

Chapter 1 : Malcolm Gladwell - Wikipedia

David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants is a non-fiction book written by Malcolm Gladwell and published by Little, Brown and Company on October 1,

If you think you know the story of David and Goliath, think again. In his new book, "David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants," Malcolm Gladwell says most people get this famous Biblical yarn all wrong because they misunderstand who really has the upper hand. In other words, Gladwell says, most people underestimate the importance of agility and speed. The same misunderstanding happens in David vs. Goliath fights in business, which Gladwell substantiates with numerous case studies and research examples in his recently published book. I recently sat down with Gladwell in Inc. This is a book that does ask a similar kind of question, but in a very different way. When I was doing "Outliers" I was struck by how often when successful people described their lives, they would talk about the things that went wrong or the things that were hard, as opposed to the things that were easy or went right. To what extent can disadvantages be advantageous and vice versa? The stone that comes from his sling has the stopping power equivalent to a bullet from a. And second, there are many medical experts who believe that Goliath was suffering from acromegaly, which causes you to grow. Many giants have acromegaly, but it has a side effect which is, it causes restrictive sight. How have you seen stories like this play out in the business world? This is the classic story of the business world. Which is the story of David and Goliath, right? He changed the rules. He brought in the superior of technology. Are there any common threads you found between successful underdogs? Imagine going to a communist country to make your product at the height of the Cold War. The only way you can do that is if you are indifferent to what the world says about you. You write that underdog strategies are hard or at least harder than giant strategies. He takes them all the way to the National Championships. He does that by instructing them to play the full court press every minute of every game and defend every inch of the court. It requires that everyone in your team expend maximum effort every minute of the game. You have to be in really good shape and you have to run yourself ragged, and you cannot let up. Effort is the route available to the underdog. I may not be able to outspend you, but I can outwork you. This really interesting notion comes from this husband and wife psychology team at UCLA called the Bjorks. And they started with learning. They were very interested in learning, and the conventional notion with learning is to the extent that I make your task easier, you will learn more. So, I began to explore all these areas where you could distinguish desirable from undesirable difficulties. Dyslexia would be a classic example. I have a whole chapter in the book about dyslexic entrepreneurs. A much larger percentage of successful entrepreneurs are dyslexic than in the general population: They think they succeeded because of it. You note there are also a disproportionate number of dyslexic people in prison, though. So what needs to happen to make a difficulty desirable? We require a certain level of adversity. The trick is, figuring out what that adversity ought to look like. Gary Cohn at Goldman Sachs is dyslexic, but he probably has an IQ of and had a pretty strong family around him. He can go through a lot of hell in school and still come out okay. One alarming theme of the book for a lot of business owners is that once you reach a certain point of success or a certain point of wealth, it actually can work against you and become a disadvantage. How do you figure? This was even after the bailout. And he was like, "You know, it probably is too big. You need to make X number of cars a year in order to be an efficient producer. But beyond that, extra size just gets in your way. What GM suffered with in terms of decision making and innovation was that they were on the wrong side of this curve. What about being a big fish in a little pond? I think a lot of start-ups emphasize this to attract the best talent. How can this position work against you? Our sense of our own self-worth and our own self-confidence is derived from judgments about our peer group. So, if you put someone in a very, very highly competitive pond, they are going to reach very different conclusions about who they are and what they are capable of than if you put them in a less selective pond, a smaller pond. Some critics say that the examples in the book are ones that specifically back up the thesis of the book. What do you say to that? So, I would hope I did that. Why should entrepreneurs read this book? Because this book is fundamentally about the weapons of the spirit. What you have are your ideas, your

motivation, your perseverance, your excitement, your faith.

Chapter 2 : David and Goliath Summary - Malcolm Gladwell | Download PDF |

In DAVID AND GOLIATH, Malcolm Gladwell challenges how we think about obstacles and disadvantages, offering a new interpretation of what it means to be discriminated against, suffer from a disability, lose a parent, attend a mediocre school, or endure any number of other apparent setbacks.

