tend to ask them to demonstrate this and I get the usual reply of *"well, it's obvious"*. Alas, it's not and the "it's obvious" turns out to be unsubstantiated. If you're feeling evil then you can test this yourself. Just ask *"How many years from innovation to commodity"* and they'll normally reply *"it's variable"*. Then ask *"At what % adoption does something become a commodity?"* and they'll normally reply *"it's variable"*. Then ask *"well, if it's variable in terms of time and adoption then how have you put a marker on a graph of time and adoption?"* … this should make a suitably uncomfortable moment. It's not that these gurus are daft but instead it's incredibly easy to fall into that "well, it's obvious" state of mind.

Back in 2007, my problem was that I had also been lulled into the same confident belief that we somehow understood the process of change and it was "*obvious*". The popular view tends to be that innovations appear somewhat randomly, either through the efforts of a group of people or often by happenstance e.g. a fortuitous accident such as the discovery of inkjets through the placing of a hot syringe in a well of ink. These innovations then diffuse as above, some succeeding and crossing the chasm whilst others fail. We often have competing examples — AC vs. DC electricity or BetaMax vs. VHS — until one becomes more established and dominant. Over time, the same innovation becomes a commodity. It feels simple and logical.

However, the rate of diffusion is not constant and we cannot measure the change of evolution over adoption or time. Furthermore, whatever process was occurring was not always continuous. As highlighted by