufte’s statement[with my addition] goes on “Or, worse, to fault viewers[learners] for a lack of understanding”(Tufte 1990: 53)
22. I am paraphrasing Tufte’s statement on density of information design in *Envisioning Information*; “Thus control of information is given over to viewers, not to editors, designers, or decorators. Data-thin, forgetful displays move viewers toward ignorance and passivity, and at the same time diminish the credibility of the source”(Tufte 1990: 50)
23. This sentence may also explain Booker Prize-winning novelist and Indian Supreme Court invitee Arundhati Roy’s paragraph about Noam Chomsky’s insane amounts of work. The sheer magnitude and relentless intensity of Chomsky’s criticism of Western intellectual culture and mass media accounts are necessary to cope with magnitude and intensity of the ill-written, crude and muddled views and badly acted attitudes of a whole industry. Roy as precise and memorable as ever writes, “As someone who grew up on the cusp of both American and Soviet propaganda (which more or less neutralized each other), when I first read Noam Chomsky, it occurred to me that his marshaling of evidence, the volume of it, the relentlessness of it, was a little — how shall I put it? — insane. Even a quarter of the evidence he had compiled would have been enough to convince me. I used to wonder why he needed to do so much work. But now I understand that the magnitude and intensity of Chomsky’s work is a barometer of the magnitude, scope, and relentlessness of the propaganda machine that he’s up against. He’s like the wood-borer who lives inside the third rack of my bookshelf. Day and night, I hear his jaws crunching through the wood, grinding it to a fine dust. It’s as though he disagrees with the literature and wants to destroy the very structure on which it rests. I call him Chompsky.”(Roy 2003) The work on propaganda to which Roy is referring is a testament to the power of intense seeing, systematic comparison, and basic common sense. It must be the joy of analytic reasoning that sustains the relentless chomping through the miserable brutality so scrupulously documented.
24. While employment may be permanent the conditions may be precarious as de-skilled teachers are seemingly enthralled to and made easily replaceable by flashy proprietary commercial products.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Albert, M.** (2010, December 13). Z Blogs | Internet Worries. Z Communications. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://www.zcommunications.org/internet-worries-by-michael-albert.html>
- Atkinson, C.** (2005). *Beyond bullet points: using Microsoft PowerPoint to create presentations that inform, motivate and inspire*. Redmond, Wash.: Microsoft Press.
- Bakan, J.** (2004). *The corporation: the pathological pursuit of profit and power*. New York: Free Press.
- Boucher, B. A., & Russo, J. P.** (n.d.). An interview with I. A. Richards . Harvard News | The Harvard Crimson. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://www.thecrimson.com/article/1969/3/11/an-interview-with-i-a-richards/>
- Bowen, T., & Marks, J.** (1994). *Inside teaching: options for English language teachers*. Oxford England: Heinemann.
- Brown, H. D.** (1994a). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Brown, H. D.** (1994b). *Teaching by principles: an interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall Regents.
- Carr, N.** (2008, July 1). Is Google making us stupid? - Nicholas Carr - The Atlantic. The Atlantic – News and analysis on politics, business, culture, technology, national, international, and life – TheAtlantic.com. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/2008/07/is-google-making-us-stupid/306868/>
- Carr, N. G.** (2010). *The shallows: what the Internet is doing to our brains*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Chomsky, N.** (1995). Introduction. *The minimalist program* (pp. 1-11). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N., & Macedo, D. P.** (2000). *Chomsky on miseducation*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Chomsky, N.** (2000). *New horizons in the study of language and mind*. Cambridge England: Cambridge University Press.
- Chomsky, N., Mitchell, P. R., & Schoeffel, J.** (2002). *Intellectuals and Social Change. Understanding power: the indispensable Chomsky* (pp. 224-266). New York: New Press.
- Davis, P., Garside, B., & Rinvulcri, M.** (1998). *Ways of doing: students explore their everyday and classroom processes*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.
- Eagleton, T.** (2002, April 25). Terry Eagleton reviews ‘I.A. Richards’ edited by John Constable · LRB 25 April 2002. London Review of Books · 12 September 2013. Retrieved September 14, 2013, from [http://www.lrb.co.uk/v24/n08/eagl01\\_.html](http://www.lrb.co.uk/v24/n08/eagl01_.html)
- Ellis, R., & Sano, F.** (1997). *Impact intro*. Hong Kong:



