moment of the eternal now, we continuously improvise based on experience, habit, a sense of a pattern, gut feeling, and our drive to move in a certain direction. Then we postrationalize and create stories to support the myth of our rational reasoning.

This could lead to problems, though, because theories and models are not only used to describe reality, but they also shape our perception of it (they change our "seeing"). Then there is a risk that reality will be manipulated to fit the theory, instead of the other way around (as in the Greek myth of Procrustes, the innkeeper who had one size of bed and would stretch the unlucky short traveler until he fit in it or, in the case of a tall guest, would chop off the parts that stuck out). In fact, this is the fate that normally befalls the open, complex, dynamic, and networked problems: they are subjected to a rational simplification, limited and adapted to what the organization can handle, instead of the organization developing itself to the point where it can deal with these complex issues as they are. The case study of the high-speed train link illustrates how even a sophisticated organization like the Dutch government fights the nature of the problem instead of accepting it. In a sense, the first three syndromes that we mentioned in chapter 1—the "lone warrior," "freeze the world," and "self-made box"—can all be shown to result from the limited view of rationality that underlies the actions of these organizations, and from their inability to reimagine their practices in the face of open, complex, dynamic, and networked problems. This inability is caused by the fourth syndrome: the people and organizations that were introduced in the case studies of chapter 1 were fearful of leaving their "rational high ground." They imagine that beyond this high ground there is only quicksand, so they had better stay up above. But the train case study shows that this will not do, and that we need to come up with an alternative to the restrictive notion of rationality that underlies much of conventional problem-solving. Frame creation offers elements of such a different, more fluid rationality.

To consider whether frame creation really contains the elements of an alternative to conventional problem-solving through the creation of a more fluid rationality, we will now briefly contrast the seven central assumptions underpinning the theory of rational action with the principles of frame creation. While in the theory of rational action (1) *rational thought is literal*, in frame creation the same words mean different things to different people, and so metaphor is a driving force in many of the creative steps. And in rational action, (2) *rational thought is considered to be logical*. We have already seen