

DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B. BY W. JOHNSON.

Chapter 1 : School Leadership | The John Fisher School

THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR A TALKING MR B Wendell Johnson. Published by: Harvard Business Publishing () in "Harvard Business Review" Length.

What We Can Do "Terrorism? On that there is unanimity. You all have provided those of us in attendance a great learning opportunity, what with 11 scheduled half-hour presentations and panels, plus breakfast, lunch, late afternoon meal, and musical celebration. That you were able to start this part of the program on time at the end of such a day is also something of a record. My sister, Kate, who lives here in New York, and my wife, Mary, both of whom are here, join me in thanking you on behalf of the Wendell Johnson family for recognizing him, and his book, *People in Quandaries*, 1 as one of the two 60th Anniversaries we commemorate today. The Ultimate Interdisciplinary Tools General semantics 4 is, of course, many things. In fact, so much so that my college friends and I had difficulty getting academic credit for the work we were doing in our general semantics study group. We represented virtually every college and department at the University of Texas. But we all got the same response from our department heads and deans: General semantics can help us deal with and resolve our quandaries. A talking to Mr. Sometimes such failures lead to law suits. What is destructive is a pre-scientific way of living in the atomic world produced by science. We can no longer tolerate studied confusion, cultivated distrust, and verbal irresponsibility. I used Google with a few phrases, and every one of them came up with hits. For over two years of that war I was serving as Administrator of the U. It is a position that carries a number of other titles and responsibilities. Or, I offered, we might send over a team of real estate developers to just buy the country, one hectare at a time. This was some of the experience I brought to bear when President George W. But there did seem to be some predictable similarities between the two, in terms of the nine factors just mentioned. So why do I say it? And yet that is the kind of language that our civilian leaders have often used in propelling our nation to war. Al Qaeda is alive and well, just over the Afghanistan border and in 60 countries. Why start a new war before resolving the last? How is "homeland security" improved by diverting focus from Al Qaeda? Global Muslim support is essential to a successful war on terrorism. What benefits from war in Iraq exceed the costs of increased terrorism here? Our worldwide economic, democratic, military and human rights efforts require allies. How does alienating them serve our national interest? President Bush says Saddam might use weapons of mass destruction. Why abandon our relatively low-cost policy of containment? And, if so, why not increase taxes to pay as we go? China could use the theory to justify attacking Taiwan. How is national security improved by setting back 60 years of progress in international relations? If we let the dogs out, minimally we lose Middle East stability. How does risking either serve our interests? We can level Baghdad, as we did Dresden and Hiroshima. But even a weakened Hitler was able to kill the 10, Russian soldiers who tried that strategy in Berlin. Our man in Afghanistan is still under attack even in Kabul. What will it cost us to rebuild Iraq? Will we keep bases there forever? How much of this proposed war is about oil? Which campaign contributors profit from this war? Three and a half years later most of these concerns have proven to be prescient. They have the desire, and the limited ability, to do us real harm. Please pardon me for a remark that may appear to be tinged with a little partisanship on this eve of the November mid-term elections. All you have to do is to tell them they are being attacked, and denounce the pacifists for lack of patriotism and exposing the country to danger. It works the same in any country" 23 emphasis supplied. Sadly, this might well not have been possible had they not had the substantial assistance of our own government. So, in this case, what do we mean by "terrorism"? How about a definition in terms of the weapons that are used? Is President Bush not a terrorist because he orders bombs dropped from military planes, and Bin Laden is a terrorist because he ordered civilian planes to be used as bombs? Do actions thought repulsive "terrorism" in time of peace become acceptable in time of war? How, why and when does that distinction make sense? What does a government or private group need to do to redefine unacceptable terrorism as acceptable war? Our government went to "war" against the Taliban in

**DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B.
BY W. JOHNSON.**

Afghanistan. Bin Laden and Mullah Omar were not nations. Should that make it more difficult for us to characterize what we are doing in Iraq, and continuing to do in Afghanistan, as "war" rather than "terrorism"? Moreover, if we are to be consistent in responding to terrorism with war, are we not obliged to at least consider the possibility that September 11th was masterminded, funded and staffed as much from Saudi Arabia as Afghanistan? More of the September 11th terrorists were Saudis than were Afghans. Indeed, Bin Laden is a Saudi. Why, then, did we not include Saudi targets in our bombing raids? Apparently our government thinks not. At least there was no known plan to bomb the State of Georgia -- to be distinguished from our military forces sent to the Republic of Georgia. Should we have bombed the State of Idaho after the Oklahoma City bombing? The World Court certainly condemned it. Presumably that would be terrorism. There were no declarations of war prior to those acts. No terrorist destruction had been wrought by Cuba or Chile in the United States -- certainly nothing like the September 11th attack. Nor is this the end of our definitional problems. International law, as the name suggests, puts a major focus on nations. How relevant are those distinctions to us when dealing with terrorism? Remember the news of Hindus burning Muslims in Ahmadabad, India a couple years ago? They used makeshift gasoline bombs, sticks and stones. Sounds like the weapons of terrorists, and the death toll rose to well over 3000. Should those Hindus have become targets, and a part of our war on terrorism? Should we bomb the bar in Uruapan? What if a military dictatorship takes over a democratic third world country? At one point the British Commonwealth of Nations considered whether that alone was sufficient to expel Pakistan from the Commonwealth. The Commonwealth was once so divided with regard to the violence and intimidation during an election in Zimbabwe that it had to postpone a discussion of whether to expel that nation as well. Should we condemn as "terrorists" those who use all available means to overthrow a dictatorial regime in order to reestablish democracy? Or are they called "freedom fighters"? If terrorists, would they still be terrorists if the U. Or are they only terrorists when we are funding and backing the new dictator? Apparently, it is not "terrorism" we condemn after all -- aside from that on September 11th. The problem comes in trying to figure out what the "it" is and, once identified, what we can most effectively do about it. Maybe we should, as they say in Hollywood, "take it from the top. In the dichotomy of "purr words" and "slur words" it clearly falls in the latter category. But it tells us almost nothing descriptive or analytically useful about the acts and perpetrators involved. What We Can Do So what can we do? We can apply some of the basic principles of general semantics. We can look for the differences nationalistic, religious, ethnic, as well as the similarities, among peoples all too easily lumped together under simplistic and undifferentiated labels and profiling. We can insist on rational, step-by-step analyses of strategic goals as well as tactics, an identification of the likely unintended, and negative, consequences of our actions that will impede the accomplishment of our goals. Wendell Johnson, the author of the book, *People in Quandaries*, the 60th Anniversary of which is being recognized on this occasion, is his father. For useful books, see those of Johnson, Hayakawa and Korzybski referenced in notes 6, 7 and 8, below. University of Illinois Press, , pp. It is probably no secret that a large part of the population of this world was swayed by such methods during the war. In times of peace, large countries are continually swayed by such use of terms which play upon the pathological s. Alfred Korzybski, *Science and Sanity*, p.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B. BY W. JOHNSON.

Chapter 2 : Library Resource Finder: Staff View for: Harvard business review--on human relati

Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.

