



**MGMT 462: SENIOR HONORS SEMINAR
LEADERSHIP IN LIFE STORIES
SPRING 2014 SYLLABUS**

Professor:	Catherine Durnell Cramton, Ph.D.
Class Meeting Time:	Wednesdays, 4:30-7:10 p.m.
Class Location:	Enterprise 277
Office:	Enterprise 218
Course Website:	Blackboard
Office Phone:	(703) 993-1814
Office Hours	3-4 p.m. Wednesdays and by appointment
E-mail:	ccramton@gmu.edu
Home Office:	240.329.3929
Fax:	Arrange in advance by telephone or e-mail.

Course Focus and Objectives:

The Management Senior Honors Seminar is intended to give accomplished students who are majoring in Management a seminar-style learning experience, working closely with a professor in a small group to read, discuss, and analyze material relevant to the discipline and practice of Management.

This year's topic, Leadership in Life Stories, offers you the opportunity to examine leadership motivations and behaviors in the context and complexity of lives and their times. Our honors seminar group will read, analyze and discuss the life stories, leadership practices, and contexts of a group of well-known business and societal leaders—women and men, leaders operating in a variety of industries and settings, and contemporary and historical figures. We also will explore the dynamics of partnership and the leader-follower relationship.

We analyze these behaviors and forces inductively—by reading biographies and autobiographies and making sense of them in our own terms—and by gradually incorporating theoretical materials that suggest possible interpretations. In addition to the content focus of the course—leaders and their life stories—you will be challenged to sharpen your skills for weighing the value of different authors' points of view. For example, we will compare autobiography with biography, and compare the accounts of different biographers, taking into account their social vantage points.

You are encouraged to understand leaders as imperfect human beings, who may simultaneously possess keen insights, troubling blind spots, notable competencies, and problematic limitations. Furthermore, you will be asked to articulate what you as a future leader and follower can learn from each of the individuals studied.

Format:

The course is organized in a seminar format, meaning that it emphasizes independent reading and analysis of materials, followed by small group discussion and integration of insights, facilitated by the professor. This is not a lecture course. Because of the small group seminar format, it is **absolutely essential** that you do the assigned readings in advance of each class and collect your thoughts for discussion. This process is facilitated by the presence of Memo and Discussion Questions in the syllabus and the major role that preparation of biweekly analytic memos plays in course evaluation.

Course Materials:

Books recommended for purchase: (All are available in paperback and many in e-format.)

- Walton, Sam. 1993. *Sam Walton: Made in America*. Bantam. ISBN: 0553562835
- Graham, Katharine. 1998. *Personal History*. Vintage. ISBN: 0375701044
- Lowenstein, Roger. 1995. *Buffett: The Making of an American Capitalist*. New York: Broadway Books. ISBN: 0-385-48491-7
- Fiorina, Carly. 2006. *Tough Choices*. New York: Portfolio. ISBN 1-59184-133-x
- Chafee, William H. 2012. *Bill and Hillary: The Politics of the Personal*. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux. ISBN: 978-0809094653
- Huntford, Roland. 1999. *The Last Place on Earth*. Modern Library. ISBN: 0375754741
- Oates, Stephen. 1994. *Let the Trumpet Sound: The Life of Martin Luther King Jr.* Harper Perennial. ISBN: 0553562835

Readings to purchase from Harvard Business School Press. Here is the link to the coursepack: <https://cb.hbsp.harvard.edu/cbmp/access/23234449>

- Coutu, Diana L. 2004. Putting leaders on the couch: A conversation with Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0401F.
- George, Bill, Sims, Peter, McLean, Andrew N. and Mayer, Diana. 2007. Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0702H.
- Collins, Jim. 2001/reprinted 2005. Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0507M.

Readings on ereserves:

- Additional readings are available on ereserves (password is global). To access E-Reserves, click on <http://furbo.gmu.edu/cgi-bin/ers/OSCRgen.cgi> (the link also appears on the Blackboard course welcome page).

Communication:

One of the best ways to reach me is via e-mail, which I monitor closely. I will communicate with the class outside of class time by e-mails sent to the GMU class list. If the weather is bad on the day of class, please call 993-1000 to see whether the university is open or closed.

