TELLING YOUR STORY AS AN INTERDISCIPLINARIAN

WRITING AN INTELLECTUAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY /
PERSONAL NARRATIVE

Life is interdisciplinary; students of life must be interdisciplinarians.

Jerry L. Petr (1986, p. 21)

Life, however, is not naturally interdisciplinary. It is a neutral assortment of phenomena that are ordered through human thought and action.

Julie Thompson Klein (1996, p. 12)

If you want to know me, then you must know my story, for my story defines who I am. And if I want to know myself, to gain insight into the meaning of my own life, then I, too, must come to know my own story.

Dan P. McAdams (1993, p. 11)

Learning Objectives

After reading Chapter Five of Becoming Interdisciplinary you should be able to:

1. Understand better why you chose interdisciplinary studies as your major.
2. Explain to others why you are an interdisciplinarian.
3. Tell your life story as an interdisciplinarian.

Telling Your Story as an Interdisciplinarian

You have learned all of the following:

1. definition(s) of interdisciplinarity;
2. how to answer the question, “What are interdisciplinary studies?”;
3. how interdisciplinary studies programs emerged;
4. various levels of integration;
5. how to use metaphor to explain interdisciplinary studies; and
6. characteristics of interdisciplinarians.
How are you going to tell your story as an interdisciplinarian? By now you should start to think of your life as the life story of an interdisciplinarian. It is important for you to be able to reflect the events and circumstances that brought you to this point in life, so that you can better plan where you want to go from here. Being able to see a clear path is critical for your academic success as an interdisciplinary studies major, as you will need both to reflect on your college career thus far and to plan the rest of your college career, i.e., your path to graduation. You should be able to understand why you chose your particular areas of study—in other words, you should understand your academic interests and how they tie in to your personal interests and professional goals.

Different instructors will ask students to tell their story as an interdisciplinarian in different ways. Some instructors will ask you to write a personal narrative. Some will ask you to reflect on your identity as a researcher. Some will ask you to consider your identity in terms of your goals and mission statement. Others will ask you to write your “intellectual autobiography”—sort of an odyssey of the mind. Layne Gneiting asks his students to create visual autobiographical maps in addition to writing their intellectual autobiographies, and his assignment is included at the end of this chapter.

The word autobiography has three parts to it etymologically:

- Auto > Greek prefix meaning “self”
- Bio > Greek root meaning “life”
- Graph > Greek root meaning “write”

The word autobiography thus means to write the life of one’s self. What is surprising to most students is that autobiographies are not necessarily considered true. In fact, according to Lejeune (1975)—autobiographies are to be considered fictions because they involve selection. Nevertheless, as Ibarra and Linebeck (2005) point out, autobiographies are not intended to be “tall tales.” An autobiography is a story, but “by ‘story’ we don’t mean ‘something made up to make a bad situation look good.’ Rather, we’re talking about accounts that are deeply true and so engaging that listeners feel that they have a stake in our success” (Ibarra and Linebeck 2005, p. 66).

What should you select to write about your life? One cannot possibly write everything about one’s lifetime is too short for such an endeavor. Students certainly cannot write their life stories down in four, five, or even six pages. They have to select what is most important for their ultimate aim—to tell a story with a particular message.

The message you want to tell is that you have had a life that lends itself to being interdisciplinary. Accordingly, you would want to stress the following:

- Your interdisciplinarian characteristics
- Your understanding of your self-identity
- Why you wanted to study more than one discipline
- Why you chose your areas of study
- The key events, situations, influences that led to your academic interests
- What is it exactly that interests you about your academic interests (be sure to be as specific as possible and include specific concepts, topics, methods, or perspectives of interest)
- Your values, skills, strengths (and if relevant, weaknesses)
- What interdisciplinary problems you are interested in
- How you plan to use your interdisciplinary knowledge and skills in your future, especially in your future career plans or goals

You should review the discussion of interdisciplinarian characteristics in Chapter Four. Be sure to do the checklist at the end of the chapter. This way you will familiarize yourself not only with characteristics of interdisciplinarians, but those characteristics that you may have. Try to mention which characteristics you have in your narrative if possible. For example, the reason why you were attracted to interdisciplinary studies was because you were dissatisfied with monodisciplinary constraints. Why? It is not enough to state the characteristic—you need to analyze how it developed. What experience(s) did you have that led to such dissatisfaction? Are they relevant? If so, be sure to explain the reasons why you have a particular characteristic of interdisciplinarians.
Also, you may want to read Reading 17 as well as Reading 18 in Part Three of this textbook. Reading 17, “Success Secret: A High Emotional IQ,” by Anne Fisher introduces the concept of emotional intelligence. Jennifer James in Reading 18, “Mastering New Forms of Intelligence” introduces Howard Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligence. By reading about emotional intelligence and multiple intelligence you may recognize additional characteristics or strengths about yourself that you might want to mention in your personal narrative.

**The Myth of the “Perfect Life”**

How are you to structure your narrative? Simply put, there is no single way to tell your story. Often students have a difficult time selecting what to write. Some students may feel that their life lacked direction, and that to admit that their life was not focused from day one would be somehow held against them. Others may not want to disclose certain things about their lives, while others may dwell on events or activities that may not necessarily be looked upon favorably by the reader. Here are some rule of thumb guidelines:

- Assume a general reader who does not know you personally.
- Do not disclose anything of which you are ashamed.
- Do not disclose any illegal activities, even if they are limited to recreational drug use.
- Do not dwell on the negative.
- If you need to discuss some major negative event, such as an accident or illness, try to emphasize what you learned from the experience rather than on the disappointments or shortcomings it may have caused.

One way to structure your narrative is as a journey of self-discovery. In other words, your education has been a journey of self-discovery. During the course of your education you have discovered not only what you are good at, but also your passion—what you want to learn more about and spend the rest of your life pursuing.

Another way to structure your narrative is to write about your life in terms working on fulfilling a goal. Your identity as an interdisciplinarian could be considered as a goal that you are currently working on. Some other common autobiographical narrative structures include tales of survival, stories of overcoming adversities or oppression, and as Mary Catherine Bateson mentions in Reading 3, tales of conversion. Ultimately, your intellectual autobiography should be a success story, i.e., affirm your interdisciplinary path.

**Readings 1 and 2**

The readings for this chapter were selected to help you write your intellectual autobiography. They will also help you think about what you want to include in your narrative. Readings 1 and 2 are recent *New York Times* obituaries of two well-known and influential men: Isaiah Berlin and Fred Rogers. In Reading 1, “Isaiah Berlin, Philosopher and Pluralist, Is Dead at 88” by Marilyn Berger, we learn that Isaiah Berlin was a well renowned philosopher. In Reading 2, “Fred Rogers, Host of *Mister Rogers’ Neighborhood*, Dies at 74” by Daniel Lewis, we read about how important Mr. Rogers was for generations of American children.
ISAIAH BERLIN, PHILOSOPHER AND PLURALIST, IS DEAD AT 88

by Marilyn Berger

Sir Isaiah Berlin, the philosopher and historian of ideas, revered for his intellect and cherished for his wit and his gift for friendship, died of a heart attack following a long illness Wednesday evening in Oxford, England. He was 88.