University of Illinois Press, , pp. For copyright and related information, see note below. Johnson is professor of speech and psychology at the State University of Iowa. The paper is here reprinted by permission of the author and the copyright holder. And most commonplace and strange of all -- possibly the most distinctively human occurrence to be found or imagined -- is the case in which Mr. Schematic stage-by-stage representation of what goes on when Mr. A talks to Mr. B -- the process of communication. An event occurs any first order fact serving as a source of sensory stimulation 2. Adapted from Wendell Johnson, *People in Quandaries*: Harper and Brothers, , p. For elaboration see accompanying outline of the process of communication, with discussion, *ibid*. The restrictions and distortions of speech with which we are concerned can be particularly well appreciated in terms of the diagram of the process of communication shown in Figure 1. The diagram provides a convenient organizing scheme for dealing in an orderly manner with an exceedingly complex pattern of events. By breaking the pattern down into a series of stages it becomes possible to examine the functions and the possible disorders at each stage, as well as the conditions importantly related to these functions and disorders. If we begin by having a look at stage 6, as represented in the diagram, and then work back toward stage 1, perhaps we shall gain most quickly the clearest possible view of the communicative process as it is here presented. So far as spoken language is concerned, what passes in any physical sense between the speaker and the listener are sound waves and, in cases where the speaker is visible to the listener, light waves. These waves may be sufficiently mysterious, but at least they set definite limits to such mystery as there may be in the transmission of whatever the speaker has to communicate to the listener. Anything in the way of "spiritual influence," "value," or "the intangibilities of personality" that Mr. Limiting our considerations to speech -- rather than writing, musical performance, painting, etc. The chief functions involved in speech at this stage are those of phonation and articulation of sounds. Auxiliary functions include gesture, posture, facial expression, and general bodily action. It is also to be considered that the manipulation of the situation is involved -- the arrangement of background or setting for the spoken words. This may include the use of music, banners, sound effects, color, lighting, clothes, etc. The possible disorders affecting these functions fall generally into the following categories: In fact, until the recent development of semantics and general semantics many of these disorders were for practical purposes unrecognized; some had not even been named. The more important ones are to be most meaningfully discussed in relation to stage 4 of our diagram. This is the stage of preliminary verbal formulation, the stage at which the preverbal tensions resulting from a sensory stimulation are transformed into words. How vacuously we take speech for granted is to be sensed from a moment of intensive contemplation of this amazing transformation of nonverbal goings on within the nervous system, and throughout the organism, into the curiously codified motor responses that we so glibly refer to as "spoken words"! One can at least be appropriately humble in recognizing the fact that no one understands very well just how this fateful transformation is brought about. But humility need not be carried to the point of swooning. The fact that does appear to be clear enough, although it is widely disregarded, is that what we verbalize is not -- as the "practical minded" seem chronically to take for granted -- anything that can be called "external reality. To stick with our homely example, there is first of all some source of sensory stimulation in what we call "the room" -- some sort of "energy radiations" stage 1 which play upon the sensory end organs in our skin. The effect of these "energy radiations" is that activity is aroused in the nerve endings, with consequent nervous currents which travel into the spinal cord and brain. This we represent in our diagram as stage 2. The resulting "disturbance" stage 3 , which we call "preverbal tensions," is determined in part by the character of the sensory nerve impulses coming into the nervous system and in part

**DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B.
BY W. JOHNSON.**

by the condition existing in the nervous system at the moment of their arrival. Moreover, the incoming impulses are relayed out to muscles and glands where the resulting activities give rise to proprioceptive stimulation, with subsequent incoming nerve impulses which complicate and intensify the effects of the original sensory stimulation. It is this whole complex process which we represent in our diagram as the preverbal tensions at stage 3. And it is these preverbal tensions that we verbalize. The crucial significance of this fact is that basically we always talk about ourselves. Our statements are the verbalizations of our preverbal tensions. What we talk about, then, is a joint product of reality regarded as a source of sensory stimulation and of the conditions existing within our nervous systems at the time of stimulation. This joint product is represented as stage 3 in our diagram. The preliminary verbalizations of it are represented as stage 4. The basic function occurring in stage 4 is that of symbolic formulation. The disorders to be considered in relation to stage 4 are to be identified accordingly. They fall roughly into three main categories. They are, first, deficiencies in vocabulary and grammatical form. While a quite limited store of words, arranged in relatively simple sentences, might well serve for most purposes of common conversation and small talk, nevertheless present-day communal living and technological specialization require very considerable language skills of any citizen who presumes to maintain an intelligent grasp of the wide range of affairs by which his life is affected. Much can be done, of course, to simplify the discussion of even relatively complex social and scientific matters, as has been demonstrated by Rudolf Flesch in his provocative book, *The Art of Plain Talk*, and by I. Ogden in their publication concerning *Basic English* for an unusually practical presentation see I. What these inventive students of language recommend as techniques of simplification, however, demand, for their adroit application, a degree of linguistic skill that is not to be come by without effort. The language skill of a school child who describes a movie, using short simple sentences and a limited vocabulary, is definitely to be contrasted with that of a university professor who manages to discuss psychoanalysis or atomic fission in equally short and simple sentences and with an equally limited vocabulary. In the case of the school child there is to be observed a deficiency, perhaps even a very grave deficiency, of language development, while in the simplified speech of the professor there is to be noted a linguistic subtlety and sophistication rarely achieved. Vocabulary deficiency, that is to say, works both ways; a vocabulary may be too limited or too elaborate for specific purposes of communication. The language used in the present discussion, for example, is probably lacking more in simplicity than in complexity, generally speaking. The basic point to be emphasized in this connection is that the language, or languages, available to us are such that they tend to make for oversimplification and overgeneralization. Reality -- that is, the sources of sensory stimulation -- is, so far as we know, decidedly process-like, highly dynamic, ever changing. Our language, on the other hand, is by comparison quite static and relatively inflexible. The six hundred thousand or so words in the English language must serve to symbolize millions -- indeed, billions -- of individual facts, experiences, and relationships. Each individual talked, interpreting fables, until he had produced a sample of three thousand words. For the freshmen just forty-six different words made up half of the thirty thousand words in the total sample. For the schizophrenic patients the comparable figure was thirty-three words. In fact, one word, the one most frequently used by the schizophrenic patients, which was the word I, made up over eight per cent of their entire thirty thousand words. Thus the magnitude of the discrepancy between reality and language, with respect to variability, is by no means adequately indicated by reference to the six hundred thousand words which make tip the approximate total for the English language. The discrepancy is more meaningfully indicated by reference to the few hundred -- at best, the few thousand -- words which make up the practical daily use vocabulary of an ordinary person. In this general sense, we all suffer from vocabulary deficiency. The basic fact is that, at best, there are far more things to speak about than there are words with which to speak about them. We have already noted that what a speaker has to verbalize is an organismic condition stage 3 which is a joint product of the sensory stimulation arising from reality and the state of his organism at the moment of stimulation. We have now to add that what a speaker has to communicate stage 5 is a joint product of this organismic condition stage 3 and the language structure of the speaker, together with his habits of

