

Inside the Academy Interview with Howard Gardner

Part I

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Hi, my name is Audrey Amrein-Beardsley. I am an Associate Professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. We have a show that we developed titled Inside the Academy during which we interview some of the top scholars in our field. Today, I have the please of interviewing Dr. Howard Gardner. Hi, it's a pleasure to honor you today.

HOWARD GARDNER

Hi, thank you.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Tell us about your childhood.

HOWARD GARDNER

I would say it was a pretty uneventful childhood. Um, I was a studious kid--also a serious young pianist. I always had a small group of friends. But they were good friends. I've often said that I kind of lived in my own mind. And I came to that conclusion in part because now there's talk about bullying. And I ask myself, "Did I get bullied when I was young?" And the answer is, I may have, but if I did, I didn't notice it. And so the childhood was uneventful in that sense. On the other hand, my family was very important to me; and my family had a very traumatic background. My parents grew up in Weimar, Germany, and they were comfortable and thought that they would live off the business. My mother when she came to America at the age of 28 had never cooked a meal or made a bed because her [inaudible] comforts were taken care of by the people who worked for the family. But then of course there was the rise of Hitler, and my family was Jewish. My parents were quite prescient. They moved in 1934--the year after Hitler came to power to escape Hitler. But then there was the Hitler-Mussolini pact, and they realized that Jews were not going to be very welcome in Italy either, so they had child, moved back to Germany and then my mother and Eric, their child were kept hostages in Germany while my father went back and forth between Germany and the United States to try to find somebody who would sign an affidavit so they could leave to the United States; and that take three years. They actually arrived in the United States by boat on Kristallnacht, the Night of the Shattering Glass, when many of their relatives were hounded, some of them died, and so on. So they got here in the nick of time with my brother, Eric. That was 1938. In January 1943, by brother, Eric died in a freak accident--a sleigh riding accident with my mother watching; and she was pregnant with me. And many, many years later, my parents said to me, if they, if my mother had not been pregnant with me, they would have killed themselves. Now we have no idea of knowing whether or not that was true. But if you think about it, if you're comfortable, you don't have a worry in the world, then you have to leave your country. They were allowed to take, I think, five dollars out of Germany. But they were allowed to take out possessions if they paid four times the value. My mother is 101--she's still alive as we speak in March 2013. Her furniture and stuff which they

took out of Nazi Germany 70, 74 years ago, 75 years ago. Anyway, my parents did not talk about the Holocaust. They did not talk about my brother. In fact, I only discovered that he had died by finding some old clippings. But there is no question that the atmosphere in the home was colored by this history, which I only gradually became aware of; and whether my parents were right in shielding me from this, or wrong, is moot at this point. There were very different child rearing practices at that time. We're talking 70 years ago, you didn't talk about stuff to kids. Now we probably err on the other side. You know we tell our kids what sexual positions we have even if they haven't asked. But you might say it was kind of repressed atmosphere. The other thing I would say is that I was a serious pianist; and when I turned 12, my teacher was very good--he was 95 years of age. He actually had studied with Edward McDowell and Clara Schumann. Things which I didn't believe because how could anyone in the 1950s living in Scranton have studied with people in the 19th century, people who were household words in music. But of course if you're 95 years old and were born in the Civil World, you could've done that. He said, "Well now, Howard, you've got to get serious. You've got to practice three hours a day and start taking lessons in New York." And I said, "Forget it. I'm not interested in doing that." I think it was a wise, it was a wise decision, but it was a snap decision. I think that if I lived in New York and I'd had parents who weren't immigrants, I would not have been given a choice about whether I continued music lessons or not. So I stopped formal lessons. I continued to play, and both in high school and college I taught piano just for fun and to make a little extra money. My, I was a very good student and when I was 13, my parents took me to Hoboken, New Jersey to see Stevens Institute of Technology to have my "tested," unquote, a word I had never heard at that time. I took a whole bank of tests, five days, I think it cost 300 dollars, which was a huge amount of money. It was probably three to 10 thousand dollars in buying power. And at the end of that period we got called in, "Mr. and Mrs. Gardner and Howard?" They said, "Your son's quite bright, he could probably do anything. He's the most talented in clerical work." By clerical work they didn't mean wearing a collar. They meant figuring out all the beads in a line or something. And at some unconscious level, I said to myself, "If we had schlepped to Hoboken for five days to be told I could be a clerk, it was probably a waste of money." That probably had something to do with my ultimate skepticism about what you could learn from formal testing. Realizing that they had a bright kid on their hands and that the schools in Pennsylvania were probably not very good. In fact, they wanted to send me to Andover, which was a very, very good private school; but I didn't want to leave home, so we compromised on a local independent school called Wyoming Seminary, and I went there as a five-day boarder for three years. And I was stretched in Wyoming Seminary more than I would have been in Scranton, but I really never was stretched until I got to college in 1961 at Harvard College. That was the first time where, to put it a little grandiosely, I didn't have to hide what I could do and what I knew. I also walked through the union and heard people play Rachmaninoff's Third Piano Concerto, practicing, and I said, "You know, this is a different league than what I knew in Scranton or Wyoming Seminary." So that was a kind of a, the way I put it now, for the first 18 years of my life, I was a big fish in a very little pond in Scranton, Pennsylvania; and that had many good features. I never really worried if I was accomplished because compared to other people, I was accomplished. But if I had gone up in New York or had gone to Phillips Academy, I would right away have seen that I was good at some things, but certainly there were many people who were better in other things. I would have had a different self-image. So that's my childhood in seven minutes.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Okay. And how do those experiences in your childhood, as well as in school inspire the scholar who you ultimately became?

HOWARD GARDNER

I didn't really know what the life of a scholar meant. My parents never had higher education themselves, and indeed, in the whole extended family, which is now 50 people who had escaped from Germany and living in New York or Pennsylvania, I was the first to go to college. So in a sense I was breaking new ground, and in a way that I wouldn't say was oppressive, I had a sense that everyone's eyes were on me. But in those days, if you were a bright, Jewish boy, the only question was whether you would become a doctor or a lawyer. I never heard the term "scholar." I didn't know, I'm not making this up, I assumed when I went to Harvard College and read a book by somebody, that person was dead. I didn't realize there were still people alive who could write books. I was very naive. I also thought that movies were all about actors. I wasn't even aware there was such a thing as a director. And worst of all, or funniest of all, when I grew up in Scranton, Pennsylvania, there were movies where they made fun of Scranton, and I assumed that in every city they would dub in the name of that city, you know Newark, Hoboken, and so on. When I went to college, they were still making fun of Scranton, so I was really very, very parochial. But when I went to college, I immediately liked studying. I liked taking courses. I probably audited more courses than anybody in the history of Harvard--dozens and dozens of courses. I went and not just to the first lecture, of course if I didn't I stopped going, but I actually stayed through the lecture, and I got a very broad education. And what I did, I tested myself. I took the pre-law courses and pre-med courses to show myself and my parents if they were interested that I could do that if I want. In fact, I remember the other day going out to Stanford after my junior year in college--I'm going to talk to the medical school admissions there, so I was quite serious, could I get into Stanford Medical School? And I took a course at Harvard with Paul Freund, the great constitutionalist scholar. And he called me and said, "You really should think about becoming a lawyer." So I was testing myself. But by the time I became a senior in college, in psychology. Initially I thought I'd go on to clinical psychology because I really didn't want to go to medical school, and if you're interested in psychology, going to medical school is a pretty big detour in terms of residency and so on. I was actually going to do a residency in the summer after my senior year in college at a mental health place in Pennsylvania. After a series of really odd coincidences, one after another, I heard about Professor Jerome Bruner, who was then 50 years of age, and he was a psychologist--very well known, but at most I would have just known his name, but he was doing some educational work in the Cambridge area where I was at the time, and he was looking for people to help him develop a curriculum in social studies for kids who were in fifth and sixth grade, and for some reason I thought that sounded interesting. So I took a chance. I went to see him, and he talked to me for five minutes, and he said, "You're hired." Then I wrote to the clinic I was going to work, and they wrote me a very angry letter, and I think 50 years later I could have written the same letter, you know, "We gave you a position. We promised you funds. Why are you doing this." And I did my best. I wrote back an apologetic letter. And the other thing, which was an autobiographical interest, is when I was in high school I dated a lot; but in college I didn't really date very much, and that's because I was really involved in my scholarship and my male friends. I went out sometimes, it was important; but when I finished college I kind of turned my thoughts elsewhere, and I remember very vividly Professor Bruner, I think I was already, everybody called him Jerry, said, "Well next week, Judy Krieger from Berkeley is going to come and start working on this project." I said, "Oh, a young woman is

coming." She actually showed up I think about July eighth of 1965. She was becoming a doctoral student of his, and we fell in love and in fact we wanted to get married right away, and our parents, having coy, said "No, you should wait awhile." So we waited awhile. So Bruner was an incredibly important influence to my life. I've been incredibly lucky, and I've written extensively about this, that I've had so many wonderful mentors, and very few tormentors; though if you ask me about it, I'll tell you about a tormentor. But nobody had more influence on me than Jerry Bruner, both because he switched me from being interested in clinical psychology to being interested in cognitive and developmental psychology, which is where I got my degree, and Judy Krieger, then Judy Gardner, became also a cognitive development psychologist. And the way that Bruner ran his enterprise. We were working in a school in Newton, Massachusetts called the Underwood School, and where I eventually taught--you can ask me about that later if you want. Everyday we would develop (13:00) curricular materials in the social sciences for fifth and sixth graders. The course was called Man: A Course of Study. It was enormously influential 40-50 years ago. Then we would try to curriculum out, and then we would revise it in the afternoon, and then we would try again the next day. So it was, now you would see it as very entrepreneurial. And at lunch, Bruner would bring in delicatessens from a delicatessen in Cambridge, and everybody would sit together and eat delicatessen foods, which I love, different kinds of cheeses and meats, and bagels, and different kinds of bread, and drink different kinds of Dr. Brown and Dr. Pepper soda. In the notion that learning and working with colleagues and having eminent professors together with people just out of college, that made an enormous effect on me. A few years later, I was a founding member of Project Zero. I have been a part of that organization, which is a part of Harvard, for 46 years, and I've always tried to maintain that Brunerian kind of influence. I'm very glad that my teacher, Jerry Bruner, very active in his late 90s, is part of your series because he really has had such enormous influence in psychology, education, literature and so on.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What did you decide to study for your dissertation at Harvard?