Contributor Why Malcolm Gladwell Is Wrong About David And Goliath Gladwell adopts the story for the title and introduction to his latest book, which is about how such lopsided conflicts can produce surprising results. He brings to his account of this familiar story new research to suggest that the conventional interpretations miss the point. Unfortunately it his account which misses the point. Malcolm Gladwell adopts the story for the title and introduction to his latest book, which is about how such lopsided conflicts can produce surprising results. The giant Goliath is the champion of the Philistines. None of the fearful Israelites are prepared to take him on until an unlikely candidate steps forward in the form of David, a shepherd boy. Gladwell makes clear why Goliath would have looked fearsome but then he seeks to demonstrate that the giant was more vulnerable than he seemed. His most original claim is that Goliath was handicapped by poor eyesight. The argument runs as follows. One explanation for great size is acromelagy, a disease of the pituitary gland. One symptom of this disease is poor vision. This leads Gladwell to suggest that to Goliath the advancing David he would have been a bit of a blur. So even before he got hit between the eyes by a well-aimed stone, Goliath was already struggling with double-vision. So the point about the story is not that David had hit upon a clever strategy which got Goliath by surprise but that the two were actually far more evenly matched than supposed. The moral to be drawn is that alleged underdogs can gain an advantage through employing distinctive and often more appropriate forms of power. The moral may be fine but it is not supported by the Bible story. It is easy to dispose of the double-vision argument. Most obviously, if Goliath saw two sticks when there was only one he would also have seen two Davids. There is no hint in the Biblical account that Goliath thinks he is addressing twins. Many basketball players are taller. But to get into these details clearly misses the purpose of the original story, which depended on David being a palpable underdog, because only then could it be shown that it was God that made the difference. In saving the Israelites David demonstrates that he will make a better King than the hapless Saul, who should really have been the one to take on Goliath. Saul, after all, had been the first man chosen to lead the Jews as a warrior rather than as a prophet. But he had been something of a disappointment, showing excessive caution and poor military judgement. If the first shot had not brought Goliath down but had pinged off his helmet instead David would have been in real trouble. Once Goliath was dead the Israelites depended on the Philistines accepting this unconventional approach as a fair fight and conceding the victory. Nor could David follow this strategy twice. Next time his opponent would know what to look for. Lastly, this was this the only strategy available. Muhammad Ali survived against stronger opponents for example Sonny Liston by using his agility to survive the early onslaught. David might have encouraged Goliath to thrash around until he was exhausted. The strategic lessons of the story are therefore quite ambiguous. Gladwell draws his lesson by means of a dubious interpretation.

Chapter 3 : David and Goliath Quotes by Malcolm Gladwell

Malcolm Gladwell's book, David, and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants, is ready to provide you with some wise words on this topic. You may think that the basis of Gladwell's book is the biblical story of David and Goliath.

