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Introduction
This essay considers perceptions of Time and perceptions of Being, and their relationship with the cultural boundaries and barriers we create in the process of living and teaching. Such a consideration is particularly significant for Humanities educators given the ongoing debate regarding interdisciplinary programs, the dropping of barriers between program areas, and the globalization of culture. Indeed, Humanities educators should be exploring questions such as: How can we explore the fluid boundaries of Humanities subjects? In what ways can we create new connections and new understandings among Humanities subjects? What can Humanistic studies add to the human process of creating "identity" and add to our students' search for meaning? What kind of education can we provide to assist people in coping with global issues and the fluid boundaries? What kind of learning medium will provide active inspiration and innovation? What kind of education do we need to understand diversity? What kind of education do we need to understand the deeply
embedded relationships between culture, identity, community, time, politics and policy? In what ways can Humanities studies be re understood as integral to the future education of world citizens in the Twenty-First Century?

In considering perceptions of Time and perceptions of Being, this essay recognizes and encourages several fruitful conversations to be held, including one that opens up the narratives of our different experiences, one that illuminates the stories of our diversity, one that shatters the boundaries of monolithic Cultural and Humanities programs, and one that increases awareness of the Humanities as a transcultural experience. Such conversations may move us from Nineteenth Century mechanistic metaphors and education models toward derivative models of biology, physics and philosophy such that we describe Humanities activities in terms of broader thresholds of human self-awareness. The theory, philosophy and human stories in this essay reveal some narratives of our different experiences and provide opportunities for both fruitful conversations and for new understandings of how we might Be and Act as educators in the Twenty-First Century.

Paul Ricoeur maintains that there is cosmic time, human time, and historical time, and he says that "history [is] a major symbolic structure of the cultural experience of time" (Ricoeur 1991: 14). As Ricoeur suggests, Cosmic time, which is vast, illusive, overwhelming, immense and always there, sits uneasily with us as time flies, death awaits, while we remember or forget events that were, and long for or fear events yet to come. Human time is our "now," our lived time, our actions as conscious beings, a "time with a present" (Ricoeur 1991: 12). And finally, Ricoeur describes that space between the two as Historical time, where we mediate cosmic and human time through a cultural experience of time, as an emplotment, a storymaking, a narrative which connects our individual acts in our lives (the things done) to the history (reported discourse). This third time then becomes the story of the biological and social rhythms, our historical time and story, in which we first live as "history in the making" and then as a narration of those events, where as characters in a story we acquire a "unique identity, the narrative identity" (Ricoeur 1991: 14). This historical time of peoples, nations, or societies, reflected for example in Humanistic Study areas, provides hope for a memory that surpasses our individual forgetfulness and lack of historical interest. These are also the stories by which we make sense of our ordinary actions, which have a present, and these are the stories by which we make sense of our relationship to the immense time of the cosmos, which does not have a present. This is about the Humanities experience, "history as it is told, which takes the place of history as it is collectively experienced" (Ricoeur 1991: 14).

**Being**

This essay's story will reveal an exploration of the transcultural stories of concepts of self, in time and in community, and will reveal their implications for Humanities education and lifelong learning based on research in Malaysia, Singapore, Australia and California, through conversations with a culturally mixed group of participants (Kerr-Edwards 1994). The intent here is, first, to explore the opportunity for and creation of new considerations for the meaning of self as narratives, in human/historical time, with relevance for education. What is meant by education is not a series of subjects in isolation but, rather, learning as a process, and in relationship with
the cultural world we create and call our 'real world.' Second, the research findings suggest that some non-western understandings of self support Ricoeur’s (1992) and Varela’s (1991) contention that self as other is a process that provides the possibility of more--more learning and more meaning.

Those of us active in the HUMANITIES stories must disclose our awareness and we must act, based on these new understandings. It is, at the very least, inappropriate for those in the Humanities to leave it to scientists, particularly biologists and physicists, to lead the move into the next Millennium--we must also lead the way.

**Being Economic: A Story of Fixed Boundaries**

There are two dominant traditions in the Twentieth Century: Modernism and Post-Modemism. Within these traditions there are several metaphoric possibilities to understanding self. Modernism, particularly after the brutality of the First World War, adopted the dominance of machine technology and advanced industrialization. Post-Modemism moved beyond industrialization to the concerns of the nuclear age, with an emphasis on self-referencing.

