Total Time: 55:34

http://english3.fsu.edu/~mdavis/BazermanInterview%201.mp3

Matt: ...all within reason.

Bazerman: Well, some of it [referring to possible answers to the interview question sheet] is in my talk later.

Matt: [in reference to the question sheet] Well if there is stuff that you will refer to later, just let us know.

Bazerman: And I've never seen [the movie] Crash.

Matt: Yeah, no, that was sort of a pop culture-- a general pop culture question.

Tony: And, you know, when we wrote these questions...

Bazerman: Well, now you know about me and pop culture.

Matt: Yeah, don't ask...

Tony: The first person we interviewed with this set of questions had written an article about Crash.

Matt: Oh, is that what it was.

Tony: and so I think that is why that question is there. We just haven't updated it.

Matt: Well, it's just supposed to be our end of-- you know, end of the long academic interview question.

Becca: I know a good one. Why don't we change that to: what's on your bedside table that you're reading?

Matt: Yes, I think that was is on here, yeah--

Becca: Oh, that one is on here.

Tony: If you could re-envision any movie of your choice, how would you?

Matt: We'll do Raging Bull...

Bazerman: I only see movies on airplanes.

Matt: Fair enough. So...Life as A House or something like that?

Becca: What's the worst movie you've ever seen on an airplane? [laughter]

Matt: Alright, so, first, thanks for coming to visit and agreeing to chat with us. The first question we usually ask is about how you got into Rhetoric and Composition. In your case, there is sort of another piece to it. How did you start doing what you do and then how did that come into Rhetoric and Composition? Does that make sense? Because some people have said, Well, I don't really consider myself in rhetoric and composition per se-- but, yeah, the idea is sort of--

Bazerman: Yeah, I'm going to try and get this. I have written a number of times about one piece of this so I don't want to be too repetitive about this. I want to say something fresh for you. But the-- when I got my PhD in 1971-- I entered grad school in '67-- this was before Rhet Comp as a field. I-- it was also the year that graduate student deferment vanished-- I was there '67, '68 and then I wasn't particularly happy with being a Lit[erature] grad student, I was going some Renaissance (unintelligble). I had a lot of undergraduate majors and had wound up doing literature and although there were certain aspects of literature I liked-- I wasn't happy with where it was leading me for a career. But they took the graduate deferment away and the only way I could not go kill people was to -- the last job they were going to give a deferment for was inner city teaching, which I did. I taught first and third grade. And although the conditions were tough and I did not stick with it and I was poorly trained and now that I am in an Ed[ucation] department I understand how poorly trained I was. Nonetheless it really seemed important. And literacy really seemed to transform lives and you could see the effect of literacy or the effect of not taking to literacy. The trajectories of these kids, even by third grade. So, I was-- that was the transformative event. I went back and finished up Literature. Because of my own limitations I finished up very quickly and when I got my first real job after that it was to teach composition. I was hired under a special kind of open admissions kind of line at the City University of New York and I pretty much committed all my attention to the teaching of writing. At that point the field was still at a much earlier stage. And that's kind of-- and then how I got to my particular problematic is that although there were lots of theories, or orientations toward writing, then, I understood that the reason why students were required to take our courses was so they could succeed at the university, and it wasn't any of the other wonderful uses of writing that was important, or the other aspects --this is why we were being paid. So, if I could get students interested in writing, this is what I could get them interested in writing for. So I started to investigate what academic writing was—I didn't phrase it quite that same way, but what kind of writing would they need to do at the university? I started to collect information about writing in other disciplines. First, I started to think about what we now call intertextuality, that the writing was heavily in the context of their readings—I started to do early surveys on this. The Black movement sort of started slightly after— and my first reaction is that we're trying to go across the curriculum but we don't know what kind of writing they *do*. We need to go out and find out. That first generation was sort of the exporting process models and journaling across the curriculum. I had this different view—that we needed to go out and actually find out what was out there-- and what the needs were. So that got me looking at scientific writing, and got me looking at intertextuality-- the book, this work, was done in the 70s-- and *now* we call it intertextually informed writing: How do you write after you've read something? How do you write after you've read *two* things? In the logic of the times it was first treated more like a research paper book, and it was originally framed as a research paper book-- for the course on a research paper-- but it really started to analyze what the skills were, and pick them apart. At that time most of the research paper books were just footnote format and bibliography. At that time, I said, I'm really interested in the intellectual skills that went into that kind of assignment. It really was many assignments, and it fanned out into all versions of academic writing. My research started on, my most focused research then started on the history of the scientific paper. How did it get that way? And how did it work within the society of scientists? So that's how my trajectory started. Do you mean how did my work get into the profession?