employing it stage 4. What a speaker eventually says can hardly be anything but a far cry from the supposedly relevant first order facts stage 1. And what the listener makes of what the speaker says is something else again! Anyone able to read a headline or twist a radio knob knows that there is no dearth of misunderstanding in the world -- and anyone with even an elementary knowledge of the process of communication can only wonder that there is not more misunderstanding and confusion than there seem to be. A second considerable source of communicative inefficiency is sheer ignorance. The number of factual subjects which the average person is able to discuss in detail and with a thorough grasp of important relationships and implications has never been determined with statistical refinement, but it is doubtless lower than any college president would find to be gratifying. The "Quiz Kids" provide a thin ray of hope, but even that is dusted up a bit by the fact that we are seldom given an opportunity to find out whether they are thinkers or mere collectors of odds and ends of information. At best, of course, only a small portion of the little information most of us have is first hand; most by far of what we know we have gained verbally, and most of this has come to us in the form of relatively high order generalization rather than detailed descriptive report. Thus, we are not only drastically limited by our common verbal means of symbolizing fact and experience, but we are also appallingly limited in our reliable knowledge of fact and experience. There is almost always a significant degree of probability that discourse involving two or more individuals will result in misunderstanding, confusion, and the intensification of conflict. There is considerable hope of decreasing this probability, however, so long as the obstacles to communication are clearly recognized so that allowance can be made for them in a forthright, impersonal, and even good-humored manner. On the other hand, a naive confidence in the constructive possibilities of discussion, an uncritical faith in the power of words, can be disastrously misleading and socially as well as individually disruptive. It obscures both the sources of misunderstanding and the possibilities of agreement and cooperative action. It is this particular class of disorders that general semantics serves to highlight effectively. The disorders constitute violations of fundamental semantic principles. One is handicapped in discussing them briefly, however, because the principles themselves can hardly be presented in a few pages, and the particular frame of reference which they represent, so far from being generally familiar, constitutes in certain respects a major break from our traditional orientation. While a general suggestion of the relevant disorders can be given in the present discussion, any serious reader will insist upon a fuller knowledge of them and of general semantics itself than can possibly be provided in this chapter. He gave this term a special meaning, which can best be approximated, perhaps, for our present purposes, by saying that undue identification involves a factually unwarranted degree of categorical thinking. Differences among individuals, and differences within given individuals from time to time, are relatively disregarded, because broad group trends and characteristics, and the general tendencies of individuals, are overemphasized. For example, no particular attention is paid to an individual Charles Brown, because he is evaluated by a process of identifying him with -- of regarding him as identical with -- all other "Negroes. One who is grossly addicted to identification, therefore, thinks in terms of verbal fictions, or high order abstractions, rather than the extensional, or factual, sources of data and experience. Statements involving undue identifications constitute, therefore, overgeneralizations. It is to be emphasized, however, that generalization, as such, is not being indicted; it is unwarranted generalization, untested and uncorrected, to which reference is being made. Class names -- categorical nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs -- play a crucial role in the process of identification. The unreflective use of such class words makes automatically for identification, for overgeneralization and the relative disregard of individual differences and specific data. Discussions carried on in terms of such words as "Democrats" and "Republicans," "Communists" and "capitalists," "the Russian," "the Englishman," "the underprivileged," "the consumer," etc. Class names serve to lump together as identical indefinite numbers of different individuals. The principles of general semantics are principles of abstracting. In terms of our diagram Figure 1, we abstract from the sources of sensory stimulation stage 1 only so much as our sensory end organs and their functional connections within the nervous system are able to abstract. What we call an object, therefore, an orange, for example, as perceived by us, is a joint product of whatever the orange may be,

**DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B.
BY W. JOHNSON.**

independently of our perceptions of it, and whatever perceptions of it we are able to make.

DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B. BY W. JOHNSON.

Chapter 3 : Library Resource Finder: Table of Contents for: Harvard business review--on human relations

A, the boss, is talking to B, the subordinate, about a new program that the firm is planning to launch. B is a poor listener.

Thus, although there would surely be some items to add from the last two years of his life, this is the last bibliography that exists and is presented here unedited. I assume, but do not know, that it was prepared by him.

