

somehow describe this then maybe that would give us a map? Take for example, the multinational Finnish company Nokia. Originally founded in 1865 as a paper mill, the company has undergone many transformations through various close calls with bankruptcy. From a paper mill to a rubber manufacturer to consumer electronics to a telecommunications giant, this organism has radically evolved. The problem for me was the core for Nokia today was not its core in 1865 but instead an unimaginable flight of fancy at that time. How could I connect the two? When you focus on what is core for a company then the question becomes whether you mean core today, core yesterday or core tomorrow? They are not necessarily the same. I followed this logic down endless rabbit holes getting nowhere fast.

In frustration, I started to ask *why* do things change? The responses I was given when talking to my peers varied from “progress” to “innovation” to “disruption”. Examples across history were normally cited including the appearance of random innovations that impact the way we operate — from the telephone to electricity to computing. But given the upheaval they cause, the close calls with bankruptcy, the death of former great companies and the need to continuously learn new skills then why would anyone want this? Surely a more sedate, slower rate of change would be more comfortable? So why are things changing?

Alas it seems that we don't get a choice. In any industrial ecosystem, novel and new things constantly appear as a consequence of the desire for companies and individuals to gain an advantage over others. Those things that are useful will be copied. They will spread until the once