Matt: No, that was pretty much the goal of the question. Just because a lot of the folks we interview predate Rhetoric and Composition as a field, so, the development of their work previous to the field coming along, and in the context of the field as it progressed…

Bazerman: When I taught at City University it was in the early days of open admissions, it was the Mina Shaughnessey period, and so there was a large group of people who were committed to writing, which became called Basic Writing. To me it wasn't just the beginning points—Basic Writing kind of orients the students at the beginning points-- But what does it take to succeed in higher education and beyond, into writing in the professional world, writing all the way up? That leads to another type of question. For many years I was an outlier, or at least I like to think of myself as an outlier. And including the interest in the higher end of writing, writing outside—there was that early book- late 70s, early 80s? Not so early maybe, in the eighties Odell and Goswami (1986) had a book called *Writing in Non-academic Settings* --so even academic writing in the contexts of writing that occur beyond the classroom. The field was starting to define itself briefly in the late 70s, early 80s as a research field, but the research was largely psychological-- we have Flower & Hayes as the big exemplar. I was saying well, it's good we have psychology, we also need a sociology. From sociology then I got to a history, which is different from the history of writing instruction, or the history of rhetorics. There's the history of writing practices, and the emergence of writing practices and writing in the society and the forms that writing took. That still is a minority view within the writing history world. So it was only over time that the things I was interested in became kind of mainstream, or at least on the edge of the mainstream.

Tony: So building off of that, I'm interested in which scholars or theorists have most influenced your thinking. I'm interested personally in a sociological view—which theorists or scholars were important to you in developing that theory, or looking at writing through what lens?

Bazerman: I mentioned to you that I've been working on this theory book for 20 years, it's got two volumes—the first is like the theory, the other is like everybody that I've read that went into that theory. In terms of sociologists, when I got interested in rhetoric of science I was directed to Robert Merton—who's like the founder of the sociology of science. He's a very, very deep influence on me. He's *called* a structural sociologist—I would say there are elements in his work that were structurational before there was structuration, but it wasn't fully blown. I'm not sure if I'd have asked him what he would say to that. Do you know the difference between structural and structurational?

Tony: Not really…

Bazerman: Structure, the older version of structural sociology—there's the social structure, some people look in terms of class, but he wasn't looking at that—he'd be more like reference groups--which group you feel associational with, or whether you feel marginal to a certain group. Whether you feel unhappy with the amount you're earning doesn't depend on your general place within the total wealth distribution in the United States, it has to do with what your neighbors and friends and family are earning. That's your reference group, and whatever your reference group is tends to be more local--- and that's structural. But *structurational*, the term invented by Giddens, means that structure doesn't exist apart from our making of it. You're treating me very nicely here and with a lot of respect as a senior professor, that makes this an event between senior professor and graduate students, but it is because we're making it that way. If we'd come with a different orientation to each other -- with beers, right, and there was television screen up here and we were watching the game, it would be a different event and our set of relationships would be different and the social structures that would be engaged would be different. That's structurational.

Becca: So the structure arises out of the situation?

Bazerman: And how we behave, and how we behave in the situation. Our actions make the situation. That's structurational. Merton was very influential, and I think you can see that in my work in that I try to understand how larger structures arise, and people orient towards larger structures in their writing, and how they orient to activity systems, for example. I also was very influenced by the Russian psychologists, Vygotsky, and all those that came after, in the way they understood cognition, and cognitive development in relationship to, not just social situation, but the individual's activities within the social situation—and how they came to understand that. That, and also, the third pole of influence was American pragmatists: Dewey, George Herbert Meade, Harry Stack Sullivan—and actually he's not as often thought of in that group-- but he clearly grew out of that group. He was a psychiatrist, but with a very social-biographical orientation towards how people come to learn to live in their world and solve problems about living in their world. He was a friend of Bateson, somebody mentioned Bateson earlier today--- there are plenty of other people, but those would be probably among the most fundamental. You'll notice none of them are language people. Although certainly Vygotsky wrote about language, he didn't have a very articulated view of language, and also the pragmatists, especially Meade and Sullivan, also, put language in a very central and formative role in the formation of consciousness, but again did not have a highly articulated sense of language or language production. Merton certainly had an awareness of language but again, he was a sociologist, and not a linguist and I think one of the reasons he was nice to me was he saw somebody who was… he was certainly very kind to me—I sat in on his seminar for 6 or 7 years—this was post-doctoral…but he was in New York City so I'd just come up to his seminar on Thursday. He was very interested in the linguistic consequences, the linguistic aspect of the social formation of science. Is this enough? I could go on!