A staunch advocate of pluralism in a century in which totalitarians and utopians claimed title to the one, single truth, Sir Isaiah considered the very notion that there could be one final answer to organizing human society a dangerous illusion that would lead to nothing but bloodshed, coercion and the deprivation of liberty.

Sir Isaiah defied classification. A renowned scholar, he was also a bon vivant, a sought-after conversationalist, a serious opera buff and an ardent Zionist. He shattered the popular concept of the Oxford don surrounded by dusty books and dry tutorials. His was an exuberant life crowded with joys—the joy of thought, the joy of music, the joy of good friends. Sir Isaiah (pronounced eye-ZIE-uh) seemed to know almost everyone worth knowing in the 20th century, among them Freud, Nehru, Stravinsky, Boris Pasternak, T.S. Eliot, W.H. Auden, Chaim Weizmann, Virginia Woolf, Edmund Wilson, Aldous Huxley, Bertrand Russell and Felix Frankfurter.

Sir Isaiah liked to say that his reputation was built on a systematic overestimation of his abilities. In fact, his reputation rests securely on his lectures and essays—a cornucopia of Western philosophical and political thought involving inquiries into the nature of liberty, the search for utopia, the misconceptions of the Enlightenment, the innate human yearning for a homeland, the roots of nationalism, the underpinnings of Fascism.

"The Hedgehog and the Fox," the essay perhaps best known to American students of philosophy, is a study of Tolstoy's view of history as embodied in War and Peace. Written in 1953, it is regarded as a classic of political inquiry and literary criticism. Taking his title from the Greek poet Archilochus ("The fox knows many things, but the hedgehog knows one big thing"), Sir Isaiah's essay was a study of the mind and the work of Tolstoy but went beyond that to become an exploration of his own central themes about the place of the individual in the historical process and the struggle between monism and pluralism.

In this essay, which became part of a great body of work by Sir Isaiah on Russian thinkers of the 19th century, he drew a distinction between two human types: those, like the fox, who pursue many ends, often unrelated, even contradictory, and those, like the hedgehog, who relate everything to a single universal organizing principle. He saw Tolstoy as a fox who wanted to be a hedgehog. He considered Aristotle, Goethe, Pushkin, Balzac, Joyce and Turgenev foxes. Plato, Dante, Pascal, Proust and Dostoyevsky were counted among the hedgehogs.

Sir Isaiah's 1959 essay, "Two Concepts of Liberty," is considered a major contribution to political theory. In it, he made a distinction between negative liberty, that which the individual must be allowed to enjoy without state interference, and positive liberty, that which the state permits by imposing regulations that, by necessity, limit some freedoms in the name of greater liberty for all. He argued that both kinds of liberty were required for a just society.

Investing Philosophy with Personality

To his philosophical and historical work, Sir Isaiah added elegant profiles of great figures. For him, ideas could not be divorced from people and their psychological and cultural milieu. If thinking thoughts was his chosen line of work, people were what he called his "scenery."
Sir Noel Annan, who wrote the introduction to his 1980 book, *Personal Impressions*, observed: "Nobody in our time has invested ideas with such personality, given them a corporeal shape and breathed life into them more than Isaiah Berlin; and he succeeds in doing so because ideas for him are not mere abstractions. They live... in the minds of men and women, inspiring them, shaping their lives, influencing their actions and changing the course of history."

At each stage of his life, whether young or old, acquaintances remember him as having the look of "indeterminate middle age," bespectacled, baldish, of medium height. In his conversation as in his writing—which he mainly dictated so it carried the full flavor of his voice—Sir Isaiah's sentences were constructs of dazzling erudition, built clause upon clause, wisdom intermixed with anecdote, quotations, historical parallels and flashes of wit. Sir Isaiah was so beguiling a conversationalist that when Prime Minister Harold Macmillan nominated him in 1957 for the Queen's list he noted that the knighthood should be bestowed "for talking."

Not everyone understood what he was talking about, for he spoke with extraordinary rapidity, his tongue barely able to keep up with his thoughts. His English bore the traces of his native Russian, and, in his later years, he suffered from a paralyzed vocal cord that never slowed the flow of his words but rendered some of them indistinct.

But even before this affliction, when he met Harold Ross of *The New Yorker*, Mr. Ross told him, "I don't understand a word you've said, but if you have something to publish, I'll publish it."

**Gathering Writings Left in a Basement**

As for his writing, much of it might have been left lying in the basement of Headington House, his elegant Queen Anne residence in Oxford, had an enterprising young graduate student not come along to gather it together.

Sir Isaiah's lectures were often not published and his essays were scattered in so many magazines and journals that his body of work was inaccessible to most people. Henry Hardy, the graduate student, set out to collect it in four volumes that became five: *Russian Thinkers* (1978); *Concepts and Categories* (1978); *Against the Current* (1979); *Personal Impressions* (1980) and *The Crooked Timber of Humanity* (1990). In addition, Sir Isaiah was the author of five other books: *Karl Marx* (1939); *The Age of Enlightenment* (1956); *Four Essays on Liberty* (1969); *Vico and Herder* (1976) and *The Magus of the North: J.G. Hamann and the Origins of Modern Irrationalism* (1993). This year, another collection edited by Mr. Hardy, *The Sense of Reality*, was published by Farrar, Straus & Giroux in the United States. It will soon be followed by another book, *The Proper Study of Mankind: An Anthology of Essays*.

Until the publication of the Hardy collections, Sir Isaiah had been known as a man who talked much but wrote little and had, in fact, been taken to task for not producing a major opus, a failing attributed to his reluctance to sit at a desk in front of a blank piece of paper. But Sir Isaiah said he gave no thought to leaving a legacy and insisted that he had no interest whatsoever either in his reputation or in what people would say about him after he died. Sitting in his London flat for an interview last year he said: "I really am very unambitious. I'm underambitious, if anything. I've never, never aimed at anything. I didn't shape my life. I did simply one thing after another. When opportunities arose I took them. It's all unplanned life essentially." When it was suggested that he was known as a man who took great pleasure in intellectual life, he said, "I take pleasure in pleasure."

**A Deep Commitment to Ideas' Importance**

Among the opportunities he grasped that afforded him many pleasures were assignments in Washington during World War II, Moscow just after the war, and a long association with Oxford. But underlying whatever he did was his belief in the overriding importance of ideas. "When ideas are neglected by those who ought to attend to them—that is to say, those who have been trained to think critically about ideas—they often acquire an unchecked momentum and an irresistible power over multitudes of men that may grow too violent to be affected by rational criticism," he wrote in "Two Concepts of Liberty."