A prevalent post-modern metaphor is the economic view of self. One understanding of this view is of life lived as a search to get the most for the least cost, what Varela (et al. 1991: 245) calls the "unconstrained economic man." This vision of motivation is expressed through metaphors such as productivity measures, input and output, the bottom line, and economic rationalism. Based on a view of a world in which goods are scarce and self is always in competition, the self forms boundaries. The resultant actions of this egoist world view are such that the boundaries are maintained to bring and keep inside as many good things as possible, and to pay out as little as possible, while keeping out as many bad things as possible (Varela et al. 1991: 246). Self-interest appears to be the only path to take, even where I need others to get what I do not already have.

In re-considering this economic meaning of self there are other possibilities, different metaphors, and expanded boundaries, which include Self as Other (Di Censo 1990, Ricoeur 1992), and Self as essentially groundless, always questing relevance and meaning in a pathless world (Varela et al. 1991). Such a metaphor is possible, without nihilism, when the self is considered to be without a fixed point, without a ground, and always in relationship with and compassionate for the other.

Consider that we may be operationally independent systems but we are structurally coupled, even biologically. When we are structurally coupled there is a history of recurrent interactions leading to the structural congruence between two (or more) systems (Maturana and Varela 1992: 75). Current metaphors of this are reflected in such sayings as, No Man is An Island, and in the Weatherman/Chaos Theory metaphor that the flapping of the wings of a butterfly in Brazil affects the weather in North America. There is then, in both biological understandings and cultural metaphors, the possibility to understand other-directedness, a we-in-relationship of Being requiring a responsibility of action, without anything being gained or lost. Through that understanding comes the choice to reject the need for gains or losses as a definition of economic wo/man.

If we do not reject the economic metaphor, hold on to the 'I' of self, and not understand the we-in-relationship of being, there is a fulfilling of self-referencing. Self-
referencing, without a grasp of the relationship with the larger unity, results not in mere perturbations but rather in destructive interactions. We can structure our metaphors for destruction, in the name of survival of the 'I', or we can structure our metaphors in a bigger bubble that understands self-as-other. As an example of bigger bubble metaphors, in both human and historical time, historians and sociologists will continue to have a grand time interpreting the transformative relationships between the British Monarchy and the People, particularly since the death of Diana, Princess of Wales.

Indeed, it is suggested (Heidegger 1962, Ricoeur 1992, Varela 1991) that letting go of habitual patterns of a need for self-boundaries, and through that a desire to acquire, and instead "acting for planetary building...allows us to let go of the street fighter mentality of watchful self-interest...to be replaced by interest in others" (Varela et al. 1991: 247). Certainly that change from scarcity opens up the possibility of more. Hoarding becomes sharing.

**Expanded Boundaries**

In fact, the narrative of this essay asks you to "imagine for a moment that you are reading this solely in order to benefit others." Consider how that might be different from "self-improvement schemes [which] foster only egohood" (Varela et al. 1991: 124, 249-252). As with the Biblical story of the loaves and fishes, sharing can mean more. The creation of that more of meaning requires us as humans to reflect upon our intentions and our acts, generating more, including 1) more meaning, 2) an expanded self-boundary and 3) an ungrounded more of self.

In that light, consider the possibility that Self is not a norm. Perhaps Self is a way to refer to mental and bodily events, rather than a centralized and all-powerful entity (Varela et al. 1991). Perhaps Self is not an "unchanging essence that is the source of our identity and that we must protect" (Varela et al. 1991:124). Can we not reject the earlier metaphor of economic wo/man, and view self as a search for meaning through a culturally shared experience of the tension of both self and other? Can we experience that "in a place where we see the other person and open up for him[her] room for existence beside us" (Maturana and Varela 1992: 246)? Can we live that in a social process that rejects rejection or redefines its meaning? In a unity of science and humanity theory, can we re-understand the process and metaphor of fixing (where an element is taken into a compound from its free and unattached state)? Can we recognize our biological process of creating larger unities as relevant to our human social processes? Can we then enter an era known as the place beyond the Modernisms? Can we call that era the human-biological age of Complementism (c)?