Tony: Well, I did mention specifically sociology but a lot of us are interested in which rhetoric and composition scholars have influenced your thinking as well.

Bazerman: Well, that's a lot more embarrassing question. In some ways, just because of her influence in sponsorship, Mina Shaughnessey was important, and in taking student writing seriously—I think there were one or two sentences she made in passing in *Errors and Expectations* which I saw as providing a kind of license for what I was doing, even though I was going in a different direction. I found a couple of concepts from classical rhetoric very useful, but classical rhetoric as a whole I found too constrained by the socio-historical circumstances in which it was created and the purpose it was created for. It wasn't created for literacy, for writing--- it was created for high-stakes oral presentation within the social structure of Greece and Rome, and the replications of that, after that. In terms of rhetoricians, I would say the ones that influenced me most deeply, and I've written on them, are Adam Smith and Joseph Priestly. Eighteenth century attempts to remake rhetoric, and they're not even viewed as the major eighteenth century rhetoricians, but in my mind, I think they were much more interesting in what they were attempting to do than the ones that are more commonly cited. I think Adam Smith in particular was very, very deep. Have any of you ever read, not just his rhetoric—the thing is, you have to read his whole corpus to understand, because his most interesting rhetorical work was not in his rhetoric, which was an early work of his. The funny angle I took on it was--- can you see a relationship between his later work and *The Wealth of Nations*? What was he doing rhetorically in *The Wealth of Nations* -- and you have to reconstruct how he came to conceive of language and the role of communication- it then becomes evident that the early work is interesting- It's interesting; it opens a couple of issues, and you can see him trying to cope with writing, and you can see him trying to cope with a more complex and more modern psychology and with social and political problems that were outside of the assumptions of Greece and Rome politics. Essentially the problem of what do you do if you don't have the authority of religion and kingship –which was the big problem of the eighteenth century; if you are moving out of the medieval world what is the basis of social order? Ultimately comes an answer, and you see it's communicative, and it plays out in a lot of different ways, but you can only see the beginnings of that in his early work-- it's in the later work where you see that kind of spelled out... I'm not going to go over the whole argument, but I've written about it. Among rhetoricians I would say he is for me one of the most exciting. Then the economics is really kind of an afterthought. Put it another way—the argument that I make is that he had very complicated ideas about communication, and forming social cells, but then there's a kind of least common denominator of communication. His book just before *The Wealth of Nations*, called *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* which was very eighteenth century, about sympathy and coming to see yourself how others might see you, and coming to evaluate your own behavior. That was a big mountain for everybody to climb; it's a kind of elite moral practice. But for most people you have to have some kind of interchange. So that became money-- money talks, and it becomes some kind of interchange, everything is put into the exchange of money--- which is problematic. If we do that-- put everything into the exchange of money-- and you see the consequences of that, you can get very different people cooperating together. Everything becomes money—you get the Stephen Colbert version of the universe,

and when everything gets translated into money. It forces out other kinds of more interesting, more complex and developing kinds of meaning; it puts them at the margins.

Jessica: In terms of your life experiences, what else has shaped you--- moving away from scholars?

Bazerman: Moving away from scholars… well my life experience, I've been a nerd-- I've always been a nerd, so most of my life experiences have been at school, in and around the university in fact. My joke is when people ask about ethnicity, I say I'm an academic. That's the people who I hang out with, same humor.

Jessica: That's your tribe.

Bazerman: That's my tribe, yes, absolutely. One of my most important experiences was being an elementary school teacher. It really gave me a mission in life, something that was meaningful to do. It wasn't solipsistic, it wasn't narcissistic; but would actually make a positive change in the lives of others, and it involved very interesting and complex problems. So that was very important. During that same period of my life I underwent psychotherapy. It was with somebody whose training followed Sullivan—that was my first introduction to that intellectual world. I came to reframe myself in a much more social sense, to understand the power of social science and the pragmatist orientation. When I was younger I thought of myself as an individual and very much different and apart from others. I was always very good in school which made it easy to maintain a view of specialness. But I also had a very troubled family life. I didn't have much of a social place and not much of a social support system, except for school- that is my ethnicity, you know. I didn't like my family--- I liked school. Then I started to develop an understanding which gave me relations to others, and my place in them, which gave me also a way to sort of monitor my behavior and kind of see who I was in social circumstances. Which gave me the practical consequences of theories, and then, that then also provided some of my orientation to writing, as I started to see writing as social interaction, and as creating identity and social positioning, writing as engaged within social systems rather than as the product of the individual. That all really came out of my psychotherapy--- that was late 60s, when I was teaching elementary school learning about the children in my classrooms and changing their lives. That's probably the most important series of events, cluster of events that really re-oriented me and gave me direction.