HOWARD GARDNER

Let me say a bit about my graduate years because I think it might be helpful to students who watch this.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Okay.

HOWARD GARDNER

I loved being an undergraduate, and I worked with Erik Erikson, with David Riesman, with really eminent scholars, and I had no hesitation about talking with them and working with them. I hated graduate school when I started. This was 1966-67, and that's because it was very, we would use now the word "transactional"--you had to pick up a certain number of credits, you were being prepared to be professional. And I just liked the idea of reading, and exploring, and so on. So I didn't like it at all. In fact, I was thinking seriously of quitting after a few months, and I made a list of all the things I liked and all the things I didn't like, and then I had an ah-ha (15:00) experience. Which was, graduate school should be for me, and I shouldn't care what it is that my fellow students want out of it, and I shouldn't care about what the professors want, other

than that I have to pass. But I should really use it for a way that's helpful to me, and I don't mean in a narcissistic way, but to getting the skills and knowledge that I wanted. And when I framed it in that way it was a much different experience, yet when I took my oral exams after my sophomore year, a very famous professor, who I won't name, wanted to flunk me because I wasn't playing by the rules. I was kind of defended and protected by some other professors, and that's made an enormous impression on me about how you can be attacked by somebody, but if good people, people who are respected, protect you, that gives you some protection. When I was in graduate school, I was already working on three books. In fact, I published a book during graduate school, and even in those days it wasn't particularly (16:00) held to your credit to write books in graduate school. You were supposed to write articles and do experiments and not write books. But I decided with the wonderful advisor, Roger Brown, that I was going to do a thesis fairly quickly. The thesis was not going to be a long, torn out, 100-page document. It was going to be three publishable articles. This was the very first time when you could do a thesis not just as one monograph, but as three articles, and I did that. The articles were on a very arcane subject--style perception in young children. I was already interested in the visual arts. After I finished, and all the arts, I mean I've already mentioned music. After I finished college I spent a year in London, supposedly enrolled in London School of Economics, but I have to admit that I was rarely seen there. But I loved going to theater and plays. I actually wrote a novel--it was terrible--concerts, and so on. And I recognized as a developmental psychologist in the Piaget and Bruner tradition (17:00) that almost everybody thought being cognitive development, being cognitively development being a scientist. I said, "Well, artists have minds too. They do things." I had been a serious musician. So I decided I was interested in artistic development. One of the books I was working on was a book called *The Arts and Human Development*, in which I took the end state of the artist as being every bit as plausible for what we're developing toward cognitively as being a scientist or mathematician or whatever. So one of the things that interested me was how people who know something about the arts can take a look at a work, let's say the visual arts, and comment instantly and say, "Oh, that's a Monet," or "That's a Renoir," or "That's a Picasso." And I being very musical, if you turn on the radio, I can tell you who the composer is almost instantly, and if you don't know, I'll tell you the secret: if in doubt, it's by Schubert because Mozart, and Haydn, and Beethoven all wrote in the same general (18:00) classical theme; but Schubert died younger, so his style wasn't quite as individual. So if it's great, but you don't know who it is, it's Schubert. So I became interested, how can people make judgments so fast? Now what's interesting about paintings is that if you're a kid, the first thing you see is it a painting of a horse? Is it a painting of a woman? Is it a painting of the ocean? Or is it an abstract painting? So if you show people all paintings of horses, or all paintings of seas, or all abstract paintings, there's no subject matter there. So then the question is, can they perceive the style? So then I became interested in what style was. I studied it philosophically. By that time I was working with Nelson Goodman, who had almost as much influence on me as Bruner. Goodman was a philosopher. Bruner was a psychologist. And I was very interested in what style was. So anyway, to cut to the chase, I wrote a thesis on style perception in the visual arts, and subsequently I looked at style perception in other art forms (19:00). In fact, I met and fell in love with Ellen Winner, who became my wife many years later, in our joint studies of literary, of students understanding of metaphor narrative, other things. So if you talk to me in the 1970s, and I was being pretentious, which I'm capable of being even though it's not something I want to be, I would have said, "Well, Piaget took science as the end stage of development, my colleagues and I," because by then I had a little research group, "we're looking at the arts as the end stage of

development." In the 1970s at Project Zero we studied children's literary development, their musical development, their artistic development, and basically asked the same questions about the kids in the arts that Piaget and Bruner, and others were asking about kids in the sciences. The other thing in my graduate life which was extraordinarily important, working in Project Zero with Nelson Goodman in a very intellectual atmosphere, we (20:00) invited knowledgeable scholars to come and talk to us, and in 1969, and this is another one of these things I'll remember, this is a joke, more vividly than my childhood because my whole childhood I don't have a lot of vivid memories, I've never been psychoanalyzed. We invited a neurologist named Norman Geschwind, and Norman Geschwind was a brilliant neurologist. He died in 1984 very prematurely, very unnecessarily. But anybody who studied with Geschwind, we're now talking 30 years later, never forgot it because he was such a brilliant mind and a brilliant lecturer. I could hear him give the same lectures every year. He came to Project Zero to give a seminar and started at 2:00 in the afternoon. It was supposed to go for an hour or two. It went until 10:00 at night. And it was talking about what we can learn about the human mind by studying brain damage, by studying people who have had strokes, or tumors, or trauma, or some other kind of brain disease, and looking at how the brain breaks down under conditions of cortical insult (21:00). I had never thought much about studying the brain because in those days psychologists weren't interested in the brain. I had sat in one physiological psychology course, which was more than many of colleagues did. But those days the notion of psychology was that it was a black box. You didn't look inside the brain. But when I heard Geschwind speak, and he talked about artists who had strokes and lost one ability and not others, or musicians who lost one ability, I said, "That's it." I'm trying to figure out how artistry works. There are a limited number of things you can do with artists when they're intact, but if they have the misfortune to have a stroke, you can see how their abilities are organized. So then and there, I decided that I wanted to do post-doctoral work with Norman Geschwind. I eventually got three years of support to do that from 1971 to 74. And I actually spent 20 years working in a brain damage unit at a local hospital, studying patients who had various forms of brain pathology. So to get a little bit ahead of the story (22:00), roughly from the late 60s to 1990 my research life was bivocal or bicameral. I would spend the morning working with brain damaged patients trying to see what sorts of things they could or couldn't do as a result of cardinal insult. Then I would go to Project Zero in the afternoon, and we would work with kids trying to understand their development in various spheres--not just artistic spheres, but other ones. It was the combination, the catenation of working with kids and brain damaged patients and looking at artistic and other kinds of symbol using skills, which eventually led to multiple intelligences and to my general philosophy of research in the social science, particularly in the psychological sciences. That is, there is no uniquely privileged way to understand the human mind. You can't understand human mind just by looking at the brain, or just looking at brain damage, or just looking at normal people, or just (23:00) looking at gifted people, or just looking at the Bongo Bongo, or just looking at kids who live in the upper east side of New York. The best thing is to look at kids through many different lenses, or look at any of us through many different lenses. So I've always been very pluralistic, very foxlike instead of hedgehog-like, in thinking that we will understand human beings, human nature, the mind best by using lots of different lenses, and that's always what I've done. When I wrote about multiple intelligences, I think what struck people was that I looked at more populations, so to speak, than anybody had before. I wasn't just looking at normal kids. I wasn't just looking at prodigies. I wasn't just looking at autistic kids or savants. I wasn't just looking in American society. I was looking at other societies in the world. I wasn't afraid of looking in the

brain. I wasn't afraid of looking at test scores and their correlations. That pluralistic, interdisciplinary thing has been very important to me. To jump way ahead (24:00), what's interesting about our time, we're sitting in 2013, is almost all the problems we look at are interdisciplinary problems, and yet, all the training is hyper-disciplinary, and that is just a huge disjunct. I've always been most attracted to people like Jerry Bruner who also think that we learn if look at people through many different lenses. And if you ask is Bruner a natural scientist, a social scientist, a humanist, and an artist? You can't answer that question because he looks through all of those lenses.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Sure. Tell us about your first academic position.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I had a very unusual academic career. First of all, when I was a doctoral student, I was a tutor, which means I was connected with one of the houses at Harvard, and I had undergraduates who I worked with, and I loved doing that. Then either when I was in graduate school or right afterwards (25:00) I taught a course at Clark University, which is fairly close to Boston and became famous because Freud went there in 1909--only time he came to America and gave famous lectures there. So Clark has always been a school with a strong psychological orientation. But then from 1971 to 1986 I did not have a regular teaching job. I lived off of grants. In retrospect, I say, "How could I possibly not have had a job and had to live from one grant acceptance or rejection to another?" One of the nice things about being young is that you don't ask those questions with quite the degree of "Oh, I applied for a grant and if I don't get one I'll apply for another." I was very lucky in 1981--I got a MacArthur Fellowship, which basically gave me support for five years. And by that time, I was in my late 30s, both to myself and publicly, I got this gift from Heaven, but after that gift I think I should have a real job (26:00). I had been at Harvard, and I had been trained in the psychology wing, but I had been education school because that's where Project Zero was housed. So of course, I thought, "Well it would be nice to have a job at Harvard." But that's hardly something you can ask for. So I began to look at other places as well, and a good colleague said to me, "You know, Howard, you really haven't taught. You ought to teach a few courses at Harvard just so people show that you can put on your socks and your shoes." So I taught a few courses, and they were well received, and that helped me. Nonetheless, when I was put up initially for tenure, I didn't get it. They chose some other people.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

You're kidding.