**Self and Other**

What is meant by the full complement of "self as other?" Dr. E. A. Herda, University of San Francisco (in conversation, June 1st, 1993), presented two worldviews of self:

**Relational Self**
- generative
- a starting point for social action
- action and self are interwoven, we

**Isolational Self**
- restricted
- disembodies persons from their lives and histories
- differentiates communicative and
create new ideas with others in community
-strategic action
-focus is on self as a you-me, with me not in the center
-individual self
-relationship develops a narrative process that enables a person to become active and create community.
-conversation is a means for persons to recognize and make changes in their individual lives.

Time and Being - A Future Story Unfolds

These new understandings of self and time suggest we are both finite and infinite cultural beings in relationship creating and carrying forth our life learning and our life work. They also suggest that the Modernist metaphors of life work as a resource or a product must fall away, and that the value of our knowledge and understanding is only present when it is shared. Our stories are not laid upon us, they are ours to make and own. There is no limit to what we can imagine, relate and describe and that is the 'more' of our sharing co-existence. Our stories are ours to create in relationship rather than in isolation, oneself with and as another. As Varela says (Maturana and Varela 1992: 246), "as human beings we have only the world we create with others - whether we like them or not." In bringing forth our world with others we must move beyond the Modern and Post-modern 'isms' to another domain where co-existence takes place in a global bubble. This domain would be a place where we recognize that to negate you is to guarantee a negation of me. Such a domain is certainly a human creation coming out of the time called the Nuclear Age. In accepting these stories and their responsibilities, we can see all our stories as worthy of consideration in choosing those actions which will be most useful and ethical in guiding our Humanities education and learning, now and in the future.

Narrative and Story - What Is It All About?

The National Endowment for the Humanities refers to the "dialogue between past and present that characterizes the humanities calls for attention to tradition and to its renewal." Such effective actions lead to more effective actions as a history of interactions (Maturana and Varela 1992). Narrating is an action through which meaningful totalities are constructed, out of scattered events (Ricoeur 1981). For learning and Humanistic Studies to be relevant, the narrative must be inclusive of and grounded in meanings of self as reflected in the cultural traditions of the participants. What I am suggesting thus far, and found in the research, is that there are considerably different understandings of and metaphors for the meaning of self and concepts of self in community, reflecting the need for a broad based educative process as is/must be found in the Humanities.

Regardless of the form chosen, in both literature, art, philosophy, language, religion, ethics and history, for example, we are obligated within narrative time to act, then to emplot and narrate the actions, both ours and those we study, reflect upon the plot and the individual and group actions within the plot, and critically think through and apply our new understandings to our future actions. These are the elements of Ricoeur’s (1988: 54-71) Mimesis 1, 2, and 3: reiterated as action, understanding, reflection, and change.
Ricoeur (1992) views self as a search for meaning through the stories (historical time) of a culturally shared experience (human time) of the tension of both self and other. Having heard a story as historical narrative, we must contemplate the actors, the actions and the plot. It is by this means that we can hope to obviate the nihilistic philosophy of relativism, while acknowledging each and every creative sense of self, within and among our various cultural and historical stories.

**Stories of Self**

In my research, the participants' disclosures of self, harmony, and difference, always in relationship, provide a potential path of shared understandings. For example, an Education Trainer/Manager of a multi-national corporation in Singapore compared two metaphors for developing people: renewal and retread. Retreading people, he said, suggests "something akin to wearing off people's rubber and then gluing a new layer back on the old, worn-out tire of life." The corporate educational standpoint he represented was one of renewal. He saw human development as,

develop[ing] the continuous renewal idea to where people are continually renewing themselves, their skills, renewing their knowledge, advancing themselves forward, keeping themselves vibrant so that they can take on not only today's activities but the activities of tomorrow and the future and keep that going.

Malaysian and Chinese workers in Singapore saw both their vision and their reality reflecting "a place where work and family life are one." An Indian lawyer and teacher in
Malaysia expressed a desire to not become an "autumn leaf." He decided to live a second life and left his tenured University position, became a lawyer, and started an entirely new school program for Indians in Malaysia. Moving very far away from "traditional Indian understandings of learning and jobs as security," he moved toward an exploration of the innovative side of his life. His states that, "I want the education experience to be innovative, to teach others and myself to feel right in the experience of going from familiarity to unfamiliarity, to toss out the status quo and learn more than to be a technician."