Matt: Seems like, and, off of that answer and your C's address from last year, that your very personal, very emotional engagement with writing in its social context is something that you

bring to your work. And so, I kind of wanted to ask about that in the context of your C's address-- because it was obvious that you had a very emotional connection to what you were writing and presenting and I was thinking about it in terms of, if you know Duane Roen's book Views From The Center. And after each C's address there is a little-- it's called and Afterword or Afterthought or something-- where people reflect on their C's address and sort of either talk about what it meant to them to compose or what effect they think it might have had. So I wondered if you would talk about that a little bit.

Charles: Well, it's been less than a year, so--

Matt: Yeah, there hasn't been a lot of time in terms of the effect part, but the composing of it and the sort of personal investment

Charles: Well, and the hope for effect

Matt: Yes, exactly.

Charles: A speech like that is an opportunity to say to the profession everything-- or challenges you to say what's the most important thing you want to say to the profession. And I had a whole lot of things I wanted to say. And so part of my problem is how do I get them all together. But I think the biggest message I wanted to get through is that writing is really really important. Much more important than we imagine. And that is what all my recent scholarship had just reinforced and let me see in deeper and deeper ways. And, it might be an artifact of my peculiar view of life, I mean, but that we often see ourselves at the margin of the academic world and are treated certainly at the margin or the vestibule or something but you know we are actually the medium that everybody swims in. And you know if we want to reverse the valences, we can say, well, you know, you're just doing a specialized form of writing, Each of them. You're just writing, you're doing a small part. We're the only ones who understand the basic processes in which you are all engaged. Or we have the potential of understanding. So that not only should we feel the confidence but we should feel the responsibilities of that and so that gets to the question of we need to take our research much more seriously. We view ourselves as practitioners. And even assuming we knew what writing was and kind of -- let me find the right way to say this, it's not flowing so easily-- but well there is this thing we kind of know what it is and we'll just teach people. Some people have a hard time getting it but not that we have a really -- we also assume that to some degree we all know-- well, we all know how to write. And that we have the sense of what the full competence is, whereas at the same time everyone still feels insecure about their writing. But we don't have the courage to go and find out what's the full extent and

variety of writing how complex it is, we are very much at the surface of it. so we have a responsibility to investigate it deeply.

Becca: Would you say it's a meta-discipline? Or an Ur-discipline?

Charles: Is or ought to be...

Becca: In reality maybe is but is not seen that way?

Charles: I would say our subject area is fundamental. But whether it's a single discipline or ought to be or ought to be for the time being-- for the foreseeable future-- that I don't know. Because writing is so multidimensional that it needs the tools of other disciplines. Now that is another problem that we haven't taken as seriously and that has impeded us. We come out of the US, out of literary studies and Humanities that, in fact, almost consider themselves anti-methodological. And I have had the experience-- and maybe you have-- of asking literary scholars, so, what's our methodology? We don't have methodology. It's individual.

Becca: It's inspirational.

Charles: It's inspirational, right. And insofar as you recognize there is a social element-- we don't take sociology seriously-- saying they might have discovered something. We reinvent it. But we reinvent it in a kind of haphazard, kind of spontaneous way. And I'm giving the extreme form of this, I know it's not quite that simple. But overall, this kind of-- we don't go in and investigate. So, what does psychology really have to say about this? There are a few moments that have been different. There have been moments of engagement. Linguistics, but that has come and gone. There were engagements with certain branches of psychology around Flower & Hayes but that vanished. We were phobic about that. I think there were real limits with the way they were approaching it. But there is something beyond that response, that critique-- there was a real phobic reaction against that. So I want to get across that we need to take that seriously but that also, we as a field have almost a sacred calling. As we are the ones who help people move into, engage with the most important tools of participation in society. And that this was important stuff. And how to get that across in the deepest and most emotionally powerful way. I also had messages of, kind of a next step after Maxine Hairston is that we needed to keep on defining ourselves in our own lights and not by the lights of the field we happen to come out of. Some of the other things I packed in there-- but it was an attempt to try to say what was important to me and what I thought the field to hear. There was another kind of problem built into that, that over the years I've had and other people have had as well-- a kind of frustration with the C's-- it's probably unrealistic frustration but C's is very much a practice-based organization. And most of the