HOWARD GARDNER

It's a healthy thing for me. I got over it. But I had a wonderful dean. We're very, very close. In fact I spoke with her this morning on the phone. She's not the dean anymore--she's gone on to greater thing. And she thought I ought to be on the faculty, and sometimes deans have that (27:00) power, and my own Professor Roger Brown, whom I loved and who I mentioned earlier, said to me many years before I came up for it, he said, "Howard, you're going to be a chimney appointment." And I said, "What is a chimney appointment?" And he said, "From the top down." Meaning, and again, I think this might be helpful for younger people watching this, sometimes the people who usually make judgments about who would fit in the position, don't have the same

perspective as someone who is looking out for the wider institution. And I think there were people at Harvard who realized I would be useful for the institution, even if the three professors who were in charge of the decision about who gets recommended at my school, rather like the grumpy one who said I should be kicked out of graduate school, don't have as much power. Also, the, I think I can say this, and it's interesting for the record, the school of education (28:00) didn't have tenure from early 70s, or the middle 70s until the middle 80s. So one reason I didn't apply for a job is I said, "Well why should I have to work for a living teaching if I can raise my salary and do research?" I was loathe to teach without the possibility of tenure. And then for reasons which are of historical interest, the ed school reinstated tenure just about the same time that I did apply for a job. In order to get tenure at a selective place like Harvard, you have to go through a number of hoops and in the end there's a presidential group that meets, and they have to decide whether or not to give you tenure. My dean being very shrewd invited from Lee Shulman and Jerry Bruner to be outside examiners. Now Jerry Bruner knew me very well. Lee Shulman did not know me very well. But she knew that they respected my work, and that the president, Derek Bok, would listen to them (29:00). Nelson Goodman was one of the in-house witnesses, they call it. So he was from within Harvard, and this story was told to me afterwards. Derek Bok, the president, who sits like a judge, and his father was a judge, says to Nelson, "I understand that Howard doesn't suffer fools gladly." And Nelson looked at him and said, "Derek, I wasn't aware that was a job description requirement for a Harvard professor." It was kind of a snarly thing to say, but it sort of broke the ice. Anyway, I got through, and one of the things I've tried to do since, in the essentially 30 years that I've been a professor, is make sure that hyper-disciplinarianism and hyper counting number of articles isn't the only lens through which we make decisions because I think that often there are people who could be very valuable to a university, even if they don't fit exactly into the (30:00) square hole that people think that they should fit into.

Part 2

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

You said something about putting on both of your socks and both of your shoes. Tell us about the time that you wore two different colored shoes.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well, that probably happens all the time because I'm colorblind, and I'm quite...

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

You look good today.

HOWARD GARDNER

I'm quite severely colorblind, so I've always asked, first Judy, who I was married to first, and then Ellen, to check me out in the morning to make sure that things match. But that doesn't always happen. And, I'm also pretty, pretty non-cognizant of dress--it's not very important to me, so I'll tell a kind of a funny story. Our family got invited to something called Renaissance Week, which is people more Democrats than Republicans who get together several times a year to talk about policy things, and we had gotten invited for the first time when Bill Clinton had just

become president, and we (1:00) knew he was there, but there were a thousand other people. And I was just having a drink with somebody, and then somebody I didn't know came up and held me and said, "The first family would like you to come to dinner." And this was a shock! Now it wasn't only us, but it was about 30 people, and I actually got to sit next to Hillary, who was, of course, 20 years younger than me. But I didn't have any clothing to wear, and my kids were there, so I literally borrowed a suit from Andrew and shoes from Jay so I would look presentable. And I don't say this as any kind of pride, I mean I think people ought to have shoes and socks that match--they ought to look well--but it is true that the academy is one of the last places where you are not judged by what you wear. I mean, if I were working on Wall Street, you know, I would be judged about whether do I have 14 different suits for every two weeks. In Hollywood, they wouldn't want me to have a suit, but they would want, unless I was Woody Allen, they would want (2:00) me to look a certain way. I'm lucky I'm in one of the last professions where you're not judged primarily by what clothing you wear.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Although your Ben says that you, but your son, Ben, says that everything you do, you do in a button down shirt. What does that mean?

HOWARD GARDNER

I don't know if he's being literal or metaphoric. I do wear kind of an ivy outfit. But I always wear a blue shirt and also, on those rare occasions when I'm on screen, people say don't wear a white shirt. So 90% of the time people see me, it'll be a blue shirt and it'll usually be button, usually it'll be button down; so Ben is right. But he may also have meant that, especially compared to younger people, I wouldn't say I'm formal, but I'm, I do, I guess I believe in a certain degree of politeness, and not being deliberately (3:00) sloppy or graceless. And I think living in New England, and you know, being at a university that probably contributed to some extent. So he may have been speaking metaphorically--I don't know.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

So you've done a lot of research on how minds develop, how minds break down, and how minds are organized. Your wife, Ellen, speaks about how minds are organized and describes you as ever since she has known you, sitting in your study intently writing, surrounded by piles of papers, boxes all over the floor every which way, filled with papers, pens, and paperclips littering the floor, sticky notes all over the edge of computer screen, with you totally oblivious to the lack of order. Tell us about your wife, Ellen.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well one wonderful thing about my wife and my four kids--three kids with Judy Gardner, the fourth with Ellen--is they have no hesitation in teasing me, making fun of me, calling me to task, and I think that's very healthy (4:00). I think especially when parents have a certain degree of accomplishment that it's very important that one, to talk about things which didn't work out, the fact that I didn't initially get tenure, et cetera; and to be if not encouraging, at least very open to being teased and being put in their place. So I think that's very good. Ellen is beautiful on the outside and beautiful on the inside, and that's why I fell in love with her. She is one of the most caring people I've ever met. She even cares about people who I think shouldn't be cared about. She's also very sharp, very witty, very good writer. We actually met at work, fell in love at work.

We did a lot of writing together in the 70s and early 80s. We don't collaborate much in research anymore. She's much more of a strict (5:00) psychologist than I am and actually has been chairman of the department at Boston College for several years. Whereas I'm kind of a lapsed psychologist. But we read what one another writes, and we edit it. Most of my book titles have come from Ellen. She gives me the book titles. When you get to be older and you get to be, have a certain degree of eminence, it's very hard to have colleagues tell when what you're saying is foolish. You wait until you publish it, then of course the rewards are for people sticking daggers into you. People may not realize this, but when you're young and pretty accomplished, people get credit by pointing to you because you're not known. They say, "Oh, I discovered blah, blah, blah." When you get older, they get points for stabbing. So I have a few friends--Bill Damon leaps to mind, Marcelo Suarez-Orozco, Mike Csikszentmihalyi, people whom I work with at Project Zero--who--Mindy Kornhaber--who will tell me when I'm full of (6:00) crap. And Ellen has no hesitation in telling me that, and often it's very good. She sometimes jokes that my job is to put the B.S. in, and her job is to take it out. B.S. you can translate if you like.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

She thinks your most important has been the distinction you make between neighborly, morality, and the ethics of roles. Tell us about this.