We all think we know what happened when David took on Goliath: Gladwell thinks we all have it wrong, and opens his new book with a retelling of that story. But as Gladwell points out, it was Goliath who was the vulnerable one. He was a giant, which made him slow, clumsy and probably half-blind double vision is a common side-effect of an excess of human growth hormone. The only way he could have beaten David was by literally getting his hands on him – but David had no need to go anywhere near him. David had a sling. Ancient armies contained teams of slingers, who could be deadly from distances as great as yards. The best, like David, were lethally accurate, and Goliath was not a small target. As Gladwell says, Goliath had as much chance against David as a man with a sword would have had against someone armed with a. This gives Gladwell his theme. The strong are often surprisingly weak, if looked at from the right angle. People who seem weak can turn out to be surprisingly strong. Dare to be a David. Most of them are great stories. The trouble with the book is that they are not great illustrations of his chosen theme. The ones that work best are about not being a Goliath. A particularly moving chapter describes the mistake made by Mike Reynolds, a Californian whose daughter Kimber was murdered in by a man out on parole for car theft. It proved a costly and counter-productive disaster. It did nothing to stop violent crime but it put massive strain on the criminal justice system. It was manifestly unjust. Reynolds believed that the best way to fight back on behalf of his daughter was to call on the most powerful weapon he could find: But his law made the state clumsy and half-blind. The most powerful weapon turned out to be a useless one. Yet past a certain point, extra-strength becomes self-defeating because it is too crude and inflexible. Gladwell gives a compelling version of the same argument in relation to school class-sizes. Big classes 35 and up are known to be bad for kids. But many schools keep making them smaller on the assumption that more of what works must be better. There is good evidence that small classes 18 or fewer are also bad for kids, because the child-teacher dynamic becomes stale and unimaginative. Somewhere in between is what keeps everyone on their toes. The simple moral is choose your weapons carefully. The real problems arise when Gladwell gives his examples of some modern-day Davids. There is a tension at the heart of his version of the David story that he never resolves. Is it really a story about David at all? One implication of the sword versus sling mismatch is that any one of a host of Israelite slingers could have beaten Goliath. With the right training, we could all do it. On the other hand, David was the only one who spotted how to win and had the courage to break with convention the rest of the Israelites assumed that they had to fight Goliath at his own game. In that respect he was unique. So, can anyone be a David or not? Gladwell wants to have it both ways. This comes out in some uncharacteristic rhetorical slips as he tries to push his case. One chapter looks at the life stories of various sufferers from dyslexia who have gone on to be hugely successful in business the proportion of high-profile entrepreneurs who are dyslexic is strikingly high. Gladwell argues that dyslexia forces people to be imaginative and resourceful, especially during their formative years, as they look for creative ways round the disadvantages of their condition. The proportion of dyslexics who end up in jail is also strikingly high. For many people it is simply a grave disadvantage. So why pretend otherwise? The truth is often the opposite: That raises the suspicion that what made the difference was not, say, the dyslexia, but something else. This problem is most acute in the final chapter of the book. Gladwell recounts the history of the remote French village of Le Chambon, which stood up to the Nazis during the German occupation. Led by their cursed priest and drawing on a heritage of persecution as Huguenots, the villagers offered refuge to Jews. Many Jews survived because of this act of brazen courage. The Nazis were not Goliath. The occupiers left the villagers alone because they realised taking them on would be more trouble than it was worth. They chose to ignore it. An army of Davids beats an army of Goliaths. But if others in France had followed the example of Le Chambon, the village would have been wiped out. Ultimately the only way to defeat the Nazis was to match them for scale and power: Any

little victories achieved within the shadow of that war, such as the one at Le Chambon, were morally, not practically significant. He did that brilliantly in *Outliers*. It is both more conventional and less convincing. He treats their unusual individual histories as morality tales. Lewis told of a poor Bosnian refugee to the US who saw his life entirely transformed thanks to the chance intervention of an inspirational teacher at his sink school. Now he is an economics professor on course for a Nobel prize. That was his story. Then Lewis found the teacher and asked her. It turned out not to be true. The boy was obviously brilliant. All she did was give him a little shove. He would have made it anyway. Individual morality tales are frequently forms of self-mythologising. In this book he seems to have muddled them up. For more go to [theguardian](#).

Gladwell opens with a re-telling of the classic story of David and Goliath and then goes onto to explain all of the historical inaccuracies in the tale and how this has shaped our understanding of what it takes to beat a giant.