people spend most of their time teaching in the class as I did for many years. And they don't have the time, the perspective, the reward system to pursue other lines of work. But, as a result of that, the convention has had a great weighting towards classroom presentations. And there has been no real venue to present hardcore research papers. It's changed a little bit in the last couple of years and something as an officer that I've been pushing. There was this brief period in the again, the Flower & Hayes early period-- the late 70s, early 80s-- there was some movement in that direction but my experience is that I could not simply present directly my serious research at C's. I just couldn't get on the program with that stuff. I stopped trying to get on the program with that and I would use other kinds of things-- more classroom or talking with my graduate students or some kind of other, less direct way. But my major research has almost never been presenting at the C's. Whereas sometimes the president's speech of some societies, they present the rationale for their line of work. I didn't feel this was the right-- it wouldn't be rhetorically powerful in that venue. So I had to create the frame and create the ethos for that.

[--- Mic glitch, a few minutes lost.]

Charles: And in a way I don't see my graduate students now as very different. Even now there are topics to courses: history of literacy in relationship to social organizations, a course I teach and writing devleopment across the lifespan. I've learned a lot, from both-- they've helped me develop a view of how parts fit together. Research methodology. Methods of studying writing, a textual analysis course. Those are the things I repetitively do now and Vygotsky, Dewey, Russians and Pragmatists kind of course. But I still see them as essentially kind of in the same terms as the composition courses. So what are you reading and writing about and what are the reading and writing tasks and how is that leading to a growth in your thinking and then, since they are mostly doctoral students, how does that then lead to the development of your major research projects. So it's a research paper course in a way, you know, they are all version of that.

Matt: We've got time for maybe one more.

Josh: I'd like to ask one since I didn't get a chance to. Just sort of, maybe as a way of summing up. It seems like many of the things you've been talking about come down to questions of definition. Like self-definition-- you see yourself as an outlier in this discipline and maybe on of the things I notice about this discipline is how to define ourselves as a field. And issues about-- do we see ourselves as a practice-based organization, discipline. And, or, how do we define ourselves? I was wondering if maybe you could talk about that. It seems to me that maybe you were encouraging a different way, a different methodology. A quantitative methodology

Charles: Not quantitative necessarily.

Josh: Ok, not necessarily.

Charles: The word research, first, does not necessarily mean quantitative.

Josh: True, true. But you're definitely encouraging a different methodology of research.

Charles: Well, multiple methodologies.

Josh: Agreed, agreed.

Charles: I would say research-- there needs to be some group, whether it's us-- whoever that is-- or some other group, who takes writing seriously as-- who tries to understand writing. There is also a need of a people who will teach it-- or support the development of individuals and communities at various parts of their writing development. Writing is something that people learn to do over their lifespans. So it's not -- we don't have full responsibility. Each individual has a kind of -- they are in control. It is their means of expression and expanding and making more precise their means of expression. That's the task-- part of their task of living. But we provide-- there are practitioners who provide support. Particularly CCCC's is the group of practitioners that provides support in writing development in the college years. And it's been largely around first term- first couple of terms of college years-- now it's courses at multiple points within the college years. There are writing centers and various auxiliary services which provide support while people develop. To help them develop and help them meet their writing desires and needs more effectively. So that's another definition. Both are needed because I still think we don't know the full extent of what writing is. Writing in society-- probably because it's an art-- we are inventive. We invented it. Writing is 5,000 years old we keep doing more and more complex and interesting things with it and we create new social relations and social institutions. So we need to keep track of that and understand what those are and in particular how they intersect with the lives of our students. We also have no, not many good ideas about how people organize themselves to be able to to it well. We have no really good sense of the varieties of just material of linguistic choices and the consequences of linguistic choices that people can make. There is just so much of it we do not understand. We don't understand how humans develop across the lifespan. This takes, writing as I'm fond of saying, can peak at 40 or 50 (years old), it's a race to senility. And I'm now at the point where it's going to start going downhill, so my capacities have gone down. So, you know, what does that mean and how to we understand that and the particular points at which we meet our students and work with them? And I'm going to give what to me is a real scandal about our profession because we don't understand that particular thing-- because if you look at the writing tasks and writing rubrics from about 3rd grade up until about 12th grade, they are pretty close. There is no-- you just keep doing the same thing over and over and you add just very very much to the rubrics. The task, the notion of what writing instruction is-- now there is some mysterious