He added, "Over a hundred years ago, the German poet Heine warned the French not to underestimate the power of ideas: philosophical concepts nurtured in the stillness of a professor's study could destroy a civilization... if professors can truly wield this fatal power, may it not be that only other professors or, at least, other thinkers (and not governments or congressional committees) can alone disarm them? Our philosophers seem oddly unaware of these devastating effects of their activities."
Isaiah Berlin was born in Riga, Latvia, on June 6, 1909. His father was a successful timber merchant and landowner and his grandfather on his mother’s side was a Hasidic rabbi of the ecstatic Lubavitch tradition. His family moved to St. Petersburg where he was a witness to the two Russian revolutions of 1917. The family then immigrated in 1921 to London, where it had business interests.

As a boy, Isaiah, then known as Shaya, had some religious education, although he said he found the Talmud a “very, very boring book. I could never figure out why I should care why the bull gored the cow.” Nevertheless, he continued his religious education in London, where he had his bar mitzvah.

Although he said he never felt the sting of anti-Semitism himself, he said he gave up the thought of going to Westminster School when a teacher suggested to him that with a name like Isaiah he wouldn’t “be comfortable” there. He dealt with it simply by attending St. Paul’s instead.

Second-Rate Student, and a Very Happy One

“I never was at the head of a single class,” he remembered. “I was fourth, fifth, seventh or eighth. But this didn’t bother me. Once, when I tried very, very hard, in my last year at St. Paul’s, I was second. My parents thought I could do a little better, but they didn’t bully me either. I was a very happy child.” When he tried to get into Balliol at Oxford he was told he wasn’t up to its level, but he managed to get a scholarship to Corpus Christi. He said he was not a top student at first, but found his strength in philosophy.

He said he had no idea what to do with himself when he finished school. He said he couldn’t be a doctor because he knew no science. He couldn’t be a civil servant because he wasn’t born in England. He was turned down when he applied for a job at The Guardian of Manchester because he told the editor that he thought he wasn’t much of a writer. His father wanted him to join him in the timber business, but he said that after one luncheon with him and his associates he decided he couldn’t. “I couldn’t laugh at their jokes and I thought, this is no good, is a world I could never belong in,” he said. “My father was very disappointed.”

After that he considered law. He dined at the law temples, as he said he was supposed to, but “I never did the exam; I never opened a law book, because then I was offered a job in Oxford to teach philosophy. That’s the end of my story.”

It was, of course, the beginning of his story. He became a lecturer in philosophy at New College in 1932, and, a few years later, it was in his rooms at All Souls College that a circle of the leading analytic philosophers of the day gathered to hold regular meetings. They included J.L. Austin, A.J. Ayer, Stuart Hampshire, Donald MacKinnon and Donald Macnabb.

Wartime Dispatches Win Churchill’s Notice

World War II pulled him out of the ivory tower. He was sent first to New York, where he worked for the British Information Service, and then to Washington, where his assignment was to report back weekly to London on the mood of wartime America. His brilliant dispatches soon came to the attention of Prime Minister Churchill, who instructed that he be invited to lunch one spring day in 1944.

As Sir Isaiah was fond of recounting, the invitation found its way to the wrong person. The conversation took an awkward turn that day at 10 Downing Street when Churchill asked his guest, “Berlin, what do you think is your most important piece you’ve done for us lately?” His guest replied hesitantly, “White Christmas.” The invitation had been sent to Irving, not Isaiah, Berlin.

Sir Isaiah was sent to the British Embassy in Moscow just after the war. It was his first visit to Russia since he left with his family and it was to be a visit, he remembered, that “permanently changed my outlook.” Warned that he would not be able to speak with anyone but officials assigned to him by the Communist regime, he wrote that he was able to meet a number of Russian writers, “at least two among them persons of outstanding genius.”

They were Boris Pasternak and Anna Akhmatova. To each of them he brought news of the outside world. He later wrote in his essay “Meetings With Russian Writers” that “it was like speaking to the victims of a shipwreck on a desert island, cut off for decades from civilization.”

Fifty years later he explained that what had so deeply moved him was “the fact that these people preserved their integrity, completely unflawed, through a miserable regime.” He recalled them as people of great personal sweetness, moral
integrity, even nobility. "I was struck," he said, "by the possibility of heroic behavior on the part of highly civilized, highly
intelligent people of great sensibility."

Anna Akhmatova was under constant surveillance and paid heavily for her meeting with Isaiah Berlin. The very
next day the Soviet authorities stepped up their harassment of her, so much so that some years later, when she visited
Sir Isaiah in Oxford, she solemnly informed him of a terrible secret that had taken hold of her.

He wrote that Akhmatova told him that "she and I— inadvertently, by the mere fact of our meeting—had started the
cold war and thereby changed the history of mankind. She meant this quite literally."

By the time he returned to Oxford after the war, Sir Isaiah had lost interest in the kind of analytic philosophy that
had preoccupied him during the 1930's. To him, philosophy had come to seem sterile, disconnected from history and
human lives. He said it was the work of the Russian philosopher and revolutionary Alexander Herzen that set history of
social and political ideas. He said that when he picked up Herzen's autobiography, *My Past and Thoughts* he thought
of him as "some kind of boring writer with a beard of the mid-19th century." But, he said, "it was one of the best books
ever written by a human being. I was hooked."

Once set on a new course, his life became tremendously productive. From 1947 to 1958 he wrote and lectured
at Oxford, in London and Washington, and at such American universities as Harvard, Princeton, Bryn Mawr and Chi­
cago. Some of those lectures and essays were later included in his collections. He also published translations of
Turgenev's *First Love* and *A Month in the Country*.

**Evaluating Trade-Offs Inherent to Liberty**

The theme that runs throughout his work is his concern with liberty and the dignity of human beings, and he sought
to emphasize that at all times, difficult, even tragic tradeoffs had to be made. It was his view that man must forever
choose among incommensurable and often incompatible values, that equality, for example, must at times be sacri­
ficed to liberty. He told the philosopher Ramin Jahanbegloo in a conversation that was published as a book, *Conver­
sations with Isaiah Berlin* (1992), "if you have maximum liberty, then the strong can destroy the weak, and if you
have absolute equality, you cannot have absolute liberty, because you have to coerce the powerful . . . if they are
not to devour the poor and the meek. . . . Total liberty can be dreadful, total equality can be equally frightful."

In "Two Concepts of Liberty," Sir Isaiah said that it is the question of who establishes the rules of positive liberty
that is of crucial importance. "Paternalism is despotic," he wrote. "I may, in my bitter longing for status, prefer to be
bullied and misgoverned by some member of my own race or social class, by whom I am, nevertheless, recognized as a
man and a rival—that is as an equal—to being well and tolerantly treated by someone from some higher and remoter
group." He added, "Although I may not get 'negative' liberty at the hands of the members of my own society, yet they
are members of my own group; they understand me, as I understand them; and this understanding creates within me
the sense of being somebody in the world."