Print The Essence The conventional wisdom underlying what we identify as advantages and disadvantages are not for everyone. Once the underdogs realize it is the perspective that they take that impacts the outcome, obstacles, weakness, and adversity become the tools that breed strength, resilience, and grit. David and Goliath Summary Journal Entry: This is my book summary of David and Goliath by Malcolm Gladwell. My notes are a reflection of the journal write up above. Written informally, the notes contain a mesh of quotes and my own thoughts on the book. The Journal write up also includes important messages and crucial passages from the book. Many advantages are shrouds for the large weaknesses they hold. A model that helps us conceptualize that too much can be a bad thing. Doing more or having more makes things better. Doing more does not make much of a difference. Doing more or having more makes things worse. Nearly everything of consequence follows the inverted U. Big Fish Little Pond Effect Entering an environment that disenfranchises your abilities to compete due to such large disparities in ability Great students can develop fixed mindsets through comparison with students way out of their league the big fish. If a student would attend a smaller institution little pond where they can be given the proper attention and not be debilitated via comparison with the superstars, they can thrive, and even achieve more than the big fish. Having peers who outperform you by large deviations will make you feel dumb. Putting deliberate emphasis on a skill can make other disabilities that would normally be cues for failure meaningless. Therefore, all progress depends on the unreasonable man. Difficulties are paradoxically a desirable outcome. We must recognize the freedom that comes from high-risk situations. Learning how to deal with failure prepares you for a career in business. Disobedience can be a response to authority. People in Authority desire those being ruled to behave. What they miss is that how they behave will indicate how the subjugated respond to the power. The people who are asked to obey authority have to feel like they have a voice. The law has to be predictable: Reasonable expectations that ensure what is the law today will be the law tomorrow. Authority has to be fair: Todd Clear " indirect effect of prison on crime is an example of how power must be seen as legitimate or else its use has the opposite intended effects If you lock up too many people far too long, the damage will outweigh the benefits Inverted U curve at work here. Here are 3 titles that I recommend based on what is discussed in David and Goliath.

Chapter 5 : David and Goliath (book) - Wikipedia

It's a classic underdog tale: David, a young shepherd armed only with a sling, beats Goliath, the mighty warrior. The story has transcended its biblical origins to become a common shorthand for.

Underdogs, Misfits and the Art of Battling Giants Gladwell opens with a re-telling of the classic story of David and Goliath and then goes on to explain all of the historical inaccuracies in the tale and how this has shaped our understanding of what it takes to beat a giant. Giants can be such things as a disability, misfortune or oppression. Gladwell proposes that what gives a giant its strength can also be its greatest weakness. Knowing how to identify that weakness to your advantage is how you become David. He continues the discussion using parenting and money as another example of when too much is a bad thing in terms of being an effective parent. Big fish are more likely to achieve their career goals and publish up to 5 times more than some of the best graduates of Harvard and Brown because to be in the bottom of the class in Harvard is to fail, but it is the equivalent of beating the top performers of the small ponds. The Impressionist movement is another example of people creating entirely new ponds and flourishing, rather than flounder against a tide in a lake of mediocrity. The next 3 chapters examine this concept with examples of some of the most successful business creators, Richard Branson of Virgin being one, having dyslexia and how this disadvantage creates a new set of advantages for those who have it. This is to do with the fearless factor that has been found to exist through research of Londoners who survived the bombings of world war 2. If you lose a parent as a child, it is devastating trust me I lost my mum at 8 and Gladwell argues it creates a courage to face anything because the worst has already happened and you have survived it. This is further demonstrated through an examination of the civil rights movement and tactics used which reflect Brer Rabbit and the Briar Patch where Martin Luther King is Brer Rabbit. Part 3 looks at the ultimate Goliath – Power. The Northern Ireland experience is relayed through the eyes of an insurgent as retold by Gladwell. Then to Brownstone New York where the opposite is demonstrated with the Goliath of the police change tactics to combat youth criminality by showing the community that they are not just a force to be hated, but people who care about others, and with this they deliver turkeys for thanksgiving and xmas dinners and presents. Gladwell is demonstrating that power has rules and when not used justly, its validity is quickly lost. Then to California and the 3 strikes rule which increased incarceration for repeat offenders. Gladwell demonstrates that although an initial significant decrease in crime followed, this policy also reached a point where its effectiveness was lost. The two responses are starkly different and yet both brilliantly demonstrate power as a Goliath and the relativeness of power over people. The work finishes with a final look at power with the examination of a small town in France, Le Chambon, which continued to harbour and aid in the emigration of Jews unchallenged by French or German authorities. The powerful are not as powerful as they seem – nor the weak as weak. Propoganda of any sort is manipulated by Goliaths to reinforce this myth. On closer inspection and study of the Goliath and its ways, David is then armed with the knowledge needed to defeat it.

