

phil henshaw

From: amerikalistan-owner@mg.skola.mark.se on behalf of phil henshaw [pfh@synapse9.com]
Sent: Sunday, November 16, 2008 11:59 AM
To: 'Stanley Salthe'
Cc: amerikalistan@mg.skola.mark.se
Subject: RE: Butterfly/Whale effect - p.s.

Thanks for both the compliment and complement.. :-) As you point out rational planning has always then been based on understanding development and the continuities it displays. It is then implicitly 'irrational' to not watch for the groping around kind of evolutionary basis for how developments find their changes in direction (their 'irrationality' in a sense) as part of a rational planning process. It's hard to point that out unless you somehow make the connection between the two...!

Phil Henshaw

From: Stanley Salthe [mailto:ssalthe@binghamton.edu]
Sent: Saturday, November 15, 2008 10:04 PM
To: pfh@synapse9.com
Cc: amerikalistan@mg.skola.mark.se
Subject: RE: Butterfly/Whale effect - p.s.

Phil --

Mary,

I think what connects them is that neither 'evolution' nor 'development' can work without the other, on an ongoing basis, so they amount to two aspects of the same process. Development follow its paths using 'blind' fingers of evolutionary exploration on a smaller scale, steering the branches of development onto new avenues of opportunity. Development only work if its various leading edges are all doing an evolutionary exploration of their potentials at once. Evolution only seems to work if there's something to develop. That's like saying that investing where there's no market, say building an eagle's nest in a parking lot, isn't likely to be the kind of evolutionary experiment that will trigger a whole system of reinforcing environmental feedbacks.

S: VERY well put! Bravo.

Evolutionary exploration seems to be a necessary part of how development observably works, as in how businesses or plants advance with many fingers of developing new form at once.

Development uses an evolutionary way of feeling along. You see that in testing out a new personal relationship or the way markets expose consumers to many variations on any new theme that manufactures then take signals of what consumers want from. That pairing also seems to be a necessary logical conclusion if systems are to operate without maps to follow other than their own forms. The appearance to me is that what we see as their 'purposes', 'plans', 'maps to follow' or 'inevitable paths' is only physically located in our own mental expectations.

The developmental paths of things and their ends are not realized until a process gets there. Humans may dismiss any differences between the real ends of things and our prior expectations,

of course. That's our privilege, and our risk. I think what I observe, though is that development has to be a fresh evolutionary discovery each and every time, a particular individual process.

A spark still needs to ignite something in order to cause a fire, for example, not just have a human expectation that, "darn it I'm sure this'll light this time". The path that development finds only exists materially in the form of each individual process discovering the opportunities for its own development. I think it seems to happen by ongoing multi-level evolutionary experimentation, and that view is strongly reinforced when you ask if the evidence supports it.

S: Developments are described after observing many examples of change of a particular kind, which, while they are happening, are as you put it. If we are to be rational, it is the developments that we base our plans upon.

STAN