If you are a student with a disability and you need academic accommodations, please see me and contact the Disability Resource Center (DRC) at 993-2472. All academic accommodation must be arranged through the DRC.

Standards of Behavior and the Honor Code:

The mission of the School of Management at George Mason University is to create and deliver high quality educational programs and research. Students, faculty, staff, and alumni who participate in these educational programs contribute to the well-being of society. High quality educational programs require an environment of trust and mutual respect, free expression and inquiry, and a commitment to truth, excellence, and lifelong learning. Students, program participants, faculty, staff, and alumni accept these principles when they join the SOM community. In doing so, they agree to abide by the following standards of behavior:

- Respect for the rights, differences, and dignity of others
- Honesty and integrity in dealing with all members of the community
- Accountability for personal behavior

Integrity is an essential ingredient of a successful learning community. You are expected to exemplify the high standards of personal integrity reflected in the University's Honor Code. When you are given an assignment as an individual, the work must be your own. In your work on all written assignments, you may not present as your own the words, the work, or the opinions of someone else without proper acknowledgement. You also may not borrow the sequence of ideas, the arrangement of material, or the pattern of thought of someone else without proper acknowledgement. In this course, when you cite course materials in your memos and in the final paper, the following format is sufficient: (Walton, p. 5).

This course is conducted in accordance with GMU Honor Code procedures: <http://www.gmu.edu/departments/unilife/honorcode.html>. There will be no tolerance for Honor Code violations.

Evaluation:

Evaluation of performance in the course will hinge on the quality of your preparation for class each week, your contributions to an analytical and insightful class discussion, and your written analyses of the leaders we study, including use of the interpretive material introduced in the course.

Class Participation. The quality of your class participation will constitute 20 percent of your final grade in the course. After our fifth class meeting on Feb. 19, I will post on Blackboard some initial individual feedback on your class participation.

Memos. This syllabus offers you opportunities to write up to seven memos in advance of class that summarize your analysis of the leader(s) in question, making connections to other leaders and to interpretive material introduced in the course. As noted above, when you cite course materials, the following format is sufficient: (Walton, p. 5). You are not expected to draw on any materials from outside the course, but should you do so for some reason, give full bibliographic information.

The seven memo opportunities are 1) Walton, 2) Graham 3) Fiorina, 4) Bill and Hillary Clinton, 5) Amundsen and Scott, 6) King, part 1, and 7) King, part 2. Each memo you write will be worth

10 percent of your grade, up to 60%. I will credit your six best memos for your grade. There is no extra credit for additional memos.

To receive credit, a memo must be turned in on paper **no later than the start of the class in question**. If you have to miss class, you may on one occasion email your memo to me in advance of the class and receive credit for it.

Memos should be 2-3 single-spaced pages in length, with paragraphs separated by empty lines. They should directly address the memo questions listed in the syllabus. Organize your memos by question and number your responses to reflect the question numbers. There is no need to reproduce the questions in your memo.

Final Paper. The final paper offers you an opportunity to reread and reflect upon the memos you have written and draw broader conclusions about your learning in the course. The final paper should be about eight double-spaced pages in length and written as an essay, rather than a point-by-point response to the questions below. Give specific examples to support your points and make associations with and cite interpretive materials introduced in the course. While drawing on your previous memos, you are expected to introduce some new analyses and insights in the final paper. A paper copy is due May 7.

Questions for Final Paper

1. How has this course affected your understanding of the nature and practice of leadership and leader-follower relationships?
2. What are some of the most important leadership behaviors that you have observed as you have reflected on the leaders we have studied?
3. Do you have a new appreciation for any risks of which leaders should be aware—either from within themselves or outside? Please describe them and make associations with course readings.
4. What is your notion now of the “life story?” How do you think leadership is embedded in a life story? Do you think factors such as gender, age and situation affect leaders and the practice of leadership?
5. Optional question: Is there a particular leader with whom you identify and if so, why? Is there one about whom you feel particularly critical and if so, why? Sometimes the answers to these questions reflect on our own best and worst sides as leaders. If you find that to be so, please comment.