HOWARD GARDNER

I actually think that Ellen was probably talking not about my life in general, but my most recent work. My work took a very sharp break when I turned 50. Until then I was really basically a cognitive development psychologist, who had become interested in education and began to think and write more about education. But in the early-middle 90s, for many reasons, I became concerned about what was happening in this country, what was happening to society as a whole, what were happening to professions (7:00) and institutions, which I had come to admire and value, but which I thought were increasingly in jeopardy. And so the sharp turn that I took was to stop doing basically descriptive research where I just trying to understand how the brain worked or how the mind worked, and then shift instead to understanding the good. And by the "good" I'm talking about what it meant to be a good person--a good worker, a good citizen--because I don't believe anybody is born good or bad. I don't believe any society is inherently good or bad, but there certainly are differences between Hitler and Mother Teresa, and there certainly are differences between Scandanavia and, what shall I say, a failed state in any part, anywhere in the world. And I think it's very important to understand the good that people can do and why and the bad (8:00) that people can do and why. So with Bill Damon, Mike Csikszentmihalyi, and person I work with most closely at Harvard--Wendy Fischman, Lynn Barendsen, and Carrie James--we've been trying to understand what it means to do the good, and how we can help promote it. So this is not simply armchair research; this is research where we're really trying to work, particularly with young people, and to help them become more ethical and so on. The distinction that Ellen has made is one that I developed in my most recent writings, and I'm sure I will continue to develop it. Neighborly morality is basically how you deal with people whom you see everyday, and this is what you learn about in the Bible. This is what you learn about from the golden rule--don't steal from people; don't commit adultery; don't kill; don't lie to them; don't disrespect. And this is all about people who live nearby. Psychology, indeed, (9:00) people nowadays have nothing new to say about neighborly morality. It hasn't changed in thousands of years. And if there is any evolutionary basis to morality, it has to do with people whom we see

everyday. It is much more difficult to hurt you if you're my neighbor than if you belong to a racial or ethnic group that I've never encountered, and I think you're threatening me. Leap forward to the modern era, or to intimations of the modern era, which we see in ancient Greece, probably more so in Athens than anywhere else, but there are intimations of it in Rome before it became imperial. People occupy roles, and the role I'm most interested in is the role of being a professional. And when you occupy the role of being a professional, it means there are certain things you are responsible for, even if you won't go to jail if you don't carry them out. In the realm (10:00) of society, there is the civic role--what does it mean to be a citizen? Being a citizen doesn't mean living on the block. It means at a certain age, you have the right to vote and to participate in civic life. There is nothing in evolution, I argue, that prepares us to be a doctor, or lawyer, or journalist, or teacher, or engineer. Those are roles which society has developed slowly over the last centuries. Similarly, there is nothing in evolution that prepares us for the French Revolution or the American Revolution or the Greek city-state, where people actually debate things and do what's in the public's interest. So these are roles, and they are roles which we have the option in a society of nurturing or of cutting off. What I argue is that in certain modern societies over the last decades or maybe century or two, we have succeeded in developing the (11:00) role of the citizen, the role of the lawyer, the role of the teacher, and so on. But these are not naturally acquired things; these are things one has to get formal training for. Indeed, a profession basically means that you get certified, and you can lose that certification if you behave non-professionally, even if you don't do anything that would send you to jail. Now, I'm actually talking sociology here, Max Weber, and I'm talking in the ideal. We all know there are plenty of teachers that don't behave very professionally. There are plenty of lawyers that don't hire professionally. But let's just take the Supreme Court now. The Supreme Court is supposed to be acting in a disinterested way. It's supposed to be making decisions which the precedence call for, and which are adhering to the Constitution. But in the last 10 years, the vote of the Supreme Court has been completely predictable by who appointed people. And so, these are not the ethics of roles anymore. This (12:00) is people being political. And it's disastrous when you have a Supreme Court where you can't count on people actually looking at the record, but rather looking at the people who appointed them. Take the accounting profession. We assume that auditors would take a look at books and tell us the health of a company and the health of its accounts. Yet, we learned with Enron in 2001 and with Standard and Poor and Moody's in 2008, that the auditors were doing what they were paid to do by the people who hired them, rather than get a disinterested account of what the books were. So this is what happens with the ethics of roles deteriorate. Let's take teaching, which I know is very important here. What do you do as a teacher if you're a good teacher of history, and students like you, and they're really coming to think historically, and the state comes in and says, "You will teach this way and not that way." In fact, in Florida it says you're only allowed to teach facts in history. You know, that's total bullshit (13:00) to use a technical term. If you want to know facts, just look at your handheld. You don't have to go to school for that. History is a very complicated interpretive enterprise, and if you're going to do history, that's what it has to be. But that's an ethical dilemma. What do you do when the state says something stupid, and you know better?

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY
Right.

HOWARD GARDNER

On the other hand, you know you have to be law-abiding. You can't look it up in the Bible. It doesn't tell you what to do. Solomon probably comes the closest, and he was a judge. He was already taking a role other than just being a neighbor. He's anomalous in the Bible for that reason. But a nice example is a journalist. A journalist is supposed to cover things objectively and is also working for a company, and that company wants to be able to stay in the city or state that is being covered. You're covering something, you see somebody doing something very cruel, what do you do? That's an ethical dilemma. Neighborly morality says you go and help the person. But your role is not to help the person. Your role is to describe what is happening (14:00). Moreover, if you help the person, maybe the bureau will be kicked out, and nobody will ever cover that country again. These are ethical dilemmas. When I talk about the ethics of roles, that's what I'm talking about. I think that scholars who look at morality are really basically studying neighborly morality--the things we've evolved for many years. They're not studying what we do with complex ethical situations, and yet, that's what we have to do as a larger society. A good work project, which you can read about in thegoodproject.org, we have developed a toolkit to help students and young professionals deal with these issues. It's actually quite interesting, Audrey. We began with working with young professionals; then we worked with graduate students; then we worked with college students. Then there was a lot of demand for us to work with high school students. And believe it or not, we're now working on an elementary school toolkit with the notion that these ethical issues are so important that we can't wait until somebody gets to law school to tackle them (15:00)--they have to be tackled much, much earlier. Of course the school is the first institution that young people run into other than their home--possibly the church, but they don't have the same kind of relation to the church as they do to school--and teachers are the first professionals they run into other than who is at home. So those become very important role models for what it means to occupy a role. Here is an ethical dilemma for a teacher. You've got 30 kids in a class. There are two kids who have real problems. How much time do you spend with those two kids? How much time do you spend with the 28? Every kid notices that. I'll tell you a story from Benjamin. Benjamin, Ellen and my child, went to a local public school. We thought it was a good school, and he liked it; and in seventh grade he said, "You know, I'm not learning anything because the teachers are spending all the time with the problem kids." This caused a crisis at home. Obviously, the way he perceived it, he was no longer (16:00) getting attention because the teacher was dealing with kids who had much more profound problems than he did. Were the teachers right or wrong? I can't say. But that's produces a moral dilemma at home. This is your kid. Do you sacrifice your kid for the other kids who have lots of problems? You know, in places where you work and where I work, that's what we argue about at the dinner table.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Right, right. Your family and friends, whom I talked to, highlighted your numerous professional contributions to the field, noting that your most impactful accomplishment thus far has been your theory of multiple intelligences. You touched on this before, but for audience that might not know as much about this, tell us a bit more about this theory and where you're headed now with this theory.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well the advantage and disadvantage to the theory can be described in a sentence or two--the so-called elevator speech. Most people think that there is a single thing called intelligence, and if

you have a lot of it, you're good at everything; if you have some of it, you're good at some things (17:00); and if you have little of it, you're tough luck. My contribution, over 30 years old now, is to say we're better thinking of the mind and the brain not as a single computer, but as a set of relatively independent computers, which I called them multiple intelligences. So I'll use myself as an example. I talked earlier about being a bright kid. What that really meant was that I was pretty good with language and logic. And when we use the word "intelligent" that's usually what we mean in a school setting. But if I had to be, rely on my spacial abilities, like a navigator, I would be quite average. If I had to rely on my bodily abilities, I would be a disaster. If I had to rely on the understanding of other people when I was 20, it was very low. I think it's gotten somewhat better with age--that's interpersonal intelligence. And so when somebody is intelligent in one way, on my theory, you can't actually predict whether they'll be intelligent in another way. The best example is if you see a child who is a good drawer, what else can you (18:00) conclude? You see a child who is a good athlete. What else can you conclude? You see a child who is very good at breaking up an argument. What else can you conclude? The answer is, don't bet much on it because intelligences are relatively independent. I put forth these ideas in the early 80s as a psychologist. I thought that's where they would have the influence. Psychologists never liked the theory particularly--that's another long conversation--but educators picked it up almost immediately. I'm not insensitive; I'm not deaf to where interest is, so roughly from the early 80s through the 1990s, I spent a lot of time working in education. My Good Work and Good Project now is certainly educationally oriented, but it's much broader. It's much more about society and the kinds of people we want and the kinds of societies that we want. Nonetheless, 30 years after publishing *Frames of Mind* 80% of my email is still about multiple intelligences. So that's clearly my 15 minutes of (19:00) fame. For a dozen years after putting forth the theory, I made no comments about how other people used or misused the theory. Finally, in 1995, I published in the Kappan an article called "Myths and Realities" about multiple intelligences. It's my most reprinted article, and in there I talk about seven things that people are true about multiple intelligences, which, according to me are not true, and what I thought the realities were. I thought that would sort of keep the enemy at the gate for a while. Then in the last few years, I've really seen flagrant abuses of my work. There are many, many people in East Asia who make money looking at fingerprints and telling people from this dermatological measure what intelligences they and what their life careers are going to be--utter nonsense.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Based on your framework? (20:00)

HOWARD GARDNER

Yes, right. And when they mention Harvard, Harvard will actually sue them. So they don't mention Harvard, they just mention me. But I decided that we should create a website, which we're calling multipleintelligencesoasis.org, and by the time people watch this, it should be up and running. There we're going to both indicate the practices which we think are good; but also we're calling misapplications with big MI, things which we think are silly or nonsense. This will be my effort, while I'm still around, to indicate what I think are the valid uses of the theory, and which things are complete misunderstandings or even malevolent. So that's the MI work for now. But almost all my time is focused on the so-called Good Project. Though as we speak, I'm expecting to launch a study of liberal arts in the 21st century. Because I think liberal arts as I know it, know them and love them, liberal arts and (21:00) sciences are under a lot of strain, a lot

of pressure, a lot of risk. You're at a state university, and in many states, they say people should have to pay extra if they want to study philosophy or literature rather than computer programming. I think that's a ridiculous perspective, but it's one that people are articulating. So, I think for the next several years I'm going to be thinking and studying that, and that'll be part of what a good education is. Most of my education work has been pre-collegiate, K through 12, but I'm now going to get interested in what happens at the college level.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

With your initial multiple intelligences theory, there's emotional intelligence is not part of that, and that's been a topic of much inquiry for the last decade or so. What are your thoughts about emotional intelligence?

