"It will cause chaos" — cue the old *"riots on the street"* line. Given construction, automotive and many other industries have no problem with componentisation then I can't see how anyone ever jumps to this notion of chaos. The truth is usually more of a desire to have "one throat to choke" though there is nothing stopping a company from using one supplier to build all the components with appropriate methods.

"You'll end up with hundreds of experimental startups" — at this point we're getting into the surreal. If you break a complex system into components, then some of the uncharted components are going to be experimental. This is not a bad thing, this is just what they are. For those components then you're likely to do this in-house with agile techniques or use a specialist company focused on more agile processes. But you won't give that company all the components because the majority of components tend to be highly industrialised and hence you'll use established utility providers such as Amazon for computing infrastructure. I'm not sure how people make the jump from componentisation to giving it all to "hundreds of experimental startups". In general, this tends to be caused by a desire to keep the current status quo.

"complexity in managing interfaces" — this is my favourite excuse which takes surreal to a whole new level. Pretending that a complex 100 component system with uncharted and industrialised components that have interfaces between them is in fact one system with a one size fits all method and non-existent interfaces is the very definition of fantasy. Those components are there, those interfaces are there — the