Evaluation Summary:

Class participation	20%
Six memos (10% each, due at the start of class)	60%
Final paper (due May 7)	20%

Grading:

Grades assigned for the course will be A, A-, B+, B, B-, C, or F. An A or A- is an honors grade. It means that your work significantly exceeded expectations and was deserving of honor. A B, B-, or B+ or is a grade for good to very good performance. It means that you have satisfactorily demonstrated command of the course material. A C is a passing grade but indicates that there were very significant flaws in your demonstrated grasp of the material. An F is a failing grade.

Course Schedule with Reading Assignments:

I recommend you read each week's items in the order listed.

Jan. 22: Course introduction and some key themes

- Note on critical thinking and insight (see pp. 9-10 of syllabus)
- The “barn-raising” model for seminars (see pp. 10-12 of syllabus)
- Purchase from Harvard Business School Publishing: Coutu, Diana L. 2004. Putting leaders on the couch: A conversation with Manfred F. R. Kets de Vries. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0401F.
- Ereserves: Fels, Anna. 2004. *Necessary Dreams*, Ch. 8, pp. 118-140. New York: Pantheon Books
- Purchase from Harvard Business School Publishing: George, Bill, Sims, Peter, McLean, Andrew N. and Mayer, Diana. 2007. Discovering your authentic leadership. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0702H.

Discussion questions:

Which of the authors' points do you find most interesting? least familiar? most useful?

Jan. 29: Sam Walton of Wal-Mart

- Walton, Sam. *Sam Walton: Made in America* (Read entire book.)

Memo questions:

1. What do you believe are Walton's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? Describe specific behaviors.
2. What forces do you think shaped Walton's leadership motivations and behaviors? Consider Walton's family background and relationships, models or mentors, and formative experiences.
3. Do any of the articles we read and discussed last week contribute to your understanding of Walton? If so, how? If not, why not?
4. How would you describe the relationship between Sam Walton as a leader and his followers?

For personal reflection:

- What can you learn from Sam Walton?
- Walton is writing his book at the end of his life, during his second bout with cancer. Do you see any ways in which that may have affected his book?

Feb. 5: Adult development and midlife transition: Considering Bill Gates

- Ereserves: Levinson, Daniel. 1977. The mid-life transition: A period in adult psychosocial development. *Psychiatry*, 40 (May), pp. 99-112.

Feb. 12: Katharine Graham of the Washington Post Company

- Graham, Katharine. *Personal History* pp. 1-59, 68-75, 85-90, 103-117, 137-40, 146-50, 179-182, 208-216, 230-234, 242-253, 305-to end.
- Lowenstein, Roger. *Buffett*, p. 181-194

Memo questions:

1. What do you see as Katharine Graham's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? Describe specific behaviors.
2. What forces do you think shaped Graham's leadership motivations and behaviors?
3. How would you describe Graham's leader-follower relationships and/or important partnerships?

4. Do you find aspects of our initial interpretive readings (Kets de Vries, Fels, George et al., Levinson) to be helpful for understanding Katharine Graham?
5. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

For personal reflection:

- What can you learn from Katharine Graham?
- What do you think is Katharine Graham's objective in writing this book?

Feb. 19: Guest speaker: Christos Efessiou, CEO Strategic Pharmaceutical Advisors, LLC

In preparation for next week: Some personality considerations

- Ereserves: Kroll, Mark J., Toombs, Leslie A. and Wright, Peter. 2000. Napoleon's tragic march home from Moscow: Lessons in hubris. *Academy of Management Executive* 14: 117-128.
- Purchase from Harvard Business School Publishing: Collins, Jim. 2001/reprinted 2005. Level 5 leadership: The triumph of humility and fierce resolve. *Harvard Business Review* Reprint R0507M.

Feb. 26: Carly Fiorina and Hewlett Packard

- Fiorina, Carly. 2006. *Tough Choices*. Chapters 1-8, 10-11, 13, 15, 16-19
- Ereserves: Burrows, Peter. *Backfire: Carly Fiorina's High Stakes Battle for the Soul of Hewlett-Packard*, Ch. 8

Memo questions:

1. What do you believe are Fiorina's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? Describe specific behaviors.
2. What forces do you think shaped Fiorina's leadership motivations and behaviors?
3. Why do you think the Hewlett-Packard board was drawn to hire Fiorina as Chief Executive Officer? How does the choice of Fiorina relate to the company's history and its situation in 1999?
4. Do you see any differences in Fiorina's leadership style early in her career relative to her style at Hewlett-Packard? Please explain. If you see differences, how do you account for the change?
5. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

Additional discussion questions:

6. Do you see any important contrasts or commonalities between Carly Fiorina and either Sam Walton or Katharine Graham?
7. Do you agree with Carly Fiorina that a leader's job is to help people overcome their fear?
8. What can you learn from Carly Fiorina and her story?