Sir Isaiah insisted that there could be no single all-embracing solution to the central problems of society. He wrote,
"any study of society shows that every solution creates a new situation which breeds its own new needs and problems,
new demands." In "The Pursuit of the Ideal," he suggested that "Utopias have their value—nothing so wonderfully
expands the imaginative horizons of human potentialities—but as guides to conduct they can prove literally fatal."

He wrote that the idea of a single solution "turns out to be an illusion: and a very dangerous one. For if one really
believes that such a solution is possible, then surely no cost would be too high to obtain it: to make mankind just and happy
and creative and harmonious forever—what could be too high a price to pay for that? To make such an omelet, there is
surely no limit to the number of eggs that should be broken—that was the fate of Lenin, of Trotsky, of Mao, and for all I
know of Pol Pot."

**Prolific Writing, but No Masterpiece**

Although Sir Isaiah had the gift for saying in 90 pages what it took others 900 pages to say less well, colleagues re­
membered that it took some time for him to come to grips with a nagging feeling that he was a fraud because he had
not produced a weighty book-length philosophical work. "I never had it in me to do a great masterpiece on some big
subject," Sir Isaiah said without apparent regret as he looked back over his life.
"There was a subject on which I had views. Romanticism. The Romantics made a greater difference to us than anything else since the Renaissance, more than Marx, more than Freud. Until the Romantics came along there was only one answer to any question. Truth was one; error was many. You might not know it, you may be too benighted to find it, but there must be one answer. The Romantics said the same question can have more than one answer. The Romantics were the first to say the answer was not something built into the universe."

Sir Isaiah did write and lecture extensively on Romanticism. He was also preoccupied with cultural nationalism, a concept that he felt was deeply misunderstood and overlooked during the 19th century with its appeal to universalism as a legacy of the Enlightenment. Hegel, he said, once wrote that "freedom consists in being at home." Everyone, he believed, needed to belong to a group. He wrote about Johann Gottfried Herder, the German philosopher and poet, who convinced him of the basic need of man to be part of a particular human community with its own traditions, language, art and imagination to shape his emotional and physical development.

Yet he said that Herder believed that if people were allowed to fulfill their yearning to belong, nations could live peacefully, side by side. "I'm afraid not," he concluded. "Perhaps in the 18th century you could believe that." Although he believed in the power of ideas, he said he had no solution for the excesses of nationalism. "I have no idea," he said, "how one stops one group, one race, from hating another. The hatred between human groups has never been cured, except by time."

From Schiller he borrowed the metaphor of the "bent twig," that was bound to snap if a society is oppressed or humiliated. And from Kant he took the title of his 1990 collection The Crooked Timber of Humanity ("Out of the crooked timber of humanity no straight thing was ever made"), to suggest that the utopian notion of one big answer that is knowable and self-contained must always be fallacious because it does not take into account the cultural pluralism and conflicting values that are part of "the crooked timber of humanity."

A Zionist Perspective Rooted in Pluralism

Sir Isaiah's fervent Zionism derived from his experience as much as from his philosophy. "I can tell you why I'm a Zionist," he said in a conversation in the year before his death. "Not because the Lord offered us the Holy Land as some people, religious Jews, believe. My reason for being a Zionist has nothing to do with preserving Jewish culture, Jewish values, wonderful things done by Jews. But the price is too high, the martyrdom too long. And if I were asked, 'Do you want to preserve this culture at all costs?' I'm not sure that I would say yes, because you can't condemn people to permanent persecution. Of course assimilation might be a quite good thing, but it doesn't work. Never has worked, never will. There isn't a Jew in the world known to me who somewhere inside him does not have a tiny drop of uneasiness vis-à-vis them, the majority among whom they live. They may be very friendly, they may be entirely happy, but one has to behave particularly well, because if they don't behave well they won't like us."

When it was suggested to him during that conversation in 1996 that he was surely the exception, that he had been knighted; awarded the Order of Merit, Britain's highest honor for intellectual achievement; that he was a renowned and beloved Oxford scholar, a president of the British Academy; that he had been saluted, cherished and accepted with pride in England, the recipient of innumerable honorary degrees, he had an immediate response: "Nevertheless, I'm not an Englishman, and if I behave badly..."

In his scholarly work, Sir Isaiah had traced the origins of Zionism in a profile of the 19th-century German-Jewish revolutionary Moses Hess, one of his many portraits of political philosophers. Often, though, he was drawn to his opposites, like Karl Marx, the subject of his first book in 1939, and Joseph de Maistre, a French philosopher of the Napoleonic age whom he regarded as a proto-fascist. Michael Ignatieff, Sir Isaiah's biographer, said, "He is liberalism's greatest elucidator of the antiliberal... He is always drawn to his opponents. Here is a liberal, balanced, amusing, witty man drawn to lonely, eccentric, crazed characters. It is said he is a rationalist who visits the irrational by day and comes back to the rational stockade at night."

Faith in the 'Great Man' to Change History

A critic of the concept of historical inevitability, Sir Isaiah believed that the "great man" can bring about significant historical change. He saw Franklin D. Roosevelt as an example of such a man, and wrote of him "He was absolutely fearless... one of the few statesmen in the 20th century or any other century who seemed to have no fear at all of the
future. "Another was Chaim Weizmann, the scientist and statesman who became the first President of Israel. Weizmann, he wrote, "committed none of those enormities for which men of action, and later their biographers, claim justification on the ground of what is called raison d''état . . . Weizmann, despite his reputation as a master of realpolitik, forged no telegrams, massacred no minorities, executed and incarcerated no political opponents."

With the exception of his wartime diplomatic service and a number of visiting professorships, Sir Isaiah was associated with Oxford all his life. He began his career there in 1932 as a lecturer in philosophy at New College and spent seven years as a fellow of All Souls College. He was said to be very conscious that he was the first Jew to hold such a position at Oxford. From 1957 to 1967, Sir Isaiah held the prestigious Chichele Chair in Social and Political Theory. As the first president of Wolfson College from 1966 to 1975, he was instrumental in attracting a strong faculty to a new school at Oxford.

In the 1950's he fell in love with Aline d'Gunzburg, a French woman who is the descendant of a noble Russian family. They were married in 1956 and enjoyed more than 40 years of what friends say was particularly felicitous life together. She and her three sons from previous marriages Michel Strauss and Peter Halban of London and Dr. Philippe Halban of Geneva, survived him.

No one who knew Sir Isaiah could remember him without remarking on his love of music and the long distances he traveled to hear concerts. He was particularly devoted to opera, an affection he attributed to his mother, who he said was a very good amateur who sang arias from all the great operas. He wrote about Verdi, numbered among his friends some of the leading musicians, and served on the board of the Royal Opera House, Covent Garden.

Sir Isaiah radiated well-being. "He gives everybody the unforgettable feeling of what it's like to be well in your own skin, of what sense of health one derives from the intellectual life," his biographer, Mr. Ignatieff said in 1996. He was also a man of great equanimity even when talking about his own death. "I don't mind death," he said, "I'm afraid of dying for it could be painful. But I find death a nuisance. I object to it. I'd rather it didn't happen . . . I'm terribly curious. I'd like to live forever."