- Longman Asia ELT.
- Freeman, D., & Graves, K.** (2005). *ICON: international communication through English*. Boston: McGraw Hill/ESL/ELT.
- IMDb. "The Corporation (2003) - Quotes - IMDb."** IMDb - Movies, TV and Celebrities. N.p., n.d. Web. 30 Sept. 2013. [http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0379225/trivia?tab=qt&ref\\_=tt\\_trv\\_qu](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0379225/trivia?tab=qt&ref_=tt_trv_qu).
- Gibson, C. M., & Richards, I. A.** (1957). *First steps in reading English*. Tokyo: IBC Publishing.
- Goodman, P.** (1960). *Growing up absurd; problems of youth in the organized system*. New York: Random House.
- Goodman, P.** (1962). *Utopian essays and practical proposals*. New York: Random House.
- Goodman, P.** (1972/1971). *Speaking and language: defence of poetry (1st ed.)*. New York: Random House.
- Graddol, David** (2006) *English Next*, British Council <http://www.britishcouncil.org/learning-research-english-next.pdf> (downloaded July 17, 2013)
- IMDb. The Corporation (2003) - Quotes - IMDb.** (n.d.). IMDb - Movies, TV and Celebrities. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from [http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0379225/trivia?tab=qt&ref\\_=tt\\_trv\\_qu](http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0379225/trivia?tab=qt&ref_=tt_trv_qu)
- Janert, P. K.** (2010). *Gnuplot in action: understanding data with graphs*. Greenwich, Conn.: Manning.
- Katagiri, Y.** (1996). *Media to shiteno bēshikku ingurishshu*. 京都市: 京都修学社.
- Kawahara, K.** (1988). *Jōdomura toroku*. 東京: 筑摩書房.
- Kohn, A.** (1996). *Beyond discipline: from compliance to community*. Alexandria, Va.: ASCD.
- Kohn, A.** (1998). *What to look for in a classroom: and other essays*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Lang, S.** (1971). *Basic mathematics*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co..
- Lang, S., & Murrow, G.** (1983). *Geometry: a high school course*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Lapham, L.** (2010, December 12). *Tomgram: Lewis Lapham, Sweet Celebrity*. TomDispatch. Retrieved September 19, 2013, from [http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175331/tomgram%3A\\_lewis\\_lapham%2C\\_sweet\\_celebrity/](http://www.tomdispatch.com/post/175331/tomgram%3A_lewis_lapham%2C_sweet_celebrity/)
- Little Malcolm's Swimming Pool:** English as she will be spoke. (n.d.). Little Malcolm's Swimming Pool. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://littlemalcolms.blogspot.jp/2008/04/english-as-she-will-be-spoke.html>
- Mailer, N.** (2005, January 23). *One Idea. a crank's progress*. Retrieved September 28, 2013, from <http://www.paulbeard.org/wordpress/2005/01/23/norman-mailers-one-big-idea/>
- Meddings, L., & Thornbury, S.** (2009). *Teaching unplugged: dogme in English language teaching*. Surrey: Delta.
- Messing, S.** (2012, March 4). *Visualization series: Insight from Cleveland and Tufte on plotting numeric data by groups | (R news & tutorials). R-bloggers | R news & tutorials from the web*. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://www.r-bloggers.com/visualization-series-insight-from-cleveland-and-tufte-on-plotting-numeric-data-by-groups/>
- Newitz, Annalee** (2008) *English is Dead*, [http://thatotherpaper.com/austin/english\\_dead](http://thatotherpaper.com/austin/english_dead) (accessed July 17, 2013)
- Noguchi, Y.** (2004). "Chō" Eigohō. Tōkyō: Kōdansha.
- Ogden, C. K., & Richards, I. A.** (1966). *The meaning of meaning: a study of the influence of language upon thought and the science of symbolism (10. ed.)*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Ogden, C. K.** (1968). *Basic English: international second language*. (1st ed.). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Park, C.** (2011, July 11). *Edward Tufte's "Slopegraphs"*. Charlie Park. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://charliepark.org/slopegraphs/>
- Perls, F. S., Goodman, P., & Hefferline, R.** (1972). *Gestalt therapy*. Gouldsboro ME: The Gestalt Journal Press.
- Postman, N.** (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: public discourse in the age of*. New York, NY: Penguin Books.
- Reynolds, G.** (2008). *Presentation zen: simple ideas on presentation design and delivery*. Berkeley, CA: New Riders Pub..
- Richards, I. A.** (1929). *Practical criticism: a study of literary judgment*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner.
- Richards, I. A.** (1943). *Basic English and its uses*. New York: W.W. Norton & Co..
- Richards, I. A., & Gibson, C. M.** (1945). *Learning Basic English, a practical handbook for English-speaking people*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, inc..
- Richards, I. A., & Gibson, C. M.** (2005/1973). *English through pictures: book 3 (Updated ed.)*. Toronto: Pippin Pub. Corp..
- Richards, I. A.** (1930). *Principles of literary criticism*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
- Richards, I. A.** (1968a). *Design for escape; world education through modern media (1st ed.)*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Richards, I. A.** (1968b). *So much nearer; essays toward a world English (1st ed.)*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Richards, I. A.** (2004). *Interpretation in teaching*. New Delhi, India: Cosmo Publications.
- Richards, I. A., and Yuzuru Katagiri.** (1993) *A semantically sequenced way of teaching English: selected and uncollected writings*. Kyoto: Yamaguchi Publishing House.
- Richards, I. A.** (1968b). *So much nearer; essays toward a world English*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.
- Richards, I. A.** (1970). *Poetries and sciences, a reissue of Science and poetry (1926, 1935) with commentary*. New York: Norton.
- Richards, I. A., & Berthoff, A. E.** (1991). *Richards on rhetoric: I.A. Richards, selected essays (1929-1974)*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Richards, I. A., & Gibson, C. M.** (2005). *English through pictures book II, and, A second workbook of English*. Toronto: Pippin Pub. Corp..
- Richards, I. A., and Yuzuru Katagiri.** (1993) *A semantically sequenced way of teaching English: selected and uncollected writings*. Kyoto: Yamaguchi Publishing House.
- Rinvoluceri, M.** (2002). *Humanising your coursebook*. London: English Teaching Professional.
- Rushkoff, D.** (2011). *Life inc: how corporatism conquered the world, and how we can take it back (Trade pbk. ed.)*. New York: Random House.
- Saslow, J. M., & Ascher, A.** (2011). *Top notch Fundamentals A (2nd ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Schmidt, J.** (2000). *Disciplined minds: a critical look at salaried professionals and the soul-battering system that shapes their lives*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Schor, J.** (2004). *Born to buy: the commercialized child and the new consumer culture*. New York: Scribner.
- Solomon, N.** (2005, March 4). *When Junk Interrupts Junk. Z Communications*. Retrieved September 9, 2013, from <http://www.zcommunications.org/when-junk-interrupts-junk-by-norman-solomon.html>
- Stevick, Earl W.** (1996) *Memory, meaning and method*.