March 5: Warren Buffett

- Lowenstein, Roger. *Buffett: The Making of an American Capitalist*, Ch. 1-5, pp. 3-95
- Ereserves: Sims, Ronald R. 2000. Changing an organization under new leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics* 25: 65-78.
- Posted on Blackboard: Buffett, Warren E. 2011. Stop coddling the super-rich. *New York Times*, August 14.
- Posted on Blackboard: O'Brien, Timothy and Saul, Stephanie. 2006. Buffett to give bulk of his fortune to Gates charity. *New York Times*, June 26.

Discussion questions:

1. What can you learn from Warren Buffett's leadership approach at Salomon Brothers?
2. How would you describe Buffett's strengths as a leader? Do you see some weaknesses?

Spring Break. No class on March 12

March 19: No class. Reading time!!!

March 26: Bill and Hillary Clinton

- Chafe, William. 2012. *Bill and Hillary: The Politics of the Personal* (Read the entire book.)

Memo Questions:

1. What do you see as the individual strengths and weaknesses of Bill Clinton and Hillary Rodham Clinton?
2. How would you describe their partnership? What forces do you think drew them together as partners? Do you think their partnership worked?
3. What do you think are the most important criteria for successful leader partnerships? To what extent do you see those qualities present in the Bill and Hillary Clinton relationship?
4. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

For personal reflection:

- What can you learn from the Clintons' story (so far)?

April 2: Enron: The Smartest Guys in the Room

- Ereserves: Stein, Mark. 2013. When does narcissistic leadership become problematic? Dick Fuld at Lehman Brothers. *Journal of Management Inquiry* 22: 282-293 (read section on narcissism; section on Lehman case is optional).

April 9: Robert Falcon Scott and Roald Amundsen, polar explorers

- Huntford, Roland. *The Last Place on Earth*. Introduction. Acknowledgements. Chs. 1-4, 6, 8-9, pp. 124-6 of Ch. 10, Chs. 11-13, pp. 196-201 of Ch. 14, Ch. 15, and Ch. 17 to end.
- Ereserves: Cherry-Garrard, Apsley. *The Worst Journey in the World*, pp. 256-259

Optional:

- Ereserves: Cherry-Garrard, Apsley. *The Worst Journey in the World*, pp. 628-641 and pp. 659-663.

Memo Questions:

1. What do you see as Amundsen's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? What do you see as Scott's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? Describe specific behaviors.
2. How would you describe Amundsen and Scott's leader-follower relationships and/or important partnerships?
3. Are there ways in which you think the national backgrounds of Amundsen and Scott, and the political context of their times, affected
 - a. their thinking and behaviors as leaders?
 - b. how the outcomes of their Antarctic expeditions were viewed by others contemporaneously?
4. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

Additional Discussion Questions:

5. Roland Huntford's book was greeted with controversy when published in 1979. How do you think about issues of bias with regard to this book?
6. Which of the interpretive material we have studied (Kets de Vries, Fels, George et al., Levinson, Kroll et al., Collins, Stein) may contribute to our understanding of Amundsen and Scott? What do you think makes them tick?
7. Discuss any important contrasts or commonalities you see between Amundsen and/or Scott and the other individuals we have studied thus far.
8. What can you learn from Amundsen and Scott?

April 16: Guest speaker: Shirley Davis Sheppard, VP Global Diversity & Inclusion, SHRM

April 23: Martin Luther King Jr.

- Oates, Stephen. 1994. *Let the Trumpet Sound: The Life of Martin Luther King, Jr.* (We will probably read the entire book.) Stephen Oates is a white American historian.
- Ereserves: Billingsley, Andrew. 1986. *Black Families in White America*, pp. 97-121 (Ch. 4). Prentice Hall. Andrew Billingsley is a black sociologist.