This new educator saw that the traditional educative processes for Indian children prepared them to be tools in the process of producing goods. Their learning process and their job is to get up in the morning, do their part of the work...What happens after that is none of their business....This comes from a basic, deeper...complacency and acceptance of the status quo, no desire to change, no desire to revolutionize or to take [learning] to the maximum to see what I can do. No. There is not such great confidence of the self, you know....They're not even taught they can do the job or create something new. What I hope to do is provide a place of sanctuary and hope in which learning would offer new opportunities beyond the caste system.

A Minister for social development in southeast Asia discussed the need to promote a caring and sharing society. She says a caring society must "encourage contributions from all sectors." She refers to the bringing together of people as "threading a needle between different communities...Behind all development programs there are people, you just can't put people aside...people must be consulted." When asked how one balances between development and keeping people in a sense of community, the Minister expressed concern that "we don't want our next generation...to have a life...that is meaningless." She goes on to share her notion of national unity, again as "this getting together, this thread," and agreeing that the metaphor of holding a nation or any organization together is a weaving or stitching. What is the thread? Is it that we are people? The response is, "yes...and that we look for these basic things...happiness....And that we have always this, if it's for the well-being of the community."

The following drawings of self (by two Muslims in Malaysia, and an American in California, as examples) reflect some of the many views of self offered by participants as part of disclosing their stories and traditions. All of the participants in the study, with some degree of struggle, believe in finding new meaning, particularly in learning/education activities. These stories of self reaffirm the transforming identities of the members of these societies, and are the means through which people create their cultures.

I would now like to share some of the metaphors of self, created by the participants of this research.
Model 2
Malaysian Model of A Complimentary Interpenetrating Sense of Self

(not either/or)

sensibilities - true and right as being aware

DOING RIGHT FOR OTHERS

ADAT (tradition)

HUKUM (Law)

DOING RIGHT FOR ALLAH

true and right as duties

Terms:

IBADAT

piety

a means, a plan, a way -- to draw from cultural sources including pre-Islam

intuition as primary sense, kindness

Being, desire (Nafsu amarah -- desire to do good)

AKAL

BUDI

NAFSU
Diagnostic Reading

A diagnostic reading of the two Models will reveal first a brief narrative of the events that comprise the models, and then an in-depth reading of the narratives.

The sense of self reflected in Model 1 concurs with Wanning (1991) that Americans understand their Being as psychological and, metaphorically, in the mind. The 'I' is seen as the ultimate indivisible core in the language of a pre-atom smasher paradigm of the nucleus of Being. The unexplainable core or nucleus of 'I' is surrounded by identifiers which provide an external characterization of the self in the layered medium of family and community.

Within the psychological box, the pieces of pie are identifiers which signify the changing relevance of each separate metaphor of self in relationship with an external world portrayed as a layered cake or pie. Interestingly, the pie box has a pre-self box called history, reflecting something akin to Gadamer’s (1992) pre-understandings.

The American participant also sees the self as having a "secret box" in which certain identifiers of self are hidden because they are "too emotional and too risky to share." The box metaphor is very significant, for the participant felt that "Americans prefer to pigeon-hole, box, or neatly wrap up who they are into understandable compartments with which they can easily deal, or which they can easily dismiss."

In a similar vein, an American businessman noted that, people think success is a big house, a car, another big car, another house in the country. But that's not success, those are rewards... Success is doing something to the utmost of your ability...where you are absolutely out there on your own, feeling wonderful about life because you are performing at your very best.

Consider that statement in relation with comments from a Malaysian Corporate Leadership Trainer who says,

For me, as a Malaysian, self is spiritual. I must have that within me, otherwise I feel like the world is based on the concept of excellence...the Tom Peters thing--which is a buzz word....The saddest thing about Western management is that you deny tradition...and spirituality...[which are] a way to integrate the whole.

That integration is reflected in the Model 2 drawing of self, drawn during the discourse between myself and two Malaysian sociologists, which reflects the dialectic of Being as a balance. Many Malaysians in fact discussed balance and relationship in depth. A few comments may help us to understand the following diagnostic reading. For example, one woman lawyer rejected a description of herself as a role model. As she says, "it sets me apart from, I don't want to be apart from." She saw herself as neither perfect nor as separate from others. She says, "I might be lonely but I am not alone." Another Malaysian, an artist, says, "the final relationship is with God, but you must help God to help you." She also says that "in the Islamic faith, humans are considered to be God's trustees." A Malaysian worker in Singapore says, "your biggest enemy in life is your own self. There is no bigger enemy that your Being...to prevent you from doing the right thing." The Malaysian Corporate Leadership Trainer refers to Malaysian values as "being about feelings and sensitivities, putting relationship ahead of task, showing modesty and
humility, deferring to loyalty and social obligation, and leading a life for spiritual fulfillment."