divide at higher ed that has to do critical reflection and analysis-- whatever those are. But still, there is a great continuity. We treat it as though it is the same thing-- I'm just going to give you a biological fact. This is real Piagetian-- although I'm more Vygotskian than Piagetian-- early adolescents--the prefrontal cortex is very important to writing, to advanced writing. Planning, conceptualization-- the brain grows in the course-- and organizes itself in the course of a lifespan and a lot of major events happening in the prefrontal cortex don't happen until the ages of 9-12, adolescents. So how can writing instruction in third grade and the goals of writing be the same as high school or higher ed? It just, it does not make sense. So we need a really fundamental research field to start to understand many many things. And we can't do our work well. So in a way we are like clinical doctors. I don't mean to-- If you think of a health-oriented medical system, rather than just being in there to repair the wounded. I know there are unfortunate aspects for that metaphor but, in this sense, if you have doctors who are simply treating patients and have no pharmacological knowledge, no biological knowledge, no knowledge of people's lives and the relationship of nature and nurture, right, they won't be very good doctors. And that was the position of doctors up until the beginning of the 20st Century. Ok, that is the position we are mostly in. When I say we have a shallow view of the field. We see patients, we see our clients and we respond on a kind of surface level, to kind of try to keep and move something around in there-- there are better choices and worse choices to be made at that level. But until we get a much deeper of what it is, what the development is, what it is that we want an they want to accomplish, how you go about doing them, then our capacities will be very limited. And, because, there are so many dimensions to writing. I think I said this before, but I didn't say this other piece. We need-- we are going to need neuroscience, we are going to need sociology, we are going to need history, we also even, we need the humanities. We need the arts and expression and meaning. We are a meaning based field, unlike medicine which is purely somatic although you bring in some psychosomatic and life conditions, social conditions effecting. But it's basically somatic. But ours is a meaning-based field, it's a meaning based creative field. Another thing I'm fond of saying these days. Which makes it different from even other areas of learning-- if you give your students a math test and everybody gives the same answer, you are happy. And you ask them to show their work and they all give the same algorithm, which you taught, you are very happy. As long as they are not cheating. If everybody hands in the same paper...you are not happy.

Becca: Because you just believe it should be different. Because they are individuals.

Charles: And they are communicating something. And everybody has something fresh to communicate. In fact we see, as part of our field-- now this may be different from, in different regions of the world, but we think that college age students ought to have individual thoughts which factor into all kinds of knowledge people bring different perspectives, different perceptual philosophies to bear, different theories, different kinds of evidence, and in fact many of our major institutions are based on structured conflict of points of view. I bring in structured because this is one of the arguments I make and I make this in my talk but I think it's very important that rhetoric has had too much of a bias towards argument in itself as argument as unfettered. But argument is only effective within a structured forum, that leads to some kind of directed outcome. Where was I going with this?

Structured conflict...your question was about identifying the field, right? Defining the field. And I was talking about why we needed so many-- oh, we're talking about creativity, that is how we go to this. And our expectation that there is not one answer but that one answer is, in fact, the wrong answer. This is why we have so much problem with five paragraph essay tests-- they are leading towards homogenization of discourse. Now there are cultural differences in this. But within the Western world, Western institutions and in fact the notion of writing as communication and that you always need to be talking from a specific situation and the specifics of your communication-- otherwise you wouldn't need to communicate. If there were one answer we could just, yeah-- you know the old joke about the prisoners who have numbered jokes and they sit around and 543. Ha! Great joke. But that's not the case. In fact, it's novelty that's important for our attention. As well as for the specifics of communication. So, I was talking about why its also creative art. So, the Humanities are needed in this, they are all need, so we don't have a single method at this point nor do we even have good ways of integrating --thats one of the challenges, and one of the things I hope I have done something with in my career. But other people have done so, so, how do we take these multidisciplinary perspectives and bring them together in a kind of coherent story from these multiple perspectives. We are not there yet, so, I don't think there is like a definition that we can clamp down the way experimental psychology clamped down and say this is just what our field is. And that is why I said there is a kind of area, a domain, which we can-- certainly, but discipline may be the wrong word.

Matt: Alright, well, thank you for coming and chatting with us and indulging our curiosity.