Memo Questions:

1. What do you see as King's strengths and weaknesses as a leader? Describe specific behaviors.
2. Do you think King's leadership was shaped by the internal dynamics of his family? By the external activities of his family? If so, how? If not, why not?
3. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

Additional Discussion Questions:

4. What were the qualities of King's relationships with his followers and other civil rights leaders?
5. What were the key ideas behind King's leadership and from where did he draw them?

April 30: Martin Luther King Jr.

- Ereserves: Davis, Allison. 1983. *Leadership, Love and Aggression*, pp. 3-14 (Ch. 1). Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Allison Davis is a black psychoanalytically oriented personality theorist.
- Ereserves: Garrow, David. 1986. *Bearing the Cross*, pp. 575-624 (Ch. 11). William Morrow & Co. David Garrow is a white American historian.

Memo Questions (continued):

5. What were the bases of King's depression?
6. Do you see any differences between the black (Billingsley and Davis) and white (Oates and Garrow) writers' accounts of King? If so, what are they? Which accounts did you find most useful?
7. Looking across all the materials we have read, why do you think King was able to be effective as a leader?
8. What other questions would you like the class to discuss?

Additional Discussion Question

9. What can you learn from Martin Luther King Jr.?

May 7: Final "exam" discussion. Final paper due.

Note on Critical Thinking and Insight

It is my hope that our seminar will deepen your skills in critical thinking and insight, particularly with regard to leaders, their lives and leadership. Here are definitions of critical thinking and insight:

Critical thinking deals with the use of reason in the pursuit of truth (from <http://www.kcmetro.cc.mo.us/longview/ctac/corenotes.htm>)

A well-cultivated critical thinker:

- Raises vital questions and problems, formulating them clearly and precisely;
- Gathers and assesses relevant information, using abstract ideas (ex. our conceptual readings) to interpret it effectively;
- Comes to well-reasoned conclusions and solutions, testing them against relevant criteria and standards;
- Thinks open-mindedly, recognizing and assessing, as need be, assumptions, implications, and practical consequences; and
- Communicates effectively with others in figuring out solutions to complex problems.

(Adapted from <http://www.criticalthinking.org/aboutCT/ourConceptCT.shtml>)

Insight is (1) the capacity to discern the true nature of a situation; penetration; (2) The act or outcome of grasping the inward or hidden nature of things or of perceiving in an intuitive manner (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, 4th edition). Some activities that might help you do this with regard to the leaders we study include:

- Considering both their strengths and weaknesses, which may be intertwined. For example, a strength like confidence also can be a weakness when it results in a person taking unwise risks or failing to line up support. Also consider whether the leader has blindspots and what might be the source of blindspots.
- Try to spot patterns of behavior in individual lives or across the leaders we study. Do you have a theory or explanation for the pattern?
- Do you see important differences across the leaders we study?
- Is the way you think about leadership changing? What is your notion now of the “life story?” How do you think leadership is embedded in a life story?
- Consider the point of view and possible biases, strengths, agendas or blindspots of the writers we read, be they the leader him or herself or a biographer. Bias isn't necessarily intentional; all writers make choices (often unconsciously) about what information to present, and how to weight and interpret it. The person qualities and experiences of the writer or his/her historical time period may shape this point of view. Critical thinking includes the ability to consider the source of information, rather than accepting it at face value.
- Consider the historical context of the leader's life. Does this offer possible explanations for their development, point of view, choices, and reception by others? Also, does our current historical context affect how we see leaders and their lives?

- What sticks in your mind about the leader? Make a note of it--whatever it is--when something particularly catches your interest. You may not know at first why that particular aspect intrigues you but if you stay with these hunches, they often can be a source of nice insights. You also can question yourself using the “Five Whys” technique described below to pursue the point.
- Use the “Five Whys” technique to question yourself and consider points more deeply. Question your conclusions methodically by asking yourself why you drew the conclusion you did, and then subject this answer in turn to the question "Why?" After a few rounds of inquiry, you may find yourself at a deeper level of understanding.
- Ask whether some of our more conceptual and interpretive readings (Kets de Vries, Fels, George et al. Levinson, Kroll et al., Collins, Stein, Billingsley, and Davis) illuminate the person or situation we are studying.