READING

FRED ROGERS, HOST OF MISTER ROGERS' NEIGHBORHOOD, DIES AT 74

by

Daniel Lewis

Fred Rogers, the thoughtful television neighbor whose songs, stories and heart-to-heart talks taught generations of children how to get along in the world, died yesterday at his home in Pittsburgh. He was 74.

The cause was stomach cancer, said David Newell, a family spokesman who also portrayed Mr. McFeely, of the Speedy Delivery Messenger Service, one of the regulars on Mister Rogers' Neighborhood.

Mr. Rogers entered the realm of children's television with a local show in Pittsburgh in 1954. But it was the daily half-hour Neighborhood show, which began nationally on public television in 1968 with homemade puppets and a cardboard castle, that caught on as a haven from the hyperactivity of most children's television. Let morphing monsters rampage elsewhere, or educational programs jump up and down for attention; Mister Rogers stayed the same year after year, a low-key affair without animation or special effects. Fred Rogers was its producer, host and chief puppeteer. He wrote the scripts and songs. Above all he supplied wisdom; and such was the need for it that he became the longest-running attraction on public television and an enduring influence on America's everyday life.

For all its reassuring familiarity, Mister Rogers' Neighborhood was a revolutionary idea at the outset and it remained a thing apart through all its decades on television. Others would also entertain the young or give them a
leg up on their studies. But it was Fred Rogers, the composer, Protestant minister and student of behavior who ventured to deal head-on with the emotional life of children.

"The world is not always a kind place," he said. "That's something all children learn for themselves, whether we want them to or not, but it's something they really need our help to understand." He believed that even the worst fears had to be "manageable and mentionable," one way or another, and because of this he did not shy away from topics like war, death, poverty and disability.

In one classic episode he sat down at the kitchen table, looked straight into the camera and calmly began talking about divorce: "Did you ever know any grown-ups who got married and then later they got a divorce?" he asked. And then, after pausing to let that sink in: "Well, it is something people can talk about, and it's something important. I know a little boy and a little girl whose mother and father got divorced, and those children cried and cried. And you know why? Well, one reason was that they thought it was all their fault. But, of course, it wasn't their fault."

When the Smithsonian Institution put one of Mr. Rogers's zippered sweaters on exhibit in 1984, no one who had grown up with American television would have needed an explanation. He had about two dozen of those cardigans. Many had been knitted by his mother. He wore one every day as part of the comforting ritual that opened the show: Mr. Rogers would come home to his living room—a set at WQED-TV in Pittsburgh—and change from a sports coat and loafers into sweater and sneakers as he sang the words of his theme, "It's a beautiful day in this neighborhood... won't you be my neighbor?"

This would be followed by a talk about something that Mr. Rogers wanted people to consider—maybe the obligations of friendship, or the pleasures of music, or how to handle jealousy. Then would come a trip into the Neighborhood of Make-Believe, where an odd little repertory company of human actors and hand puppets like King Friday XIII and Daniel Striped Tiger might dramatize the day's theme with a skit or occasionally stage an opera.

The show had guests, too, often musicians like Wynton Marsalis or Yo-Yo Ma, and field trips. Mr. Rogers would venture out to show what adults did for a living and the objects made in factories, passing along useful information along the way. Visiting a restaurant for a cheese, lettuce and tomato sandwich, he would stop to demonstrate the right way to set a table. And the sign that said restroom? It just meant bathroom, and most restaurants had them, "if you have to go."

Among his dozens of awards for excellence and public service, he won four daytime Emmys as a writer or performer between 1979 and 1999, as well as the lifetime achievement award of the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences in 1997. Last year President George W. Bush gave him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

No visit to the Neighborhood was complete without the counsel and comfort to be found in his easy-to-follow songs, which covered everything from the beauty of nature to the common childhood fear of being sucked down the bathtub drain with the water. He wrote about 200 songs and repeated many of them so regularly that his viewers, most of them between 2½ and 5½ years old, knew them by heart.

"What Do You Do," about controlling anger, began this way:
What do you do with the mad that you feel
When you feel so mad you could bite?
When the whole wide world seems oh, so wrong
And nothing you do seems very right?
What do you do? Do you punch a bag?
Do you pound some clay or some dough?
Do you round up friends for a game of tag?
Or see how fast you can go?
It's great to be able to stop
When you've planned a thing that's wrong.

Long ago, in the days before grown-ups learned how to say "mission statement," Mr. Rogers wrote down the things he wanted to encourage in his audience. Self-esteem, self-control, imagination, creativity, curiosity, appreciation of diversity, cooperation, tolerance for waiting, and persistence.

It was no coincidence that his list reflected the child-rearing principles gaining wide acceptance at the time; he worked closely with people like Margaret McFarland, a leading child psychologist, who was until her death in 1988 the principal adviser for Mister Rogers' Neighborhood.
Like any good storyteller, he believed in the power of make-believe to reveal truth, and he trusted children to sort out the obvious inconsistencies according to their own imaginations, as when the puppet X the Owl's cousin, for example, turned out to be the human Lady Aberlin in a bird suit.

His flights of fantasy probably reached their apex in his extended comic operas; "trippy productions," as the television critic Joyce Millman called them, that were "a cross between the innocently disjointed imaginings of a preschooler and some avant-garde opus by John Adams." At least one of these works, Spoon Mountain, was adapted for the stage. It was presented at the Vineyard Theater in New York in 1984.

Those who knew Mr. Rogers best, including his wife, said he was exactly the same man on-camera and off. That man had a much more complex personality than the mild, deliberate, somewhat stooped fellow in the zippered sweater might let on. One got glimpses of this in film clips of him behind the scenes, especially when working his hand puppets: here he wore a black shirt to blend into the background, became lithe and intense, and changed his voice and attitude like lightning as he switched back and forth between characters.

He was Henrietta Pussycat, who spoke mostly in meow-meows; the frequently clueless X the Owl; Queen Sara; the pompous and pedantic King Friday XIII; Lady Elaine Fairchilde, heavily rouged and evidently battle-tested in the theater of life; and others.

He inhabited his characters so artfully that Josie Carey, the host of an earlier children's series in which Mr. Rogers did not appear on camera, said that she would find herself confiding in his puppets and completely forgetting he was behind them.

He had known everything about puppets for a long time, since his solitary childhood in the 1930's. The story of how he and they came to appear together on television is a good one.

Fred McFeely Rogers was born in Latrobe, Pa., on March 20, 1928, the son of Nancy Rogers and James H. Rogers, a brick manufacturer. An only child until his parents adopted a baby girl when he was 11, and sometimes on the chubby side, he spent many hours inventing adventures for his puppets and finding emotional release in playing the piano. He could, he said, "laugh or cry or be very angry through the ends of my fingers."