As can be seen in the Model 2 drawing, Nafsu is Being, from the Arabic نفس for breath or spirit (as well as passions and desires) which is governed through God, Allah. For example, the participant says that "if one were to go crazy or behave badly, the understanding is that the breath has over-balanced the rest of the self toward tradition (Adat), away from the criteria of appropriate action in Islamic law (Hukum) and piety (Ibadat)."

This movable scale, the line drawn horizontally through the circle, which may move up or down entailing more of one part than the other, reflects the balance in self. This balance is not however to be understood as an either/or metaphor. The complimentarity and antagonism, the bigness or smallness of the law and breath-of-Being in one’s balance, are interpenetrating. A consistent comment of the Malaysian participants is that "the human being needs harmony and balance."

Intuition/kindness (Budi) and tradition (Adat) reflect the characterization of the intellect as kindness and sensitivity or sensibility. The Malay Sociologists and the Corporate Trainer concurred that action in this domain reflects "an ethical system for Malays in which one must have an awareness of the true and right, and must act with respect for the feelings and needs of others." Budi, as intuitive kindness, envisions the superiority of the intuitive inner feelings (Rasa) over rationality. Budi helps self avoid being perceived as heartless and unrefined. Rasa (intuition, inner feelings) helps to maintain a coordinated and balanced existence. Adat provides the traditions and customary laws which assure the culture and society the integrity of its existence. In tradition (Adat), manners are essential to a relationship. Enduring manners cannot be separated from the qualities of a person. As the participants all agreed, "for a Malay it is not possible to say: I love you but not what you did. For the Malay, what self does is self."

Adat (tradition) and Budi (inner kindness) are seen as a framework for living so there are not fluctuating values. For example, one participant says that "self must have inner discipline, conceal frustration and disappointment, not cause shame, save face, show self-restraint and maintain harmony and consensus." Such metaphors reflect doing right as understood in relation to others. In Islamic Law (Hukum) and piety (Ibadat) we also see that doing right is understood in relation to Allah and the word of Allah, whether it be a fixed or an interpretive narrative of Allah’s word.

Critical Evaluation of the Significance of the Different Interpretations

In reflecting upon these narratives of self there is considerable awareness brought forth of the differences between these two images. The Malay centers and balances the way (akal) of Being (نفس) with tradition and Islamic law through the act of doing right. Being is a totality of more, a both...and metaphor based on a template of right action within a medium of community, family and work. For the American, a self, created in the mind, presents various and separate identifiers or symbols to an external world, without an ability or desire to explain the central core, with a secret part.

For the American, all these identifiers are layered on top of Others (family, community) in easily handled and compartmentalized boxes. For example, while religion is a secret for the American, for the Malay the law of Allah
(hukum) is a palpable part of the total Being and is essential to balance and harmony. The indivisible ‘I’ of the American drawing is not viewed as the excess of self; tradition and history are derived from a small, tandem box of pre-history. The ‘I’ rather is indicative of a sense of isolation and aloneness, a sense that in the end all oneself really has is oneself. The Malay self is always in relationship, with both tradition and with Allah, and action is done for others. However, the non-interpretational, fundamentalist, sense of Islamic law represses the tradition of Malaysian Adat, disassociating self from the balance and harmony traditionally regarded as essential to Budi in Malay culture. Such interpretive rigidity may create a model of self for the Malay Muslim which is more confined or boxed than any schema created by the creative (though possibly lonely and disenfranchised) American psychological self.

Each of these models is a story. Reflecting upon the disclosure of these stories, these narratives present the opportunity for all of us to see our past and present in relationship to the wider society in the larger domains of other stories. The narratives and drawings I share are therefore about how we as living organisms create our meaning. In lifelong learning and world-view construction, for the participant, observer, and educator, both the intended and unintended learning environments require authenticity, sensitivity, options and opportunities (McKenzie 1991: vii, Jarvis 1992: 177).