HOWARD GARDNER

I'm in favor of it.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Okay, good. Sounds like it aligns with your recent research as well.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well actually, I'm quite friendly with Dan Goleman, and when he came up with that term, he nicely credited (22:00) me and my colleagues for having made him think about these things as intelligences. What Dan Goleman writes about emotional intelligence is quite close to what I write about when I talk about personal intelligence, particularly understanding of yourself. He since has written about social intelligence, which should be very close to my interpersonal intelligence. Clearly emotion and social are more person-friendly terms than inter- and intra-personal, just like multiple intelligences is more person-friendly than the triarchic theory, and how we name and brand things is a factor. But Dan and I have one disagree, which he and I have written and talked about, Dan, in my view, conflates description and prescription. When he describes emotional intelligence, he describes what people can be good at, but also what kinds of people they would like (23:00), what he would like them to be. I think that it's important analytically to separate those. So both Nelson Mandela and Slobodan Milosevic have lots of interpersonal intelligence. Mandela used it to bring people together, to unite a war-torn country. Milosevic used it to fan the flames of ethnic hatred. They're both using their emotional, interpersonal intelligence, but they're using it in a different way. The sadist wouldn't get any pleasure out of what he was doing unless you realized that the victim was using a lot of pain. Now, you're quite right, my recent work is all in the direction of how people use these skills that they have. But, I think we have to recognize that just because you have skill doesn't mean that you're going to use it in a way that it is pro-social.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

You talked, you mentioned your book, *Frames of Mind*. Tell us a bit more about that book.

HOWARD GARDNER

(24:00) Well, that's the book where I first introduced, at that time, seven different intelligences. I wouldn't be sitting here today if I'd called it seven talents. Using, taking the word intelligence and pluralizing it, is what I think people got, got people's attention. It was a 400-page book--a lot

of research there. Certainly many people had talked about intelligences being pluralistic before, but I drew on this evidence from different sources, brain damage, prodigies, autistic people, and so on, and nobody had done that before, and I think that's what gave it the vividness that made it viral, you would say today.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

And what are your thoughts about your theory and current educational issues today.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I've always been completely out of step with American educational policy. Much less so...

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Makes for an interesting read.

HOWARD GARDNER

Much less so with other countries (25:00). No, I think we've had one educational, one educational philosophy and program in the United States since the late 1980s, since President George H. W. Bush and then Governor Clinton met in Charlottesville for the Charlottesville Summit. The educational philosophy is well intentioned, but as far as I'm concerned, it's largely moving deck chairs on the Titanic. When I talk about this, I talk about Finland and Singapore--two countries which couldn't be more different from one another--yet their educational systems are rightly admired. And in many ways, what they do in classrooms is very different from one another. Finland is very, very progressive, laissez-faire, permissive. Singapore is really quite authoritarian. But, in both of those societies, teaching is highly professionalized and highly sought after. People want to be teachers. It's competitive (26:00) to be a teacher. They are reasonably compensated, and there are lifelong trajectories. You can either stay in the classroom if that's what you're good at, or you can advance in the system, and it's that there's politics on the one hand and practitioners on the other. As you can tell, I am rarely speechless. But I had a meal with the minister of education from Singapore a few years ago, and he left me tongue-tied when he said, "Howard," or "Dr. Gardner, it takes 15 to 20 years to change an educational system." And of course he was talking about Singapore, which is tiny--it's five million people. He said, "How can you possibly think about changing an educational system in a country where everything is determined by quarterly profits and by biannual elections?" Of course, he's right. America, you know, no company can afford to lose anything from one quarter to another, and people are continuously running for office. You might say, "Howard, why is that consistent (27:00) with there being one educational philosophy for 20 years?" It's consistent because people say the same thing. But in fact, they can't make long-term plans because everything is too corrupted. And as everybody who studies American urban education knows, the average urban superintendent has a very short term--a few years at the most--and then he or she moves to another city, and it's kind of a circulating poker game. The few places like Boston, which have longer running superintendents are more stable. But Boston is tiny compared to New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and so on.

When I began to become interested in education, I realized that I needed to have, I needed to articulate what my own education philosophy was. I realized that in my own education before college, there was nothing particularly distinctive about it, but that the education my children had had, and the education that I'd had in working with Jerome Bruner in the middle 60s, and then also I had taught for a year in school, the same school we had done research with Bruner. I developed an education philosophy of sorts, and so I decided that I should write about it. At the same time, I was still very much a consumer of the literature on children's cognition, and the thing that struck me the most (1:00) in reading this literature, this was in the 70s and 80s was the power of early misconceptions. A lot of what we try to do in education is to get rid of simple-minded ideas. For example, the earth looks flat, so it's flat, right? If you can't see something anymore, it doesn't exist. Everybody, every species was created at the same time and never changed. If you drop a coin and a piece of paper at the same time, the coin falls more quickly to the ground. In any society, you have the good guys and the bad guys, and the purpose is for the good guys to win. And these ideas which people develop when they're young, even if they're not taught them, they're kind of, we might say the intuitive theories that young people have (2:00). A lot of education should be designed to complexify the way we think about things. I mean, if you think about American foreign policy over the past 50 years, it's kind of one bad guy after another. Whether his name is Fidel Castro, or Manuel Noriega, or Saddam Hussein, or Bin Laden, and we get rid of those bad guys and everything can be fine. Of course it's never turned out to be the case, and still isn't going to be the case. So, in the *The Unschooled Mind*, I try to lay out what these early uneducated, untutored theories of the world are, and to show from ample data that even when people are taught to think differently over the years, if you examine them off-site, when they're not taking an exam, those old theories are very, very powerful, and they're very hard to erase. This is most dramatically conveyed (3:00) by a film made some years ago of some Harvard and MIT students graduating with their black robes and their hat on, and some interviewer says to them, "Why is it warmer in the summer than it is the winter?" And one kid after another says, "Well because the earth is closer to the sun during summer than it is in the winter." And that's not the right answer. But it's an intuitive answer, and even those people have degrees from elite institutions, they still think in the same un-schooled kind of way. People will study the first World War, and they'll learn that it's a very powerful set of factors which contributed to the Guns of August. You know, there are political ones, economic ones, mercantile one, ethnic strife, et cetera. And you say, what's going on in the world now, and they say, "There's this bad guy named Osama Bin Laden, and we've got to get rid of him." So there's no transfer of that complex way of thinking from history to what's going on nowadays (4:00). So in *The Unschooled Mind*, I first lay out the power of these early conceptions and theories, and then I try to talk about things that we can do--what I call "Christopherian encounters," I named after Christopher Columbus because if you think the world is flat, then you keep sailing, you should never come back to where you started. You should just keep going until you fall off or keep going forever. The sorts of things which make those early theories more fragile, and then what you need to do, which is very hard and nobody has figured out how to do it quickly, is how to get people to think more sophisticatedly about things because otherwise, why go to school? Even though you didn't ask me this, my subsequent work after *The Unschooled Mind*, *The Disciplined Mind*, *Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed*, those are two books that I wrote at about 10-year intervals, are all efforts to figure out how do you have the education which we need to make people think more sophisticatedly. Then in this recent book, what do we do (5:00)

with the philosophical threat of postmodernism and relativism, which is to say, how the hell do you know what is true? If what I say is beautiful isn't the same as you, how can we use the "beauty." And the digital media, where anything can be posted, changed, revised, morphed, transformed at any moment. It's much, much harder to teach the traditional virtues, the traditional values, when you have these philosophical and technological things. So, even though I've been lucky enough to write about many different things, that's one of the great things about being a scholar, our dean, another dean once said, "Well, I want you people to all study X." And I said at a faculty meeting, "Well you can tell us what to teach, but you can't tell us what research to do." I've been able to study what I want, even if that professor when I was in graduate school wanted to flunk me out, and people did not want to give me tenure. But I think there are certain through lines, and when I worked in *Man: A Course of Study* with (6:00) Jerry Bruner when I was just a kid out of school, there were three questions, and I had forgotten them for years, but in a way, they are questions I'm still asking: What makes human beings human? How did they get that? What can make them more so? And what's the Good Work Project? It's an effort to say, what can make us more so? And when asked, what's human? My contribution, if there is, is to think not just about science, about art, but art and other fields as well. I did want to say something else. I have been incredibly privileged to have a job and to be able to do research in the United States, get funded, not often without lots of efforts, and to be in a very privileged community of scholars. I could easily understand people watching, if they've been patient enough, to say, "Well, you know (7:00), what does he have to say to people who don't have that kind of privilege? Should he be attempting to say how people should live, and what good work and good citizenship is?" I think that that's a valid critique. I remember once talking to the people who run Renaissance Weekend, and the person who runs it, we were friends, says, "Howard, you need to go teach for a few years in the south or the west and get off your very privileged niche." And while I travel a lot, I have never done that. In fact, the place I've spent the most time in, other than the United States, was China through a fluke. I actually wrote a book about China in the 1980s, so that's a long time ago, but I don't know Chinese, so the understanding of China (8:00) has to be very limited. But the answer I would give to what I think is a very reasonable, hey-wait-a-minute kind of statement is, that doesn't, I shouldn't therefore come to the conclusion I shouldn't try to make things better, that I shouldn't try to influence the education system, that I shouldn't try to promote good work and good citizenship. I may not be doing it in the best possible way. I'm almost certainly going to fail because everybody fails. But the question is, do you make an effort, or not? And I believe I should make an effort. And it's up to people who have taken the trouble to read what I have written or to listened to me to criticize them. I never go to look at [Ratemyprofessor\[.com\]](http://Ratemyprofessor.com), and I never will because I don't care what people say about me if they don't know me. But I read my students' criticisms, which are given anonymously, very carefully because they do know me. Similarly when people say (9:00) dismissive things about my work, the first question I ask is, "Have you actually read it?" And if they've read it, then I pay attention to it. But if they say, "MI theory is silly," but it's quite clear they have no idea what I'm saying, then I don't pay attention to it. That has to do with my wider notion of human discourse and human intercourse--namely that anything that's raised seriously deserves to have an answer, but things that are raised frivolously are not. In my teaching, and now I've taught for many years, if people take nothing away from what I teach, not a single substantive thing, they remain every bit as unschooled as they were before, if there are two things they get, then I feel I've been successful. One is, if somebody asks a serious question or a non-facetious question, they deserve an answer; and if it's out of ignorance, you should be kind, but try to help them be less ignorant.