He graduated from Latrobe High School, attended Dartmouth College for a year, and then transferred to Rollins College in Winter Park, Fla., graduating magna cum laude in 1951 with a music composition degree. From there he intended to study at a seminary. But his timetable changed in his senior year when he visited his parents at home and saw something new to him. It was television.

Something "horrible" was on, he remembered—people throwing pies at one another. Still, he understood at once that television was something important for better or worse, and he decided on the spot to be part of it. "You've never even seen television!" was his parents' reaction. But right after graduating from Rollins he got work at the NBC studios in New York, first as a gofer and eventually as a floor director for shows like The Kate Smith Evening Hour and Your Hit Parade.

In 1953 he was invited to help with programming at WQED in Pittsburgh, which was just starting up as this country's first community-supported public television station. The next year he began producing and writing The Children's Corner, the show with Ms. Carey, and he simply brought some puppets from home and put them on the air. In its seven-year run, the show won a Sylvania Award for the best locally produced children's program in the country, and NBC picked up and telecast 30 segments of it in 1955-56.

Meanwhile, Mr. Rogers had not given up his other big goal. Studying part-time, he earned a divinity degree from the Pittsburgh Theological Seminary in 1962. The Presbyterian Church ordained him and charged him with a special mission: in effect, to keep on doing what he was doing on television.

He first showed his own face as Mister Rogers in 1963 on a show called "Mister Rogers" when the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation asked him to start a show with himself as the on-camera host. The CBC-designed sets and other details became part of the permanent look of Rogers productions. But as for Canada, Mr. Rogers and his wife, Joanne, a pianist he had met while at Rollins, soon decided they should be raising their two young sons back in western Pennsylvania.

He is survived by his wife, their sons and two grandchildren.

Mr. Rogers returned to WQED where, in 1966, Mister Rogers' Neighborhood had its premiere in its fully developed form. It was distributed regionally in the East, and then, in 1968, what became PBS stations began showing it across the country.

In their own way, the shows and Mr. Rogers's production company, Family Communications, constituted one of the country's more stable little industries. Underwriting by the Sears, Roebuck Foundation provided long-term financial
security. Technicians, collaborators and cast members like Mr. McFeely, the deliveryman, enjoyed virtual lifetime employment. (Did anyone not know that McFeely was Mr. Rogers's middle name, which came from his maternal grandfather?)

The unlikelihood of such an institution, along with Mr. Rogers's mannerisms—that gleaming straight-ahead stare, for instance, which could be a little unnerving if you really thought about it—made parody inevitable. Perhaps the most famous sendup was on Saturday Night Live, with Eddie Murphy as a black "Mr. Robinson" who lamented: "I hope I get to move into your neighborhood some day. The problem is that when I move in, y'all move away." When Mr. Murphy later met Mr. Rogers, it was reported, he did what most everyone else did. He gave him a hug.

Mr. Rogers was a vegetarian and a dedicated lap swimmer. He did not smoke or drink. He never carried more than about 150 pounds on his six-foot frame, and his good health permitted him to continue taping shows.

But two years ago he decided to leave the daily grind. "I really respect opera singers who stop when they feel that they're doing their best work," he said at the time, expressing relief. The last episode was taped in December 2000 and was shown in August 2001, though roughly 300 of the 1,700 shows that Mr. Rogers made will continue to be shown.

He took a few years off from production in the late 1970's, and later, toward the end of his long career, he cut back to taping 12 or 15 episodes a year. Although his show ran daily throughout those years, what his latter-day viewers saw was a mix of new material and reruns, the differences between them softened by a bit of black dye in Mr. Rogers's gray hair. As a spokesman for Mr. Rogers said, it didn't matter so much that the shows were repeated: the audience was always new.

Mr. Rogers kept a busy schedule outside the Neighborhood. He was the chairman of a White House forum on child development and the mass media in 1968, and from then on was frequently consulted as an expert or witness on such issues. He produced several specials for live television and videotape. Many of his regular show's themes and songs were worked into audiotapes. There were more than a dozen books, with titles like You Are Special and How Families Grow.

He was also one of the country's most sought-after commencement speakers, and if college seniors were not always bowled over by his pronouncements, they often cried tears of joy just to see him, an old friend of their childhood.

When he was inducted into the Television Hall of Fame in 1999, he began his formal acceptance speech by saying, "Fame is a four-letter word." And now that he had gotten the attention of a house full of the industry's most powerful and glamorous names, he asked them to think about their responsibilities as people "chosen to help meet the deeper needs of those who watch and listen, day and night." He instructed them to be silent for 10 seconds and think about someone who had had a good influence on them.

Yesterday, Mr. Rogers's Web site, www.misterrogers.org, provided a link to help parents discuss his death with their children.

"Children have always known Mister Rogers as their 'television friend,' and that relationship doesn't change with his death," the site says.

"Remember," it added, "that Fred Rogers has always helped children know that feelings are natural and normal, and that happy times and sad times are part of everyone's life."


Questions on Readings 1 and 2

Were Isaiah Berlin and Fred Rogers successful in your humble opinion? Why or why not?

What is your definition of success?
What is your idea of a successful life?

Does the biography of either Isaiah Berlin or Fred Rogers represent “the myth of a perfect life”? Why or why not?

Would you consider Isaiah Berlin an interdisciplinarian? Why or why not?

Would you consider Fred Rogers an interdisciplinarian? Why or why not?

Discussion on Readings 1 and 2

Readings 1 and 2 were selected because both men share some interesting similarities. Both men did not start out knowing what exactly they would end up doing. Nevertheless, both men ended up accomplishing a great deal, even though both men did not achieve instant success.

Were both men successful? Berlin never did write the great book of philosophy. He was, according to Marilyn Berger, a *bon vivant*, meaning he was more interested in enjoying life than collecting and editing his essays into books. Perhaps a more contemporary term for Berlin instead of *bon vivant* would be *partier*, as he seemed to have valued his social life a great deal. Can you imagine how his biography could have been written differently, more negatively, by stressing what he did not accomplish but perhaps should have?

Berlin’s obituary could have been written even more positively by minimizing what could be construed as his “shortcomings” rather than emphasizing how he succeeded in spite of them. Learn from this example and avoid emphasizing what could be regarded as shortcomings. For example, students sometimes will go into much detail in their intellectual autobiographies about all the wild things they may have done during high school. Instead of detailing all of your “bad girl” or “bad boy” behavior, you can summarize that period in your life by writing a sentence similar (but not exactly—avoid plagiarism!) to the following one sentence: “I had some wild times during high school, from which I learned the importance of accountability and responsibility.”

You might want to emphasize those experiences in which you had significant learning experiences, even if they were short-term, such as during a summer job or internship. If it was a life-altering event, it is worth mentioning and describing how you changed, what you learned from the experience, and its continuing relevance in your life.
Some students may experience difficulties writing about their accomplishments. They may be modest. They may prefer to remain humble. They may have been taught that telling others about their accomplishments is tantamount to bragging and self-centeredness. Think of writing your autobiography, then, as an exercise in stating the facts, or even a preliminary exercise in personal marketing. If you do not tell others about the wonderful things you have done, who will? How will others learn about your accomplishments? Learning how to talk about your accomplishments is a necessary skill in today’s workplace. Without this skill you may not get the job you want. You will be passed over in promotions, and you could even be fired as many positions require you to list your accomplishments for annual reviews or performance evaluations. Stating your accomplishments is not the same as exaggerating. Be proud of your accomplishments and of your identity as an interdisciplinarian!