Chapter 6 : Malcolm Gladwell: The unheard story of David and Goliath | TED Talk

David and Goliath is perhaps the most entertaining book I read this year! In the introduction, Gladwell reviews the biblical story of David and Goliath. The popular conception is that Goliath was a mighty warrior, and David a Malcolm Gladwell's books are all in the same style.

And it takes place in an area called the Shephelah in what is now Israel. Still same is true of Israel today. And in the mountain range are all of the ancient cities of that region, so Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Hebron. And connecting the mountain range with the coastal plain is an area called the Shephelah, which is a series of valleys and ridges that run east to west, and you can follow the Shephelah, go through the Shephelah to get from the coastal plain to the mountains. The Philistines, who are the biggest of enemies of the Kingdom of Israel, are living in the coastal plain. And they may start to make their way through one of the valleys of the Shephelah up into the mountains, because what they want to do is occupy the highland area right by Bethlehem and split the Kingdom of Israel in two. And the Kingdom of Israel, which is headed by King Saul, obviously catches wind of this, and Saul brings his army down from the mountains and he confronts the Philistines in the Valley of Elah, one of the most beautiful of the valleys of the Shephelah. It was a way of settling disputes without incurring the bloodshed of a major battle. And the Philistine who is sent down, their mighty warrior, is a giant. He is absolutely terrifying. This is this mighty warrior. I think I can do it. So he says, "All right. And the giant sees this figure approaching, and calls out, "Come to me so I can feed your flesh to the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the field. And of course, the name of the giant is Goliath and the name of the shepherd boy is David, and the reason that story has obsessed me over the course of writing my book is that everything I thought I knew about that story turned out to be wrong. So David, in that story, is supposed to be the underdog, right? In fact, that term, David and Goliath, has entered our language as a metaphor for improbable victories by some weak party over someone far stronger. Now why do we call David an underdog? We also call him an underdog because Goliath is an experienced warrior, and David is just a shepherd. In ancient warfare, there are three kinds of warriors. And a slinger is someone who has a leather pouch with two long cords attached to it, and they put a projectile, either a rock or a lead ball, inside the pouch, and they whirl it around like this and they let one of the cords go, and the effect is to send the projectile forward towards its target. More than that, the stones in the Valley of Elah were not normal rocks. They were barium sulphate, which are rocks twice the density of normal stones. This is an incredibly devastating weapon. Accuracy, we know from historical records that slingers — experienced slingers could hit and maim or even kill a target at distances of up to yards. From medieval tapestries, we know that slingers were capable of hitting birds in flight. They were incredibly accurate. If you go back over the history of ancient warfare, you will find time and time again that slingers were the decisive factor against infantry in one kind of battle or another. When he says, "Come to me that I might feed your flesh to the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the field," the key phrase is "Come to me. Saul has the same expectation. So here he is, this shepherd, experienced in the use of a devastating weapon, up against this lumbering giant weighed down by a hundred pounds of armor and these incredibly heavy weapons that are useful only in short-range combat. Goliath is a sitting duck. So why do we keep calling David an underdog, and why do we keep referring to his victory as improbable? Goliath is not what he seems to be. So to begin with, the Bible says that Goliath is led onto the valley floor by an attendant. Now that is weird, right? Here is this mighty warrior challenging the Israelites to one-on-one combat. Why is he being led by the hand by some young boy, presumably, to the point of combat? There is nothing about him that says, "I am about to fight you like this. Why does Goliath not react to that? David only has one stick. There have been many articles written. So the most common form of giantism is a condition called acromegaly, and acromegaly is caused by a benign tumor on your pituitary gland that causes an overproduction of human growth hormone. And throughout history, many of the most famous giants have all had acromegaly. So the tallest person of all time was a guy named Robert Wadlow who was still growing when he died at the age of 24 and he was 8 foot And acromegaly has a very distinct set of side effects associated with it, principally having to do with vision. The pituitary tumor, as it grows, often starts to

compress the visual nerves in your brain, with the result that people with acromegaly have either double vision or they are profoundly nearsighted. Why does he move so slowly and have to be escorted down into the valley floor by an attendant? When he says, "Come to me that I might feed your flesh to the birds of the heavens and the beasts of the field," the phrase "come to me" is a hint also of his vulnerability. So the Israelites up on the mountain ridge looking down on him thought he was this extraordinarily powerful foe. And there is, I think, in that, a very important lesson for all of us. Giants are not as strong and powerful as they seem. And sometimes the shepherd boy has a sling in his pocket.