And you should know what's going on in the world. So I never teach without reading the newspaper (10:00)--I still read a physical newspaper--and listening to the radio, even when I'm abroad, I'll look at the newspaper online, and I talk about what's happening these days. Because if you don't know what's going on in the world, what are you here for? You know, we're all here for a speck of time, and you should know what's going on, and you should relate what's happening in the world to. I'll tell a story just from last week. We're now talking in March of 2013. We had a big cheating scandal at Harvard last spring, and I became very involved in trying to understand why so many students had cheated, and I identify with the institution, so I became very central there. Then we had a case of the dean, for motivations which are not particularly relevant, giving green light to looking at the email of another dean. This caused a huge explosion (11:00) in certain parts of the campus and was upsetting to many people, including me. I was about to go to a faculty meeting, and I knew the faculty meeting we were going to look at a dossier of candidates because that's what we do at faculty meetings. But I called my dean and said, "I'd like to say something about what's happening on campus." And I had a three-minute written speech because I didn't want to take up a lot of time. But I read about, but I read aloud at the beginning of the meeting, and I said, "I am doing this in part to bear witness. I don't have any particular answer to these things, but when something this important is going on at the campus, I think we need to take note of it, and we at least need to think about what we ought to do." And a few people came afterwards and actually had some ideas. This is how I in my very lowborn ways as my friend, Bill Damon, says, every once in a while I manage to eke out a moral act, a way in which I try to get people to think about what's happening everyday and not just be in our fox hole, which is so easy to do.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Your extensive publishing career includes to date more than (12:00) 20 books translated into 28 languages and several hundred articles, in addition to numerous and honors. You have received honorary degrees from 26 colleges and universities. In 2005 and 2008 you were selected by *Foreign Policy* and *Prospect* magazines as one of the 100 most influential public intellectuals in the world. In 2009 you published a book, *Multiple Intelligences Around the World*, in which 42 authors from 15 countries on five continents wrote about how they had used multiple intelligences theory. What is next for you?

HOWARD GARDNER

That's an embarrassing introduction.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

And you can't say "nothing."

HOWARD GARDNER

What's the joke? I liked it, and my mother believed it. I, one thing about me, I love when my ideas have influence, but I don't have a cult of personality. I always say I don't want to be recognized in the airport (13:00). You know, I hope that some of these ideas will have benign influence, but I don't wallow in that. Until about six months ago, what I would've said is that I'm trying to get the multiple intelligences legacy straight. That's the reason for the MI Oasis website. And I'm trying to consolidate the various Good Work enterprises. We started with the Good Work Project, but we now have this umbrella of the Good Project because we have Good Work,

Good Play, Good Collaboration, Good Life, and so on. And each of these are little areas of research and practice, and I really don't care if people have heard of the Good Work Project, but I care that we make strategic alliances with other places and people who are doing similar things. So we were at a conference in March of 2013 about the Good Project, and there were people there from Finland, Sweden, Australia, India (14:00), the British Isles, and so on. This is not for our glory, it's to try to get people who are also interested in ethics and people of good work. So I would've said that. But in part because of the scandals at Harvard--the cheating and the surveillance--and I'm also on the board at Amherst College, and we've had very bad sexual harassment there. At Oberlin College there's racial and ethnic slurs. The price of liberal arts education is sky high in this country, and people say, "What do we get for the money?" We have massive online, open online courses, MOOCs, which could be good or bad, but certainly look like they're going to be a challenging residential liberal arts education, and I would say moving towards skills rather than thinking and reflecting. And hyper vocationalism on the part of American young people for which there is some reason, but also I think is way overblown. Probably the (15:00) worst thing is to say, "I want to follow this particular job, and that's all I'm being trained for," because their job could be gone in two years, and then you're completely ruffed. So that's the elevator speech. With a colleague named Richard Light, we are expecting to carry out a five-year study which we are calling LAS 21--Liberal Arts and Sciences in the 21st Century. I also call it as a nickname BBB--Baby Beyond Bathwater--because there may be a lot of bathwater in liberal arts education, but there's a very precious baby. Part of the privilege that I've had because I've been at an elite university, and I've had contact with such wonderful mentors is I see the wonderful things you can have you can learn about different ways of thinking. You can have contact with young minds. You can continue to grow, I hope even at my age, even at Jerry Bruner's age, we don't want to lose that because through MOOCs or through people only being able to study stuff which will land them the first job (16:00). But we have to be sensitive to the threats from within because if people see campuses as places where kids cheat, where they do binge drinking, where they indulge in drugs, illegal drugs, where there's sexual harassment, and so on, then they're not going to want to support our liberal arts institutions. There have been wonderful books written about the liberal arts. We have no need to add to the defenses. What we want to do is an empirical study of how the different interest groups on campuses think about education--incoming students, graduating students, their parents, faculty and staff, trustees and alumni, and importantly, recruiters, because recruiters, particularly at the elite campuses have enormous power. And if the only recruiters who come, come from the investment banks, from management consultants, and maybe if you're lucky, from Teach for America, then that's the message about where the jobs are. Except for Teach for America, I don't think any of the other ones are (17:00) the shortest distance to good work. When I was an undergraduate at Harvard College in the early 1960s, there was a very thin kid named Bill Drayton, whom I got to know, and he had a table every week at Lowell House called the Ashoka table, and I learned through him that Ashoka was an emperor in India thousands of years ago, who got to be an emperor the usual pugnacious way, but then tried to be pacific and pacify people, tried to get them to do what I would call good work and so on. Bill was interested in that when I was interested in the girl next door. Then he started 30 years ago something called Ashoka, which was the first social entrepreneur organization in the world. There now have been thousands of people who have been Asoka fellows all over the world. Then when at my 40th college reunion, I said the most important (18:00) person in our class was Bill Drayton because of what he did, everybody applauded. He's still not a household world like Madonna, or Lady

Gaga, or Justin Bibber, or the Kardashians, but he's much more important, and he came out of a liberal education. I think we need to preserve that, and in my however many years I have left, that's something I'm going to work toward.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Is there anything in your research throughout your career thus far, that you feel we've missed? That there's a nugget in there that has not had the impact that you thought it would?

HOWARD GARDNER

Let me just do a little free association. First of all, we haven't talked a lot about family, but family is incredibly important to me. I have four wonderful kids all grown up, all productive citizens, all of whom get it ethically and morally, and (19:00) that's something I'm incredibly proud of. Two grandchildren, wonderful wife. We haven't talked much about Project Zero, but that's been my intellectual home since 1967, so we're going on to 50 years. For 28 years, David Perkins and I were the directors of Project Zero, and very unusually for a university, we've since had two leadership transitions. Typically at universities, unless an organization is funded by a permanent line, as soon as the leaders disappear, the organization disappears. But this was an organization started by Nelson Goodman, and then we've had these leadership transitions since. Project Zero began with an interest in artistic knowledge. Nelson Goodman, the founder, quipped, "We know a lot about education and the arts, but we don't know anything (20:00) systematic. So let's have a systematic exploration of that." And that's been the through line for decades. But if people have heard of Project Zero now, they could have heard of it for a dozen reasons. It's much more known abroad, much better known abroad than the United States. Again because United States educational policy is so antithetical to what we do at Project Zero, which is teaching for understanding, paying attention to individual differences, talking about the relevance gap, which is what's the most important things for people to know, studying things like global consciousness, globalization. We have an annual, we have an annual institute called the Future of Learning where we look at technological breakthroughs, biological breakthroughs, things which every politician mentions in the first and last paragraphs, but never looks at the educational system to see whether it covers those things. All of my close colleagues have been associated with Project Zero. There are dozens, if not hundreds of younger people who I work with, and we have probably (21:00) 20 people who have been associated with Project Zero for over 20 years, including my wife, Ellen, who has actually been there for 40 years, and that's been an incredible part of my life. Yet, 25 years ago, a journalist came to me and said, "I want to do a cover story about you for a science magazine." And I said, "Well, I'd like you to do it about Project Zero." And I never heard from the person again because we live in a cult of celebrity personality thing, and people either what someone like I did, someone like me did, or they want to know what our underwear is like, and the notion of people working together over long periods of time to develop a body of work is not something that's of much interest. So my family, Project Zero. I continue to be very much involved in the arts. I will not play the piano for anybody else, but I still play for myself. I'm on the board of the Museum of Modern Art in New York. I'm a very unusual appointment there; but they're very interested in education, and I've been on their education (22:00) committee for 30 years, so I hope I make some contribution. I'm also on the board here for an orchestra, the Boston Landmarks Orchestra. When I travel, and I travel a lot, I always make time to go to a theatrical production and/or a museum. When I turned 60, my kids wanted to have a big party, and I said, "I don't like a party. Let's travel." So we went to Iceland,