Reading 3

Readings 1 and 2 are meant to be read with Reading 3, “Construing Continuity,” by scholar Mary Catherine Bateson. Bateson’s parents, Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson were both famous anthropologists. Bateson in Reading 3 calls life stories such as Berlin’s and Rogers’ “discontinuous narratives.” Nevertheless, Bateson believes that common threads or patterns can be found in the most discontinuous life story. For example, one continuity in Mr. Rogers’ career would be his love of music. Can you find the continuities despite the discontinuities in your own life? What are those continuities? How do they relate to your academic and professional interests?

READING

CONSTRUING CONTINUITY

by

Mary Catherine Bateson

It was not until thirty years after the senior year of high school I spent in Israel that I returned in 1988 for an extended visit, accompanied by Vanni. We traveled around the country, and I told her stories of what that year had meant to me, even as I kept trying to understand the changes in the interval: three wars, expanded territories, and new waves of immigrants. Vanni’s responses were different from mine at her age, more skeptical. Although she was only a year older than I had been, she filtered her perceptions through different experiences, including seven years of childhood in Iran. I was different too: whenever I tried to fathom how much things had changed, I was confounded by the problem of knowing whether the change was in myself or in the country.

In 1956 Israel matched my youth. It offered me, as an American teenager, a model of commitment that I took away with me and treasured, so I was startled at the ways individual plans had been redirected, how different my friends’ lives had been from what they had firmly predicted. They still had the same intensity, but not the same innocent idealism. They commented constantly on the extent of changes, boasting and kvetching alternately, but that was a familiar pattern. I found that I responded to the same individuals I had liked thirty years before and to the familiar atmosphere of questioning and debate. It reassured me of a basic continuity across the years: that I was in some sense the same person I had been, and so were they.

Israel had also offered me a vision of equality for women, but returning with my perceptions changed by progress and debate in the interval, I was startled to realize that, by 1988, even with a backlash under way, the status of women looked better in the United States—but how to be certain that the status of women had not also changed in Israel, perhaps for the worse, because of increasing numbers of ultra-Orthodox? I was puzzled at things I had failed to see
during my first stay and unsure whether I had been too busy or inattentive or simply blind. Why, for instance, had I never climbed up to the fortress of Masada as a teenager? Simply because the archaeological excavations that led to opening the site, where Jews had fought to the death to preserve their tradition, had not been completed. Why had I never been to Yad Vashem, the vast holocaust memorial? I had, but most of it was built later, and preoccupation with the holocaust has intensified since.

I returned again a year later and made a project of seeking out high school classmates from thirty years before, asking them to tell me the stories of their lives in the interval and pondering their experiences of continuity and change. Israel is not an easy site for research, for I found I had to answer five questions for every one I got a response to. Still, I was startled to realize how often, in this context where everyone spoke of change, families hunkered down, couples stayed together, and children settled close to their parents.

Both Iran and the Philippines have gone through revolutions since we lived there, yet continuities keep emerging under superficial change, sometimes a long time later, like the forms of nationalism that emerged in the former Soviet Union after seventy years of Communist rule. Revolutions sweep individuals from positions of power but rarely sweep away the old concepts of power and how to use it, so patterns reassert themselves. The search for change is almost always the assertion of some underlying value that has been there all along, for men and women who set out to build something new bring with them their ideas of what is possible as well as what is seemly and what is comely. Social visions come like brides, dressed in hand-me-down finery.

In Iran after the revolution, old themes resurfaced very rapidly. I had been with the students when they went through the buildings and took down all the portraits of the Pahlavi dynasty at our fledgling university on the Caspian, sharing their euphoria and sense of liberation. The removals left pale patches on the walls, but repainting was not necessary. Within weeks they were covered with portraits of Khomeini on the same scale. One common portrait of the ayatollah standing against the sky was virtually a remake of a favorite picture of the shah. From our first arrival in Iran, the prison at Evin had been pointed out to us as a symbol of the kind of political repression that must be changed, but once emptied it was quickly filled again with dissidents against the new regime. The rumors of corruption among the mullahs and even the members of Khomeini's family sounded suspiciously similar to rumors about the old elite, whether the actual continuity was in a pattern of corruption or a pattern of paranoia about the powerful—or both. The names of streets have changed, the women are veiled, the cabarets are gone, but at a deeper level I suspect that much is the same. The Islamic revolutionaries were seeking continuities with Iran's religious past and, at another level, reasserting an ancient longing for authenticity that recurs through Iranian history. But there is also a recurrence of familiar and unlovely ideas about power and the corrupting nature of social life.

In all learning, one is changed, becoming someone slightly—or profoundly—different; but learning is welcome when it affirms a continuing sense of self. What is learned then becomes a part of that system of self-definition that filters all future perceptions and possibilities of learning. It is only from a sense of continuing truths that we can draw the courage for change, even for the constant, day-to-day changes of growth and aging.

When Vanni was reaching her teens, already committed to a career in acting, she said one day, "Mommy, it must be awfully hard on you and Daddy that I don't want to do any of the same things you and Daddy do, or Grandma and Granddad." Well, how could I know whether the sense of continuity was critical at that moment or the sense of rebellion? Somehow both must be present. I crossed my fingers and said, "You can't be a good actress unless you're an observer of human behavior and unless you wonder about other people's motivations. Actually, what we do does have a lot in common." I was lucky, since apparently what I said then was useful in setting up a relationship between continuity and change that fit her needs. American families have traditionally felt they were combining continuity and change when the sons of garage mechanics have become engineers and their sons have become physicists, but they might as easily have felt alienation across the differences in income and education.

In Israel I had repeated conversations with older members of kibbutzim bewailing the fact that their children do not want to "follow in their footsteps," choosing to leave the kibbutz, even to live abroad. "Did you grow up on a kibbutz?" I would ask. "Oh, no, my father was a shopkeeper in the city and very religious." The parents had left home to found the kibbutz, and now the children are following in their footsteps by leaving. Any social innovation, like the cooperative living of the kibbutz, is vulnerable to the fact that the next generation may be more interested in emulating the novelty of innovation than in continuing the parents' particular solutions. The pioneers of Israeli kibbutzim wanted to go back to the soil and to productive labor, but they tried to retain many aspects of urban life in their attitudes toward ideas and toward the arts, reading, questioning, and debating political ideals. If the kibbutz movement ever does fully settle into a pattern of biological recruitment—of one generation replacing the next—these older stylistic continuities may fade into country ways.
There are no known errors in the document provided. It appears to be a page from a text, possibly discussing educational or professional topics. The text is written in English and is readable without any issues of rotation, table, or diagram detection.
Chapter Five

...
The capacity to change

the capacity to change by making small, incremental adjustments. This is a critical aspect of the learning process, as it allows individuals to adapt and grow over time. In order to be effective, change must be gradual and continuous, rather than abrupt and radical. This can be facilitated through regular practice and feedback, which help individuals to identify areas for improvement and adjust their approach accordingly.