"Giants are not what we think they are. The same qualities that appear to give them strength are often the sources of great weakness." — Malcolm Gladwell, David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants.

This is generally how the tale is told: But is this really what the Bible describes? Underdogs, Misfits and the Art of Battling Giants — takes a closer look at this classic story, digging into the details which are easily lost on a modern audience. It all begins with a closer look at that sling which is not the toy slingshot we might picture, and at the five rocks David picked up to use in it. As a bonus, we also asked him what pasta sauce he prefers. An edited transcript of the conversation follows. How were you first introduced to the story of David and Goliath? My mother read me biblical stories at night. I was drawn to these kind of stories from the very beginning. What made you decide to zoom in on David and Goliath? What showed you this story was something you wanted to explore further? So originally, I just wanted to kind of reference it, and then move on. But the more I thought about it, the more interesting it became. I began to dig around and I just uncovered all of these fascinating facts — both about David and about Goliath — that really radically changed my understanding of what happened that day in the Valley of Elah. What was the radical change? The thing that makes Goliath seem strong is the source of his greatest weakness. This is something that was hinted at in the original accounts of the battle of David and Goliath, and that has been confirmed more recently by modern scholars. And David is also not what you think he is. It was a devastating weapon. So devastating, in fact, that the minute he decided to use a sling against Goliath, the tables were turned. Once you understand that Goliath is much weaker than you think he is, and David has superior technology, then you say: The appeal of the story is the boy gets the giant, right? The outsider against the insider. So that remains unchanged in the retelling. But I think what we did was that we were content with a certain explanation of the story. We have lost some of the nuances that would have been obvious to someone in that era. Why do you think the idea of the underdog has such appeal? Because it makes the world seem just. So the underdog story gives all of us who are not on top hope. Occasionally we do get to come out on top. Which do you think is stronger: Well, I think this is one of those contradictions that we carry around in our heads without ever fully resolving. We want to be on the winning side, and we also want to root for the underdog. I think it makes sense. The underdog winning is the romantic position. We begin to increase our faith in those measures of results. What is it about our current time that demands it? This book is really about power. Where does advantage lie? These questions are at the center of everything from the wars that we fight overseas, to the way we educate children, to the way we fight crime at home, to the way we understand disabilities. Well, that definition depends a lot on how you define advantage. If you think advantage lies in resources, then you think the best educational system is the one that spends the most money. So I think these are very, very relevant questions for the world we live in. Can you maybe give an example of something — a corporation, a person, a government — that we define as a Goliath that retelling this story might help us rethink? Well, the United States. What this book tells you is that Goliaths have more weaknesses than you think. I think that would help people to understand why the foreign policy objectives of the United States have been so difficult to accomplish in recent years. Why we had such a hard time in Vietnam, and again in Iraq and now in Afghanistan? These are countries that we dwarf — they are a fraction of our size. And still, we struggle to achieve our objectives there. I think this book will help people understand why. Whenever you start something, you only have a tiny glimpse of how interesting it could be. And you trust that you could find hidden angles and unlocked doors and all kinds of things that can flesh out that idea. If you lose your way, you have to fight your way back. I know I authors always say that their most current book is their favorite, but this is really my favorite. Which pasta sauce do you prefer? I make my own. I never buy store pasta sauce, but I do like my pasta sauce thick and hearty, so I know which one I would choose if I had to. There are so many. One of the old standards: I think he has done a better job than almost anyone of making academic work accessible and useful to people. I really think that his talks on happiness have actually changed lives. I think that people who see them, many of them went away and were happier as a result.