The “Barn Raising” Model for Seminars

This is an excerpt from an article by Don McCormick and Michael Kahn that appeared in *Exchange: The Organizational Behavior Teaching Journal*. 1987, v. 7(4), pp. 16-20.

What Is a Good Seminar?

... It seems intuitively clear that a seminar ought not to be a question-and-answer session, though often it is. Conversely, the implication is that it should be conversation among the students in which the participation is widespread and the teacher is just another participant, or else in some way a facilitator of the discussion. But what sort of conversation? ...

We would like to suggest ... (t)he model ... (of)... a group of builders constructing a building together or a group of artists fabricating a creation together ...

(W)e are going to offer here a collaborative model for the seminar. Before describing (it), we will quote from an earlier paper which describes three dysfunctional kinds of seminars and then describe our fourth model. The four are . . . the Free-for-All, the Beauty Contest, the Distinguished House Tour, and the Barn-Raising. We think they go in that order toward being ... progressively richer styles of intellectual conversation.

Free-for-all. In this seminar there is a prize to be won, whether it's the instructor's approval or one's self esteem. There is no other goal but to win. If fighting fair won't win, then one fights in whatever way will win. One wins not simply by looking smart, but by looking smarter. Thus, important as it is to look smart, it is equally important to make the others look dumb.

Beauty contest. This is the seminar in which each idea is paraded in all its finery, seeking admiration. When it has been displayed, its sponsor withdraws to think up the next idea, paying little attention to the next contestant. Thus, each person's ideas bear little or no relation to anyone else's.

Distinguished house tour. Similarly, the Distinguished House Tour seminar begins with one member advancing an idea. The other students spend some time exploring that idea as they might an interesting house. They ask questions and look for inconsistencies, trying hard to

understand the conception. When they have a good grasp of it, someone offers another idea and the seminar members explore that. Just as gracious hosts don't compare houses or claim one is better, each idea is thought to be interesting in its own right. This is a high form of discourse and can produce a good seminar. It also has some problems.

In our early work we had thought that the Distinguished House Tour was the most advanced seminar. It is, after all, the Socratic dialogue. Socrates invites a friend to adopt a position and then incisively questions that position. Gradually, we learned from our own experience what Socrates' students may well have learned from theirs: defending or explaining a position is lonely and stressful. When one is trying to explore a new thought, the pressure of the group probing for problems or inconsistencies is at best like a trial and at worst like an inquisition ... (T)here are few people, even those who enjoy fencing, who find that this position enhances the development of a thought. In most Socratic dialogues, we realized, Socrates emerges one-up and everyone else comes out looking a little foolish. That discovery led us to our next step.

The Barn Raising Model

In frontier America when a family needed a barn but had limited labor and other resources, the entire community gathered to help them build the barn. The host family described the kind of barn it had in mind and picked the site. The community then pitched in and built it. Neighbors would suggest changes and improvements as they built.

This seminar begins with a member telling the group ideas which might be newly formed and not yet thought out. Then the community gathers to build the barn, to put together that idea. As I hear you say the original idea, it may be something I "disagree" with or something I've never thought about before; but now it becomes my project, and I set about helping you build it, helping us build it. After you've offered the idea, you have no more responsibility for developing it, defending it, or explaining it than anybody else in the group. If I have a problem with that idea, the problem belongs to the whole seminar, not just to you. You are not the lonely defender of that idea but part of a task-force whose job is to develop it to its fullest potential, to make the best possible case for it. It is not your idea anymore; it belongs to the seminar. The energy which might have gone into conflict, or into polite challenge-and-defense, now is directed toward a common goal.

One advantage of the Barn Raising seminar turned out to be that people don't come out of the seminars holding their original ideas. Social psychologists' work on persuasion has made it clear that an effect of argument is to entrench the original ideas all the more firmly In contrast, one of the most effective methods of helping someone to unfreeze an old attitude or idea is to ask that person to make the case for an unfamiliar or unwelcome position Thus, students, building on colleagues' ideas, maximize the chances of freeing their own flexibility and creativity

It should be made clear that the freedom to build ideas in this way depends on the crucial difference between idea-groups and groups required to make a decision. In the early stages of conversation, a decision-group can learn much from barn raising. But, eventually, mutually exclusive alternatives must be recognized as such. That fact serves to underline the major freedom provided by idea-groups. It is ironic how rigidly trained we have been to squander that freedom and argue ideas as though we believed a decision had to be made. Is Hamlet mad or not? The world will little note which decision we reach. But we will long remember whether we have explored the question in a way calculated to enrich our understanding of the play and our relationship with each other (Kahn, 1981).