In all of my research and wanderings in various cultures I have come to understand that while values are what frequently get expressed as the tie that binds, there is as well a sense of meaningful action and direction (our story) that joins actors together; what we say and do and how we do it is very much what we are. In expanding our horizon through an understanding of self such as the Malaysian Model, we can discover a sense of self both as a relational self and a creative self. This creative self shares in the development of a story (Ricoeur 1971, 1988, 1992).

In this essay the story emphasized is one of learning and development: development of self with other. Every participant is involved in a process of creation in community. These various communities organize around more than concepts such as ethnicity, geography, religion, and economics, and around more than discrete or monolithic parts of a Humanities curriculum. Indeed, Ricoeur (1992: 317) says that “otherness is not added on to selfhood from outside...but...belongs instead to the tenor of meaning...of selfhood.”

**Implications and Summary**

And how will the process of our storymaking assist in creating 'more?' We see in this essay the interpretations of the most effective storylines for self of members in each of these research site cultures. As with self, the web of our social and educational/learning life is not something to which we are only connected, it is something which we create. Do we ignore our actions that validate our world, sidestep them, or allow them to remain unknown? A full complement of the two Models’ stories suggests we take responsibility for that which we create and narrate for the future. The full complement of the stories also suggests that we act with awareness of our becoming what we become through our actions in the present. To do so shows the critical significance of the process of lifelong learning, particularly in the Humanities.
The first issue of critical significance is recognising the generative creation of a self-as-other that celebrates the past, lives in the now and appropriates the future, in community. The second issue of critical significance is that the Humanities, and education (as historical time), must relate knowledge and understanding to the many stories of the real world we are creating in our human time. It is, first and foremost, that understanding of more meaning and more learning that must carry the study of the Humanities into the Twenty-First Century.

How shall we create our study of the Humanities? By reflecting Mimesis in the focus of this essay, I suggest that our educational work, our actions, are mediated by our pre-and post-understandings of self. Referring back to Diagram 1, it is through application of the creation of narrative that we return to a refiguration of our actions, in whatever Humanistic Studies medium and whether as a creator, researcher, teacher or student of those mediums. Those refigurations, I suggest, must include a sense of self in relationship, such that, for example, opera studies are not just about the chronological history of opera. It is rather an integrative experience with one expression of human narrative as imagination and critical thinking. Opera, be it Japanese, Chinese or European, is a story with a past, present and future, and with a particular cultural perception of self and time. Such narrative brings a world with it, beyond the world of the original creator, an excess of meaning. Such narrative is both fixed and fluid. We stand before it, and through the excess of meaning created in the narrative, both interpreter and participant (teacher and student) co-create a text (Ricoeur 1977). Our metaphors disclose what our text has opened up. Our interpretive process is not volatile yet our experience remains ungrounded. The goods are not scarce, the fortress may be dismantled, the many stories may join the plot.

Our Humanities subjects, as I have noted, are not subjects in isolation and they carry with them an excess of 'more.' They are in relationship with the 'real world' and it is in Mimesis 3, application upon reflection of the multiplicity of Humanities stories, experienced transculturally, that we can re-turn, as it were, to the place and time of human actions. These human-time actions are our actions, in Mimesis 1, narrated, reconsidered, and through which we prepare for the future as well as insert the future into the present, all in the spiral of human and historical time.

Two possibilities thus transform our meaning of the work of Humanities education. First, we find through narrative the means to mediate between the imaginary and the real as we configure the narrative of our chronological events of action. Second, we find that through emplotment the event becomes a story that can be followed and create more meaning, converting the paradox of chronological and non-chronological time into a dialectic, a playing and weaving of the individuals and the stories as a whole, oneself as another. Through a living, hermeneutic spiral of configuration and refiguration in the stories of self and learning, we create "a synthesis of the heterogeneous" (Ricoeur 1981: ix) through cosmic time refigured into human time. Including this diverse Play of Stories (T) and integrating the process is an essential part of Humanities teaching.

If we have an orientation to complementism, to fluid boundaries, to understanding as well as knowledge, to moving beyond our present, to seeing new possibilities
within a recognition of the transformation of our traditions, we become obligated to carry out non-monolithic and boundaryless activities based on our many global narratives. Thus will we create the Twenty-First Century meaning of learning possibilities in the Humanities.
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