Iowa Studies correspondence students with C. The Influence of Stuttering on the Personality. Chemical factors and the stuttering spasm with G. Speech, , 19, An interpretation of stuttering. Stuttering and the concept of handedness with L. The influence of stuttering on the attitudes and adaptations of the stutterer. A Course in Treatment for Stuttering. State University of Iowa Speech Clinic, , p. Changes in handedness associated with onset or disappearance of stuttering; sixteen cases with L. Stuttering in the preschool child. Stuttering in relation to various speech sounds with S. Speech, , 21, Dextrality quotients of fifty six-year-olds with regard to hand usage with D. A comparative study of stutterers, former stutterers, and normal speakers whose handedness has been changed with R. Speech, , 1, An interpretative demonstration of ten observable facts about stuttering with J. The factor of attention in relation to the moment of stuttering with J. An objective study of the relationship between certain psychological factors and the severity of stuttering with M. Psychological considerations of stuttering. Exceptional Children, , 43, The moment of stuttering with J. Iowa State Medical J. The dominant thumb in relation to stuttering, eyedness and handedness. Hand usage dextrality quotients of seven-year-olds with D. Studies in the Psychology of Stuttering: The distribution of moments of stuttering in successive readings of the same material with J. Speech Disorders, , 2, A quantitative evaluation of expectation of stuttering in relation to the occurrence of stuttering with J. Certain objective cues related to the precipitation of the moment of stuttering, with J. A quantitative study of expectation of stuttering as a process involving a low degree of consciousness with A. Frequency of Stuttering with the expectation of stuttering controlled with A. The role of cues representative of past stuttering in the distribution of stuttering moments during oral reading with L. Effect of certain changes in speech pattern upon frequency of stuttering with L. Certain cues associated with precipitation of moments of stuttering. The relation of bilingualism to stuttering: Certain laterality characteristics of functional articulatory defectives with E. Research needs in speech pathology. Exceptional Children, extra monograph issue, Jan. A statistical evaluation of specified cues related to the moment of stuttering. The role of evaluation in stuttering. Speech Disorders, , 3, Constancy of lack of expectancy of stuttering with S. A statistical analysis of the adaptation and consistency effects in relation to stuttering with M. Speech Disorders, , 4, The treatment of stuttering. Stuttering in relation to various speech sounds: A correction with S. Speech, , 25, Some semantic aspects of stuttering. Language and Speech Hygiene. General Semantics Monographs, No. Institute of General Semantics, , p. Iowa Child Welfare Bull. Iowa Hand usage dextrality quotients of one hundred high school students with V. Revised Iowa usage dextrality quotients of six-year-olds with D. Hand usage and angleboard dextrality quotients of adult stutterers and non- stutterers with A. Read before the American Psychol. Full report published in J. A study of the onset and early development of stuttering. Read before the Amer. Speech Disorders, , 7, Iowa Child Welfare Research Station, , p. A semantic theory of stuttering. In Eugene Hahn ed. Significant Theories and Therapies, Stanford Univ. Revised edition, , Research program in language behavior. The problem of stuttering from the point of view of general semantics. Experiences in developing a university course in general semantics. Status of speech defectives in military service. Quarterly Journal of Speech, April, ,, 29, A Review of General Semantics, , 1, Reprinted in Correct English, , 48, Sept. Reprinted in Twentieth Century English Wm. Reprinted in Language, Meaning, and Maturity S. Construction and application of a test of attitude toward stuttering with Robert Ammons. Speech Disorders, , 9, Studies in Language Behavior: A program of research. Reprinted as Appendix in People in Quandaries, The speech and auditorily handicapped with W. Some fundamental objectives in special education. The Indians have no word for it: Stuttering in Children and Adults. Speech, , 30, and A Review of General Semantics, , Reprinted in digest form in Magazine Digest,

DOWNLOAD PDF THE FATEFUL PROCESS OF MR. A. TALKING TO MR. B. BY W. JOHNSON.

Sept. The relationship between frequency and duration of moments of stuttering with W. Speech Disorders, , 10, John told Jim what Joe told him: A study of the process of abstracting with C. A Review of General Semantics, , 2, Degree of extensional agreement among twenty psychologists in their use of the labels, hypothesis, theory, and "law" with J. The Semantics of Personal Adjustment. Inventory for evaluating a program of speech correction with F. The Clearing House, , 20,

Chapter 4 : Nicholas Johnson/Wendell Johnson, The Communication Process

An Empirically Tested Communication Skills Core Module for Mba Students, With Implications for the AACSB.

Chapter 5 : PDF Version: General Semantics Bulletin Nos. 14 & 15 () â€“ The Institute of General Semanti

Planning on the left side and managing on the right / Henry Mintzberg -- Fallacy of the one big brain / Pearson Hunt -- How managers' minds work / James L. McKenney and Peter G.W. Keen -- The fateful process of Mr.

Chapter 6 : The Fateful Process of Mr a Talking Mr B | The Case Centre, for educators

The fateful process of Mr. A talking to Mr. B (Harvard Business Review) by Wendell Johnson. Out of Print--Limited Availability. Show results for. Any Category.