We learned in barn-raising that when a seminar develops a point of view about anything, another point of view is likely to emerge which seems at first hopelessly contradictory to the first. In doing this work we have come to see the world as composed of an endless collection of dilemmas. In our culture what we typically do (and most academic discussions are no exception) is deny the pain of the dilemma by assuming that one horn or the other must be wrong. We then set up an argument-my horn against yours (This) forces us into a greatly over-simplified view of the issue when its complexity may be its greatest beauty. So, in our seminars, we learned to try to identify and preserve the dilemmas

But what do you do with them, beyond merely preserving them? It seemed to us that the thing to do was to try to convert them not to debate, but rather to dialectic. Dialectic consists of two posed, potential antagonists (thesis and antithesis) which come together and give birth to the synthesis. It ... leads discussants to collaboration

The barn-raising seminar is not merely a form of classroom learning. It can be a way of making every conversation an educational experience.

References

Kahn, M., "The Seminar." Unpublished paper, 1974.

Kahn, M., "The Seminar: An Experiment in Humanistic Education." *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, 21(2), 119-127 Spring 1981.

Selected Events in Polar Exploration and in the Lives of Scott and Amundsen

- 1831 James Clark Ross reaches the North Magnetic Pole
- 1841 James Clark Ross discovers the Antarctic ice shelf, now known as the Ross Ice Barrier
- 1868 Robert Falcon Scott born new Plymouth, England
- 1872 Roald Amundsen born near Christiana, Norway (now Oslo). At the time, Norway is ruled by Sweden
- 1888-9 Norwegian explorer Fridtjof Nansen makes first crossing of Greenland
- 1892-5 Commanding the new ship Fram, Nansen enters the Arctic Circle, allows the ship to freeze into the pack ice and drifts across the Polar Basin. Nansen and Hjalmar Johansen (who later went to Antarctica with Amundsen) leave Fram and travel with sledges, dogs and skis to 86° 14', establishing a new furthest north.
- 1898 Belgian naval officer Adrien de Gerlache and crew (with Amundsen as second mate) become stuck in ice off Antarctic Peninsula. Become first team to spend a winter in Antarctic region. Amundsen leads first sled expedition in Antarctica.
- 1899 Norwegian Carsten Borchgrevink and crew are first to spend a winter camped on Antarctic continent.
- 1901 Queen Victoria dies. King Edward VII crowned. Commanding the ship Discovery, Robert Falcon Scott leads the British National Antarctic Expedition to explore the South Pole region.
- 1902 Scott, Edward Wilson and Ernest Shackleton set out on overland trek to South Pole, reaching the southernmost point attained by any expedition to date. Exhaustion and hunger force them to retreat before reaching the pole.
- 1905 Norway gains independence from Sweden. Scott publishes *The Voyage of the Discovery*, which is well received.
- 1906 As commander of the ship Gjoa, Amundsen completes first trip through Northwest Passage in Arctic Circle.
- 1/1909 As commander of the ship Nimrod, Shackleton leads British Antarctic Expedition, trekking to within 97 miles of the South Pole, setting a new record for the furthest south. Party turns back before reaching the pole because of hunger and illness.
- 9/1909 American explorer Robert Peary claims to have reached North Pole in April. American explorer Frederick Cook claims to have reached the North Pole in 1908.
- 6/1910 Commanding the ship Terra Nova, Scott departs England for another attempt at reaching the South Pole.

10/1910 Amundsen, slated for an expedition to North Pole, changes the course of the ship Fram for the South Pole.

British Antarctic Expedition under R.F. Scott, 1910 (*key characters)

Shore party

Atkinson, Edward L. , R.N (Royal Navy). - surgeon, parasitologist

***Bowers**, Henry Robertson - lieutenant

Campbell, Victor - Lieutenant, R.N.

