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# A – The Female Advantage

I’m having a tough time relating to this article. The world that Helgesen is describing isn’t one that is familiar to me. While the corporate hierarchy still exists, it doesn’t seem to be as inflexible and rigid as she believes it is.

As an example, just the other day I needed a new database created for my work. I didn’t have to ask my manager to ask his manager to forward a request down the chain of command and eventually get the work done. Instead I asked my manager for the name of a DBA that would be able to handle my request. Once I knew who would help me, I was able to contact him directly and get what I needed done.

I think technology has had a large impact on lowering the importance of the hierarchy. Now I can instantly start a Lync chat with someone I barely know and we can get things done easily. Because of this I no longer need to ask someone to ask someone and hope nothing gets lost in the conversation.

I understand that the rigid corporate hierarchy may have been a problem at some point in the past, I just don’t think it is anymore.

# B – Type Talk

My type ended up being INTJ but I was very close to being INTP. I feel like both accurately describe me. I like the problem solving aspects of INTP and the constant improvement aspect of INTJ. I think they both go together because the desire for improvement gives motivation for the problem solving.

Going into this I already did believe in the general categorization of personalities like the Meyers-Briggs test. I even put my results on my dating profile so people can quickly figure out if we will be compatible. It’s kind of like a horoscope except without the crackpot wishful thinking.

I wasn’t surprised by this too much because I have taken similar tests based on Meyers-Briggs before. It was a test called “Colouful Personalities”. I scored really high in the green personality which is closest to the INTJ and INTP types. So it’s good the tests agree with each other at least for me.

I imagine the INTP personality type would be fairly concentrated in an environment like BAIST. INTP is described as a problem solving personality that loves to think. Dealing with computers is all about using problem solving skills, so it makes sense that the technology field would naturally attract problem solving personalities.

# C – The Philosopher King

This one was really abstract. It was so abstract that it was tough to imagine the exact person that Socrates was trying to describe. I suppose I shouldn’t expect anything less from a philosopher. When I was reading it I couldn’t help but thinking that the entire argument could be boiled down to a page or two without losing anything important.

It was also only an academic exercise because the level of perfection that Socrates is talking about doesn’t exist in any person, living or dead. We all have our flaws and moments of weakness and I think that is a major problem in Socrates’ argument that he doesn’t recognize. We shouldn’t be concerned with finding the perfect person for leading but should be looking for the best person for the task at hand.

I also don’t think you can find a one-size-fits-all kind of leader. Different leaders will have different personalities which will be better adapted for different situations. A good wartime leader might be a bad peacetime leader and vice versa.

It would be interesting to talk to Socrates (in modern English!) and ask him to point out exactly who he is talking about. I wouldn’t be surprised if he was just setting up a long argument that he should be in charge. Yes it’s an ad hominem attack but it’s curious that he would spend so much time stating that only philosophers should be rulers when he just so happens to be a philosopher.

I’m not sure the famous ship example is a good one for Socrates. When he is saying that a good captain uses a high level of knowledge to navigate he is arguing for a scientist ruler, not a philosopher. Philosophers tend to use thought experiments (like the article) instead of empirical evidence (winds, stars, etc). A philosopher would prefer to write a long winded logical argument about why the ship moves the way it does while a scientist would prefer to understand the mechanics behind the boats movement. The ship captain example is an argument for empiricism, not for abstract thought.

Early on, Socrates makes the argument that “philosophers are the ones who are able to grasp what is always the same in all respects”. As if philosophers have some sort of monopoly on the truth. It’s kind of like Socrates is describing some sort of secret club where only members know what really happens. I find this to be fairly silly, you don’t have to be a philosopher to understand reality.

Most of the rest of the article is stringing together logical statements of one argument implying the other. A desire for truth implies a desire for justice and so on. While the argument is logically sound, people don’t work that way. People are perfectly capable of holding two conflicting ideas in their heads at the same time and believing them both to be true. It happens quite often without people even realizing it. The classic example is the sour grapes story. Since philosophers happen to be people, I don’t see why they would be immune to this. Cognitive dissonance is fairly basic human psychology.

# D – Dead Poets Society

What strikes me most about this movie is the similarities to The Female Advantage. In both cases, we have a courageous leader going against the norm and setting their own standards for how leadership should work. Both Helgesen and Keating are portrayed as victims of their respective times. They are too forward thinking for a world stuck in a rigid hierarchy. Both leaders would have us question conventional wisdom of how leadership should be and maybe look at different ways of doing things.

The similarities end there however. I find Keating to be much more inspiring than Helgesen. I suppose if you want to make poetry exciting you would have to be inspiring. Keatings style is very unorthodox for his environment and he ends up losing his job because of it. However he did earn the respect of his students which I suspect was one of his goals.