

The Brain: Two Halves a Whole?

Where is the *evidence* promised in the introduction to Dudley Lynch's article? The "durability" of an idea in the popular press, and the vehemence of the idea's aficionados (see the howls of outrage regarding Professor Hine's article on pages 6 and 10 of the February 1986 *Journal*) are not evidence regarding the idea's validity.

A symposium sponsored by the American Association for the Advancement of Science in 1982 was entitled "Beyond Cerebral Laterality—New Methods Reveal the Interaction of Many Parts of the Brain During Mental Activities." Science has demonstrated with spatial, numeric, linguistic, and musical stimuli that many parts of the brain are involved in a complex manner in all thought.

While Professor Hines offered evidence well known throughout legitimate cognitive science circles that the simplistic two-part brain, four-part brain, easy creativity ideas regarding the brain do not even come close to representing the fascinating complexity of the human brain at work, Dudley Lynch (his lengthy bibliography notwithstanding) did *not* provide evidence for the validity of any version of a brain dominance theory.

As a cognitive psychologist working in the areas of perception, learning, memory, and thinking, I resent Lynch's constant use of the word "brain" in contexts such as ". . . those brains that have moved 'beyond self-actualization . . .'" If, as a trainer, you have a social agenda, a hidden motive—go for it. But don't try to doll it up with a false cloak of scientific respectability. The study of habitual mental strategies and the changing of individual value systems, which are after all Lynch's real subject matter, do not require a simplistic biological reductionist position for support.

With one lonely exception, none of Lynch's references had anything to do with contemporary research on

hemispheric specialization. What Lynch produced was an argument, devoid of evidence supporting *any* version of brain dominance, for using brain dominance theory to promote a private social agenda.

Robert J. Velk
President
Cognitive Science Corporation
Fort Collins, Colorado

A Real Education

Wilkinson and Orth's article, "Toning the Soft Side," (March 1986) reinforced my belief that participants in education and training should be involved in the planning process, and that education and training should be presented as opportunities to grow and to open doors. Everyone is part of the whole, and there are always desirable places to move. Education is not a way to avoid things that are undesirable or unacceptable.

The greatest complaint by managers about training is that the difficult employees, the ones with "big problems," aren't "cured" by one-week seminars that they didn't necessarily want to attend, a wasteful form of education if there ever was one.

Elizabeth M. Hawthorne
Director of Research
The Carroll Group Inc.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

More On Union-Management Cooperation

Authors Edward Cohen-Rosenthal and Cynthia Burton (May, 1986, "Union-Management Cooperation") would like readers to know that a significantly expanded version of their manuscript is available for the asking. Just write to *Mutual Gains Offer, Training and Development Journal*, 1630 Duke Street, Box 1443, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313, or call 703/683-8132.

Our apologies to Cohen-Rosenthal and Burton for misspelling their company name. It is: ECR Associates, 2421 Everton Road, Baltimore, Maryland 21209.

In the May issue of the *Journal*, the article entitled "Focus on Results at Motorola" contained two incorrect pieces of information. Motorola is a publicly owned company, *not* a family-owned one. Also, the company's *earnings per share* in 1985 dropped from \$2.95 to 61 cents. Our apologies for the errors.