Chapter 8 : David, Goliath + the appeal of the underdog: Q&A with Malcolm Gladwell | TED Blog

It's a classic underdog tale: David, a young shepherd armed only with a sling, beats Goliath, the mighty warrior. The story has transcended its biblical origins to become a common shorthand for unlikely victory.

The Art of Avoiding Bestsellers: A Field Guide for Authors How do books succeed? By getting into the Bestseller lists? By making a few millions? By winning the most prestigious awards of the day? These are very narrow views on what constitutes success for a work of art, especially literature or serious non-fiction. This applies to The Art of Avoiding Bestsellers: This applies to prestigious prizes such as Bookers as well, as we will see. We might even get an idea of why so few of the Booker winning books seem to be good enough a few years after their moment of glory. This reviewer has to warn the reader that the example is originally invoked in the book for another purpose though it has been adopted more or less verbatim here, but we need to get into that now. By the way, the careful reader should also be able to divine why this small essay is can also serve as a review for this book in particular and to all of Mr. Let us go back to 19th century France. Art was a big deal in the cultural life of France back then. Painting was regulated by the government and was considered a profession in the same way that medicine or the law is a profession today. The Professionals who did well would win awards and prestigious fellowships. And at the pinnacle of the profession was The Salon, the most important art exhibition in all of Europe. Throughout the next few weeks, the jury would vote on each painting in turn. Those accepted would be hung on the walls of the Palais, and over the course of six weeks beginning in early May, as many as a million people would throng the exhibition. The best paintings were given medals. The losers limped home and went back to work. In short, for a painter in nineteenth-century France, the Salon was everything - the Booker Committee and the Bestseller List rolled into one. In spite of the all the benefits, the acceptance by the Salon also came with a large cost: It required creating the kind of art that they did not find meaningful, 2. Was it worth it? The Salon was the place where reputations were made. And what made it special was how selective it was. Rejection was the norm. Getting in was a feat. No painter could submit more than three works. The crowds were often overwhelming. The Salon was the Big Pond. But it was very hard to be anything at the Salon but a Little Fish. It had a reputation to uphold for being the voice of approval. It could not afford to make mistakes. For the most part, they knew what they liked, and expected to see what they knew. The Impressionists, on the other hand, had an entirely different idea about what constituted art. They painted everyday life. Their brushstrokes were visible. Their figures were indistinct. To the Salon jury and the crowds thronging the Palais, their work looked amateurish, even shocking, and was repeatedly turned down. They had no hope of making waves in the Big Pond of The Salon. They conjured up an alternative to the shackles of the Salon. They thought it made more sense to be a Big Fish in a Little Pond. They could paint whatever they wanted. There would be no competition, no juries, and no medals. Every artist would be treated as an equal. The entrance fee was one franc. In their show, the Impressionists could exhibit as many canvases as they wished and hang them in a way that allowed people to actually see them. This was the first exhibition of "Impressionism". Not all of that attention was positive: But that was the second part of the Big Fishâ€”Little Pond bargain. The Big Fishâ€”Little Pond option might be scorned by some on the outside, but Small Ponds are welcoming places for those on the inside. They have all of the support that comes from community and friendshipâ€”and they are places where innovation and individuality are not frowned upon. Off by themselves, the Impressionists found a new identity. They felt a new creative freedom, and before long, the outside world began to sit up and take notice. In the history of modern art, there has never been a more important or more famous exhibition. If you tried to buy the paintings in that warren of top-floor rooms today, it would cost you more than a billion dollars. But this same dilemma comes up again and again, and often the choice made is not as wise. One of the important lessons the Impressionists could teach the modern artists is that there are times and places where it is better to be a Big Fish in a Little Pond than a Little Fish in a Big Pond, where the apparent disadvantage of being an outsider in a marginal world turns out not to be a disadvantage at all. Another important lesson is that what counts in the end is if you let the Big Pond define you, or if you were brave enough to invent an alternative. Think of all the great artists of the modern age who