and we spent a couple weeks there. And when I turned 65, we went to the Galapagos Islands, which was fantastic. I had a grandson then, and I knew that was a place where he could enjoy it because of the flora and fauna, which Darwin looked at, you know, almost 200 years. We'll do something similar as my 70th birthday comes. So doing travel and doing stuff with my kids. I mentioned the time in China, I was very lucky to be able to go to China a lot. I think there's nothing more educational than having to spend time, or having the opportunity to spend time in different (23:00) cultures. I didn't go into detail about the Good Work Project, but it began in 1994-95. At that time there were a new set of people elected to the House of Representatives. 80% of them did not have passports, and I thought that was unbelievable in the shadow of the 21st century that four out of every five representatives had never traveled abroad and didn't have a desire to travel abroad. We live in a global world, and I think the best gift you can give to students and to your own kids is the chance to travel. They don't have to stay at the Ritz. So that's another thing. My mother is still alive and 101. I go to see her every weekend and talk to her everyday. And she's been through a lot. Let me tell a story about her, and that might be a good conclusion. She's a remarkable, doesn't have higher education, but knows what's going on. Has a fantastic connector. I tend to connect people through ideas. You know, Audrey you worked on that, and John worked on that, maybe you should read each other's stuff. But she connects people through their passions, and interests, and relatives, and when my father died in 1999 at the age of 91, we decided my mother should move to a retirement place, and she agreed. The move was the move from hell. The movers were breaking things, they broke the elevator down. She had to sleep in her house with none of her things there. And my sister and I, we both live in Boston, were going nuts. You know, how could these people be so awful? What are we going to do? Are we going to sue? My mother was sitting there very placidly, and I said, "Mom, this is a disaster. How can you sit there so patiently and quietly?" She said, "Son, I know what real problems are." And thinking back to what she went through with family and how many were lost in concentration camps, and thinking of losing her one son (25:00) when she was pregnant with me. I think it's important to know what real problems are. I'm lucky enough to have had very few problems in my life, but as I think Marcelo Suarez-Orozco told you, maybe I do have a feeling of the frailty of life and that it's important to use the time you have here the best you can.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Now on to a series of introspective questions.

HOWARD GARDNER

I thought we were done. Here I am giving the sermon, and they haven't even passed out the wafer yet.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

We're almost done. Who do you believe has had the greatest impact on you and the person and scholar you have become today?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I've written extensively about being in a place like Cambridge, which is not just Harvard, but MIT, where I went assiduously to all of Noam Chomsky's lecturers, lectures. He's probably the one scholar alive today who will be read in 100 years. He's that important. And when I had to write an autobiographical essay for a book called *Gardner Under Fire*, where people shot at me,

I called it a blessing of influences. So, there are literally dozens of influences--some of whom I know, some of whom don't know who have had influence on my. In my office I don't have diplomas or awards, I have letters who wrote letters to me when I was a student, and the most amazing thing, which I didn't recognize until I moved into my office just a few years ago, is I have two letters from credible scholars: Jean Piaget, who had enormous influence on my thinking, probably more influence on my thinking than anyone else, and Claude Levi-Strauss, a great anthropologist And my first popular book was about Piaget and Levi-Strauss. Those letters were sent in English from Paris and in French from Geneva on the same day, April 10, 1970, so I was 26 years old. That's not a lesson to me, that's a lesson to my students. We build on other people. I think Piaget probably had the greatest influence on me. I knew a little bit, but certainly not personally. I think personally probably Jerome Bruner and Nelson Goodman. Bruner both because of his ideas and because of the social world he had around him; and Goodman because he made me very skeptical, not cynical. He was a little bit too cynical, but very skeptical about things. I don't believe claims just because they are made (2:00), even if they're made with flord. I always want to know what the evidence is. And part of my writing about the disciplines and writing about *Truth, Beauty, and Goodness Reframed*, is that we can't evaluate what people say or write or show us, unless we know the methods that they used. So if you tell me that you just have some interesting finding, I want to know how did you go about getting that finding and can you show me. So I think that I learned that. Nelson Goodman said something to me, which was frightening. He said, "When I read something of yours, Howard, the first time I come to something I don't understand, I stop reading." And I've never been that way with students, but it's a pretty powerful super ego. So I think that probably those are the two people whom I knew well, both of whom I mentioned were in my ad hoc, as they call it, the tenure evaluation thing, who probably had the most influence on me. I regret that there were no men who had the same influence on me, but a woman who (3:00) had an enormous influence on me was Susanne Langer, who was a great philosopher. Would have taught at Harvard, except that her husband was teaching here, and there was a nepotistic rule. She was actually the teacher of my first wife, Judy Krieger Gardner, and I learned about Susanne Langer significantly through Judy, and that was a great intellectual influence. We use the word paragon for that. Paragon is somebody who you don't know personally, but you have a huge influence on you. And if you ask me, I don't know if this is on the list or not, who is the human being who, in memory of the greatest influence, and also you're going to ask me who I wanted to have dinner with, it would have been Gandhi. I think Gandhi is the most important human of the last thousand years. I think Christ is the most important person of the last two thousand years. I suppose that I'd be interested to talk to both of them. But so much of what we know about Christ is legend, that it's (4:00) much harder to think about what that would be. Whereas with Gandhi, a lot of people who know him are still around.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Sure. What inspires you?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well we've talked about paragons who've inspired me. Just this past week I had lunch with a younger person who I had met once before, and some of whose work I knew, and it was a transformative lunch for me. He's a 40 year old, and he sat and told me about so many things that I guess I was ready to hear but never had thought of myself, and I began to write to people and

put him in touch with people, so that was inspiring. I guess I've already said works of art are the things that have the most impact on me. So, you know, when there are contemporary artists like James Turrell, who I think has lived in Arizona or New Mexico. I'm not sure which. Or artists from my lifetime like Mark Rothko, I would happily go to Texas to look at his cathedral, his church installations. Or great literary works, great works of music, I would walk many miles to hear a good performance of a Mahler symphonies. That's inspiring. But there's nothing like holding your own grandchildren. That's the peak.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What do you find uninspiring?

HOWARD GARDNER

Banality. I love movies, and I love good stuff on television, but it's hard enough to discover what's (6:00) really worthwhile that I have to hear a lot of talk about something to want to spend time on it. We did a big study, which is being published now. What do people admire the most in the 21st century? We were asking them about quality. And we thought they would talk about wrist watches, but nobody has a watch anymore; about cars, but kids don't drive anymore, there's actually some data on that; or about their computers, or their smart phones, or their pads. The surprise was how many people, both in the United State and abroad said time well spent. And the same people who spend hours each day looking at Facebook and fixing their portrait lament the fact that they spend so much time, and it's not time well spent. So banality and wasted time are things that don't inspire. But wasted time doesn't mean how much time. So if I'm going to a meeting, I don't ask how many hours it is, I ask is it time going to be well spent? I would rather spend three hours, or like with Norman Geschwind, eight hours in a meeting where it's well spent, than five minutes. I will see every student who wants to see me from Harvard and any student from elsewhere if they have a legitimate thing; but I ask beforehand, "What are we going to talk about, and send me a note," because if all they want is a photograph, we don't have to see there and say hem and haw. But there's an interesting thing there from an educational point of view, which is that a number of times in my life there has been a student in the class who says absolutely nothing, so of course I don't know the student, and they write something that's wonderful. One of the great things about, and then I say, "I'd like to speak with you," and one of the great things about the new media is there are more ways for people to show that they can connect. It isn't just waving your hand. So, again, it's the short (8:00) time we have here, the fragility, the frailty, we shouldn't intentionally waste time. At the same time, with Dick Light we've begun reflection sessions at Harvard where we just let students reflect on their lives. We've done it in other places it's being imitated. It's moving up from freshman to, I think some people are so connected and are so busy monitoring their machines all the time that they don't have any time to reflect, and that's actually very bad. When people ask me, "If you're just suddenly given some free time, what do you do?" They're very surprised to hear that often I would just lie in bed and think, and let my mind, so that's reflection. Is it time well spent? I don't know. But I think that if I didn't do that, it would be bad.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Sure. What is your favorite word?

HOWARD GARDNER

I actually was once asked that for a book, and I came up with an answer, it's a little banal, since we're talking about banality, but it was the subject of an interesting little essay. It was "yet," because when I write in particular, I like to lay out the opposite point of view, but then I say "and yet," and "yet" is a very short word which allows me to put forth the other point of view. So when we were talking a minute ago I said, "I hate wasting time." The "and yet" would have been "You do need to take time to reflect." One of reasons many people like to travel is because at least when you're in an airplane or a hotel room, there are fewer people who can bother you, and you have more time to reflect. So, "yet" is a word that I like. I've gotten in a lot of trouble for saying that my least favorite word is "webinar," and my second least favorite word is "Skype." But probably in 10 years I'll just accept those because they're a part of life.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What is your favorite curse word?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I wish I didn't curse, but I do. Recently I cursed in front of somebody with a young child in the car, and I apologized. But I guess the answer is the same as other people, I don't have, it depends on the environment. There are certain words that I would not say in front of a child intentionally, but if I said "damn it" I probably would.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What profession...

