Hello Jeremy,

Your statement, “I appreciate the concept of breaking down systems into simpler components,” is intriguing to me. For most of my career, we have looked at problems in this way. The first step was to understand the system as a whole and then break it down into smaller subsystems that can be understood in finer detail.

“He [Prigogine] said all systems contain subsystems that are continuously fluctuating.” (Bushe, 2015) This seems to contradict what was stated earlier in the chapter while talking about Newtonian or classical science: “We have broken things into parts and fragments for so long and have believed that was the best way to understand them that we are unequipped to see a different order that is there, moving the whole” (Wheatly, 1992)  
 These statements in the book are hard for me to process. I wonder how you would decide when to break a system down into pieces and when to adapt. On page 138, I see they talk about adaptive challenges vs. technical ones. Are these the simple interactions that you were pointing to? To be fair, I have killed one highlighter with this book, and I can’t say I am entirely on board with the message, as it is hard to see the real-life implementation aside from the few examples so far.
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