could hardly be defined as mainstream during their own lifetimes, who would never dream of writing for the approval of a committee, who were as far away from honors and awards and money as only exiles could be. Think of all the books with prestigious honors and the 1 bestseller mark that seem like jokes now. Think about how so many of our best authors seem to end up producing the same sort of exceptional trash - very well written, but hardly the real deal that would last a century. We can talk about one option that our case study suggests - it might not be the only option, and the creative ones can always come up with better option, but the exhortation of this reviewer is a simple one: Added here from the comments section, for clarity: To restate, in our day the artists have three options - 1. Satisfy the Bank 2. Satisfy the critics or impress 3. Or satisfy their own genius or impress The last being the most risky and perhaps most important one.

Chapter 9 : David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants by Malcolm Gladwell

In his new book, "David and Goliath: Underdogs, Misfits, and the Art of Battling Giants," Malcolm Gladwell says most people get this famous Biblical yarn all wrong because they misunderstand who.

Early life[edit] Gladwell was born in Fareham , Hampshire , England. His father, Graham Gladwell, was a mathematics professor from Kent , England. It took 10 yearsâ€”exactly that long. Instead of writing about high-class fashion, Gladwell opted to write a piece about a man who manufactured T-shirts, saying: Gladwell also served as a contributing editor for Grantland , a sports journalism website founded by former ESPN columnist Bill Simmons. In a July article in The New Yorker, Gladwell introduced the concept of " The Talent Myth " that companies and organizations, supposedly, incorrectly follow. He states that the misconception seems to be that management and executives are all too ready to classify employees without ample performance records and thus make hasty decisions. Many companies believe in disproportionately rewarding "stars" over other employees with bonuses and promotions. However with the quick rise of inexperienced workers with little in-depth performance review, promotions are often incorrectly made, putting employees into positions they should not have and keeping other more experienced employees from rising. He also points out that under this system, narcissistic personality types are more likely to climb the ladder, since they are more likely to take more credit for achievements and take less blame for failure. Gladwell states that the most successful long-term companies are those who reward experience above all else and require greater time for promotions. When asked for the process behind his writing, he said: He wanted the book to have a broader appeal than just crime, however, and sought to explain similar phenomena through the lens of epidemiology. He began to take note of "how strange epidemics were", saying epidemiologists have a "strikingly different way of looking at the world". The term " tipping point " comes from the moment in an epidemic when the virus reaches critical mass and begins to spread at a much higher rate. He went on to say that he was "so enamored by the metaphorical simplicity of that idea that I overstated its importance". He stated that once he allowed his hair to get longer, he started getting speeding tickets all the time, an oddity considering that he had never gotten one before, and that he started getting pulled out of airport security lines for special attention. The Tipping Point sold more than two million copies in the United States. Blink sold equally well. I just was curious: Why is it all the same guy? He noted that he knew a lot of people who are really smart and really ambitious, but not worth 60 billion dollars. And Other Adventures[edit] Main article: What the Dog Saw: And Other Adventures, was published on October 20, Club , The Guardian , and The Times. There is depth to his research and clarity in his arguments, but it is the breadth of subjects he applies himself to that is truly impressive. The New Republic called the final chapter of Outliers, "impervious to all forms of critical thinking" and said Gladwell believes "a perfect anecdote proves a fatuous rule". Referencing a Gladwell reporting mistake in which Gladwell refers to " eigenvalue " as "Igon Value", Pinker criticizes his lack of expertise: A Conversation with Malcolm Gladwell". However, Gladwell says he was unaware Bank of America was "bragging about his speaking engagements" until the Atlantic Wire emailed him. I did a talk about innovation for a group of entrepreneurs in Los Angeles a while back, sponsored by Bank of America. They liked the talk, and asked me to give the same talk at two more small business eventsâ€”in Dallas and yesterday in D. No different from any other speaking gig. Gladwell has been spreading the love a bit too thinly? Gladwell wandered away from his Christian roots when he moved to New York, only to rediscover his faith during the writing of David and Goliath and his encounter with Wilma Derksen regarding the death of her child.