HOWARD GARDNER

Has anyone given you a good answer to that?

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Oh, we've had a plethora of answers, and a lot of people have declined, so we've had a run of the gamut. What profession, other than your own, would you have liked to attempt?

HOWARD GARDNER

I think about that a lot. As you get older, that's the kind of question that you ask. I guess the first thing is that I have no regret about going into scholarship. It's the life that, scholarship and teaching, that for me has been golden. I went into psychology, but I could have easily gone into another social science. I think in many ways I'm more of a historian than I am a psychologist. But I also love biology (11:00). I love doing neurology. I used to joke that I was a neurologist from the neck up. I don't think I could have done the highly mathematic things in biology, but I think biologically as well historically. The theory of multiple intelligences does not pose problems for biologists because it's very biological--it has to do with how the brain has evolved over thousands of years. It's not very psychological because we don't have a test for it. So, I think the academy was the best for. If I hadn't gone into the academy, I would have become a lawyer. Let me give an answer. I would have become a lawyer, but I would have hated being a lawyer unless I got to be a judge, and you can't do that. If I would have gone to medical school, I would have hated it, but I wouldn't have minded being a psychiatrist or neurologist because I would have been dealing with issues of the mind. Recently, and this is really just in the last few years, I've thought about journalism. Both because journalism was (12:00) the first domain that we

looked at in the Good Work Project, and because journalism is under so much enormous strain now. Also because while I don't like to blog, I blog, and because so much of journalism now is doing things very quickly, and I can write very quickly. But I don't really like it because I like to be able to think about things. I like to be able to reflect. Of course it used to be in journalism, at least you could write for the next day's newspaper. But now, the next day the story is already old hat. You know, the Pope is already, everybody already knows about it. So you have to blog and just keep up every moment. But I think maybe the answer is the same as the answer for law and medicine. If I could be a columnist for The New York Times, that would be fine. But the chances of being a columnist for The New York Times is about as low as the chances of being a judge, and it's not something you can make happen. So, and I think maybe this is a good message for people, the life of a teacher (13:00) and a scholar can be satisfying even if you're not a judge or a columnist. But, I would not have wanted to help people who were guilty avoid going to jail, people who are already rich getting very richer. I actually worked in an emergency room when I was thinking about being a medical student. I don't actually; I'm not excited by people's injuries. Of course I'd like to be able to help them.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What profession, other than your own, would you have not like to attempt?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well that's funny. I never was attracted to business. My father and everybody before me was a businessperson, and I think it was helpful to me, but I've never been attracted to be a businessperson. I had a thought last week, which I hadn't thought about before. Nowadays everybody talks about being a serial entrepreneur, which means starting one business after another. I never had any desire to do that. But in a sense (14:00), I've been a serial idea entrepreneur because we have people in my field and often have very good people who study the same thing for 40 years, and I would go totally nuts doing that. One of the reasons that bonded so much with Jerry Bruner is because he also gets bored very easily, so he moves to new things. So in a certain way I've been a serial idea entrepreneur. Anything that I wanted to do I had to raise money for. It wasn't raising money by selling something tangible, but I was sort of selling my ideas. So in a funny kind of way, I did repeat what my forefathers and foremothers did. I wasn't in business, but I was in the business of ideas. Just like I said in reference to my mother, she's a connector, but she connects people in the human dimension. I connect people more by ideas.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

What is your favorite book?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I knew you were going to ask that question. It's not something that I think about in that way. Undergraduates, I had them read Claude Levi-Strauss's autobiographical book, *Tristes Tropiques*, which was a story about how a French intellectual went to Brazil in the 1930s searching for the noble savage, the Rousseauian savage, and discovered at the end of the day we're all human beings. Then he became a great anthropologist. Then my first popular book was about Piaget and Levi-Strauss. I got to know Levi-Strauss much better than Piaget--he only died about a year or two ago. So that's a book. But in the sense, it's a book which was important for me, but also one that I would say to students, "This is the kind of thing that you wouldn't

normally look at." So I don't know if it's my favorite book. I used to read all the novels of John le Carre. I loved Dickens. George Eliot is the great fiction writer. But now, most of my reading is to help me with my work, and I don't have as much time for leisurely (16:00) reading. I thought Philip Roth had a wonderful new run after some books that weren't very good, and I loved reading John Updike, but it was not his novels after his first novels. It was his criticism. When he died I said, "Who's going to tell me what's going on now that John Updike is dead?" So I have a lot of, I would say more favorite writers than favorite books.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

If you could tell President Obama one thing, what would it be?

HOWARD GARDNER

Well I used to have an elevator speech for President Obama, and it was about good work and to help people be excellent, engaged, and ethical. But we're now in 2013, and I guess what I say to him is that I think his values are (17:00) very admirable. That he gave a State of the Union address, and he gave an Inaugural address in 2013. His State of Union address was a bunch of what I would call small bore programs and laws, which is probably all that he can expect to accomplish in the next years because he'll be a lame duck after 2014, and because he has a congress which simply does not want to play ball with anybody. But in his Inaugural address, I saw him laying the groundwork for the next 40 years, and Arthur Schlesinger, the great historian, who he clearly knows, said in America we have 30-year cycles, and the cycles are not predictable, but it is predictable that we're in a 30 year cycle. And the 30-year cycle in America really began in the late 20th century, and it's over. What his job now is to help define the next cycle, which (18:00) is one for a country which will be incredibly demographically diverse. A country where the division between rich and poor is obscene. A country which can no longer tell the rest of the world what to do but has to contribute to peace and to climate control. And he has to set into motion groups of young people, institutions, even political action committees, though I nauseate at the whole idea, which can help bring about that 40-year change. And I'm not telling him anything he knows, but I may be stating it to him in a more clear way. And to say that he should keep his eyes at least as much on that as on whether the particular thing about gun control passes or whether or not the budget or the sequestration. Because really what he has to do is get people in Washington (19:00) who are willing to work for the country rather than just their own political interests. Once they do that, they can get rid of Citizens United, which is the single worst decision the Supreme Court has made since the Dred Scott case. We haven't gone political till now, but since you asked, that's what I would tell President Obama.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

If Heaven exists, what would you like God say when you arrive at the pearly gates?

HOWARD GARDNER

This is a question which has an awful lot of counter-factual clauses into it. This is a question which has a high counter-factual component to it. I guess I would not want to be greeted different than anybody else. But if there were things one could do there to improve things, I try to find other right-minded people.

(20:00)

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

When asked to capture the essence and nature of Howard Gardner, your friend and colleague David Perkins describes you as hardworking and intellectually, strikingly productive. You have a keen nose for areas of inquiry right for pursuit, both in terms of what the questions are and what might be timely in terms of big questions. Your son, Andrew, describes you as an insanely hard worker who continued pushing yourself and expanding your expertise. Though you will always be known as the multiple intelligences guy, he's glad that you've moved on in your research. He added that you have little interest in licensing and that you haven't sold out, and of that he's proud. Your son, Jay appreciates your dedication to your family, writing that your dedication to your family rivals your dedication to your work. You are a loving, communicative, and supportive father, a devoted son to your 101-year-old mother, and an absolutely wonderful grandfather to his children. He adds that he has never seen you as happy as when you are bantering with your grandson or holding your granddaughter. He is grateful that his kids have the luxury of taking their Opa for granted. Your son, Ben, says that you have been a great father to four kids and all the while had a very time consuming career. But you always had time for your family whenever they needed you, no matter what continent you have been on. You're a passionate, and you care deeply about everything you do, including the best part--being a dad. Your friend and colleague, Marcelo Suarez-Orozco describes you as half Mick Jagger and half Charles V. Like Mick, you are a rock star. Like Charles V, the sun never sets on your empire of ideas. Regarding your most important achievement, he writes that it is still too soon to tell. Your most immediate and practical achievement is that you gave teachers the world over the permission to teach children in ways they intuitively understand were better to engage students with different learning styles (22:00). Finally, your wife, Ellen, praises your ability to think synthetically and analytically. Most people are stronger at one than the other. And you have vision and think about the big picture. Your questions always go to the heart of the matter, and you're an incredible mentor to your students--always giving them quick and detailed responses to their work. You are also a devoted father to your four children and grandfather to your two grandchildren--one of your most important accomplishments in your life. Well there is no doubt that.

HOWARD GARDNER

Am I supposed to cry?

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

Yes. Well there is no doubt that actually in your own words we view you as a psychologist scholar who has tried to understand the human mind in its full richness and complexity. You seek to share your conclusions both with other scholars concerned with the mind and with the broader educated public. On behalf of all of us--educators, scholars, future educationists, educational researchers, and the like, we thank you, Dr. Howard Gardner, for everything you do and (23:00) mostly for being you, working on all of our behalves everyday. It's been a pleasure interviewing you.

HOWARD GARDNER

Well, thank you. I am very touched and very grateful.

AUDREY AMREIN-BEARDSLEY

I'm so glad that you agreed to participate.