***Evans**, Edward R.G.R. - lieutenant, R.N. "Teddy Evans"

Levick, G. Murray - surgeon, R.N.

***Oates**, Lawrence , Capt. 6th Iniskilling Dragoons (Cavalry) (paid passenger) – in charge of horses

***Scott**, Robert Falcon Commander, R.N. - **expedition leader**

Scientific Staff

Day, Bernard C. - motor engineer

Debenham, Frank - geologist

***Cherry-Garrard**, Apsley - assistant zoologist (paid passenger)

***Gran**, Tryggve - ski expert

***Meares**, Cecil H. - in charge of dogs

Nelson, Edward W. - biologist

Ponting, Herbert G. - camera artist

Priestley, Raymond E. - geologist

Simpson, George - meteorologist

Taylor, T. Griffith - geologist

***Wilson**, Edward Adrian - chief of scientific staff and biologist "Bill Wilson"

Wright, Charles S. - physicist

Crew

Abbot, George - petty officer, R.N.

Archer, W.W. - chief steward, late R.N.

Browning, Frank V. - petty officer, 2nd class, R.N.

Clissold, Thomas - cook, late R.N.

Crean, Tom , petty officer, R.N.

Dickason, Harry - able seaman, R.N.

***Evans**, Edgar - petty officer, R.N. "P.O. Evans"

Forde, Robert - petty officer, R.N.

***Geroff**, Dimitri - dog driver

Hooper, F.J. - steward, late R.N.

Keohane, Patrick - petty officer, R.N.

***Lashley**, William - chief stoker, R.N.

Omelchenko, Anton - groom

Williamson, Thomas - petty officer, R.N.

Ship's Party

Bailey, Arthur S. - petty officer, 2nd class, R.N.

Balson, Albert - leading seaman, R.N.

Brissenden, Robert - leading stoker, R.N.

Bruce, Wilfred M. - commander, R.N.R.

Burton, William - leading stoker, R.N.

Cheetham, Alfred B. - boatswain (bosun), R.N.R.

Davies, Francis E.C. - leading shipwright, R.N.
Dennistoun, James R. - in charge of mules in the ship.
Drake, Francis R.H. - asst. paymaster, R.N. (retired), secretary and meteorologist in the ship.
Heald, William L. - late P.O., R.N.
Horton, William A. - engine room artificer, R.N. 2nd engineer
Knowles, William - able seaman
Lammas, Charles - fireman
Leese, Joseph - able seaman, R.N.
Lillie, Dennis G. - biologist in the ship
Mather, John Hugh - petty officer, R.N.V.R.
McCarthy, Mortimer - able seaman
McDonald, Angus - fireman
McDonald, William - able seaman
McGillon, Thomas - fireman
McKenzie, Edward A. - leading stoker, R.N.
McLeod, Thomas F. - able seaman
Neale, W.H. - steward
Oliphant, Robert - able seaman
Parsons, Frederick - petty officer, R.N.
Paton, James - able seaman
Pennell, Harry L.L. - commander, R.N.
Rennick, Henry E. de P. - lieutenant, R.N.
Skelton, James - able seaman
Stone, Bernard J. - leading stoker, R.N.
Williams, Charles - able seaman
Williams, William - chief engine room artificer, R.N. engineer

Norwegian South Pole Expedition under R. Amundsen, 1910

***Amundsen, Roald - expedition leader**
Beck, Andreas - seaman and ice pilot
***Bjaaland, Olav Olavson – champion skier**
Gjertsen, Lieutenant Fredrick - first mate.
Hansen, Ludvig - seaman and ice pilot
***Hanssen, Helmer – master dog driver, navigator**
***Hassel, Sverre – master dog driver, navigator**
***Johansen, Hjalmar – went to Arctic with Nansen 1892-5**
Kristensen - deck-hand, 3rd engineer
Kutchin, Alexander
***Lindstrom, Adolf - cook / carpenter**
Nilsen, Lieutenant Thorvald - first-Lieutenant, second in command.
Nodtvedt, Jacob - 2nd engineer
Olsen, Karinius - cook / carpenter
Prestrude, Lieutenant Kristian - second officer.
Ronne, Martin - sail maker
Stubberud, Jorgen - carpenter
Sundbeck, Knut - engineer
Wisting, Oskar