Boston: Heinle & Heinle

**Stevick, Earl W.** (1980) *A way and ways*. Massachusetts: Newbury House

**Templer, Bill** (2005) "Towards a People's English: Back to BASIC in EIL" *Humanising Language Teaching*; Year 7; Issue 5; September 05 <http://www.hltmag.co.uk/sep05/mart05.htm> (accessed August 28, 2013)

**Tufte, E. R.** (1990). *Envisioning information*. Cheshire, Conn. (P.O. Box 430, Cheshire 06410): Graphics Press.

**Tufte, E. R.** (1997a). *Visual explanations: images and quantities, evidence and narrative*. Cheshire, Conn.: Graphics Press.

**Tufte, E. R.** (1997b). *Visual and statistical thinking: displays of evidence for making decisions*. Cheshire, Conn.: Graphic Press.

**Tufte, E. R.** (2006). *Beautiful evidence*. Cheshire, Conn.:

Graphics Press.

**Vendler, H.** (1989, April 27). *The Explorer* by Helen Vendler | The New York Review of Books. Home | The New York Review of Books. Retrieved September 18, 2013, from <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/archives/1989/apr/27/the-explorer/>

**Wikipedia. Microsoft PowerPoint.** (2013, September 23). In *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. Retrieved 06:28, September 26, 2013, from [http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Microsoft\\_PowerPoint&oldid=574254614](http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Microsoft_PowerPoint&oldid=574254614)

**Walcott, W. H.** (2007). *Knowledge, competence and communication: Chomsky, Freire, Searle, and communicative language teaching*. Montreal, Canada: Black Rose Books.