The capacity to change is also closely related to the concept of resilience, which refers to the ability to bounce back from difficult experiences and continue to grow and learn. Resilient individuals are better able to adapt to change and maintain their capacity to learn and grow.

One effective way to develop the capacity to change is through regular practice and feedback. This can be achieved through regular practice and feedback, which help individuals to identify areas for improvement and adjust their approach accordingly. In addition, it is important to maintain a growth mindset, which encourages individuals to view challenges as opportunities for growth and learning, rather than as threats to their self-efficacy.

By fostering a culture of continuous improvement, organizations can help their employees to develop the capacity to change and become more adaptable and resilient.
State degree with experience.

Abstract
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of the philosophical and psychological activities that inform the very heart of a social psychological experiment. And yet, one can believe it—uncritically.

For many, knowing the why of a phenomenon is crucial to understanding and grasping its significance. The question of how and why, however, often remains elusive. This is especially true in the realm of social psychology, where the factors that influence human behavior are often complex and difficult to pin down. It is in this context that the philosophical and psychological traditions come into play, offering insights and frameworks that can help us better understand the social world around us.

Of course, my philosophical engagement with the concept of social psychology is deeply influenced by the work of thinkers such as John Dewey and Max Weber. Dewey's emphasis on the importance of social action and the role of the individual in shaping society resonates with the social psychological perspective, while Weber's insights into power, authority, and social change provide a valuable framework for understanding the dynamics at play in social psychological phenomena.

Moreover, the philosophical and psychological traditions are not mutually exclusive. They coexist and complement each other, offering different but complementary perspectives on the same phenomena. Thus, my engagement with these traditions is not just an exercise in intellect, but a commitment to understanding the world around us and making sense of our place in it.
philosophy

...
The philosophy of science was focused on the nature of the evidence that supports scientific claims. It is argued that the best evidence is that which is objective and verifiable. This is in contrast to the personal beliefs and biases that can influence our perception of the world.

The concept of scientific method is the process by which new scientific knowledge is acquired. It involves making observations,形成 hypotheses, conducting experiments, and drawing conclusions. The scientific method is a systematic approach to understanding the natural world.

The novel, A Theory of Everything, by the Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov opens in a park where two men are discussing the latest trends in the field of theoretical physics. The novel explores the nature and meaning of the Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov's works, and delves into the complexities of the field in a thought-provoking manner.

The Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov's works, such as The Master and Margarita, are not discussed in this section. However, they are all seen to be significant in shaping the field of theoretical physics. The novel, A Theory of Everything, serves as a starting point for further exploration in the field of theoretical physics.

In conclusion, the novel A Theory of Everything by the Russian writer Mikhail Bulgakov serves as a starting point for further exploration in the field of theoretical physics. It explores the nature and meaning of the writer's works, and delves into the complexities of the field in a thought-provoking manner. The novel is a testament to the power of literature in shaping our understanding of the world.
null
The recent emphasis on interdisciplinary education and research is well-founded and prepares the beginning academician for the complexities of understanding the world. It is time for observers of interdisciplinary research to reflect on the breadth of interdisciplinary down to the weight of its constituent parts.

A second consideration is suggested by W. E. Morgan's well-written and perceptive essays on the nature of the teaching and learning experience in non-disciplinary education. His compelling argument that the culture of interdisciplinary education is the foundation of educational change is a powerful insight into the current and possible future directions of educational practice.

All three and speaks directly to interdisciplinary research and not to interdisciplinary education.
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Notes

The Celts in Ireland

Reading
Sign cannot be accomplished without involving the meditative and process descriptors.

Given from different angles and experiences, the best way to develop an artistic design is to link the different perspectives. This essay will focus on a specific example, which is described in detail above. The focus is on the creative process, and how the different perspectives can be integrated. The essay will highlight the importance of the meditative aspect, and how it can be used to enhance the design process. The essay will also discuss the role of the artist in the creative process, and how their perspective can be used to create a unique design.

In conclusion, the meditative aspect of the creative process is an essential part of the design process. It allows the designer to explore different perspectives, and to create a unique design that is both visually appealing and conceptually rich. The essay has shown how the meditative aspect can be integrated into the design process, and how it can be used to create a unique and compelling design.

References:
- The Design Process by John H. Clark
- The Artist's Way by Julia Cameron
- The Power of Now by Eckhart Tolle
easier they will be in learning more about your identity an interdisciplinary.

For those who have their first experience with this, the more time you can spend
in the classroom, the better your understanding of human behavior will be. I believe
that understanding others is the key to living a happy life. People say rằng
I want to change, but do not seem to do so. One reason why people say they
don't want to change is because they are afraid of the change. My curiosity on
the subject leads me to deeper understanding and a better understanding of
myself and others.

change

I believe we are in a difficult time, but we are not alone. I believe we can make
a difference in the world. I believe we can make a difference in our lives.

There are many things we can do to improve our lives. I believe we can make
a difference in the world. I believe we can make a difference in our lives.
1. **Symbolism**—What elements do you use to symbolize your life? Why did you choose these elements and what do they mean?

Here are some suggestions to get you started:

- Consider your journey on the map. Demonstrate the path you've followed. Show continuity with discontinuities.
- A visual description of your written autobiographical autobiography.

Create your map around your narrative. Follow the same structure as your narrative so that the map becomes a visual representation of your written autobiographical autobiography.

Compare with different sections ( aesis, woodwind, bass, percussion) to represent developments in your life. Some are more important than others. Use your imagination to depict the significance of each place for instance, places that are meaningful to you. This should create your own geographical place.

- The map should be meaningful (see Chapter Three) rather than geographical. Avoid the urge to name the places.

- Your map should reveal the development of your value system, convey an interdisciplinary blend of concepts. Teritory you have yet to visit
- Territory you choose not to visit
- Territory you visited

**SECTION II—VISUAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY (MAP)**

This map should include geographical and political elements, boundaries, roads, cities of significance, cities and towns. Each map should convey the following elements:

- A visual description of your interdisciplinary journey in the form of a map. Creating and seeing a visual representation of your life will reveal continuities within discontinuities and help guide your progress toward your ultimate dreams.

**SECTION I—INTERDISCIPLINARY AUTOBIOGRAPHY (NARRATIVE)**

The primary purpose of the autobiographical map is to facilitate your reflective process. (2) Explore the episodes that have shaped your value system and (3) identity specific steps you must take to reach your professional goals.

- Purpose

**OVERVIEW**

6. Lay out your map by assignment.

**REVIEW**

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MAP

Reading