

**SYSTEMS**

<http://cba.unomaha.edu/faculty/mohara/web/LEAfio-SYSTEMS-handout.pdf>

*"For every complex problem  
there is an answer that is clear, simple, and wrong."*  
H. L. Mencken

*"Any intelligent fool can make things bigger and more complex.  
It takes a touch of genius - and a lot of courage to move in the opposite direction."*  
Albert Einstein

*"As far as the laws of mathematics refer to reality,  
they are not certain, and as far as they are certain, they do not refer to reality."*  
Albert Einstein

*"Not everything that counts can be counted,  
and not everything that can be counted counts."*  
Albert Einstein

*"Two things are infinite: the universe and human stupidity;  
and I'm not sure about the universe."*  
Albert Einstein

*"Technological progress is like an axe in the hands of a pathological criminal."*  
Albert Einstein

*"Imagination is more important than knowledge."*  
Albert Einstein

Many, but far from all, of the items outlined below can be found discussed in:  
**Hayden, F. Gregory. *Policymaking for a Good Society: The Social Fabric Matrix Approach to Policy Analysis and Program Evaluation*. Springer: New York, 2006. ISBN-13: 978-0387-29369-1.**

- I. All excellent analysis focuses upon systems.
  - A. Profit necessarily requires **at least two systems** ( $\pi = TR - TC$ ).
  - B. Ethics always involves **at least a multitude** of systems.
  - C. Complex socio-ecological systems necessarily engage complex socio-technological systems.
  - D. One tool for managing such analysis is the Social Fabric Matrix.
  
- II. Systems analysis requires a **paradigm shift** away from **isolated transactions** and towards **interrelated processes**.
  - A. Point of view is dependent upon a system of beliefs; and, that system of beliefs rarely is inventoried or acknowledged by the viewer.
    1. Context.  
An isolated zero sum transaction versus a linear flow versus a system.
    2. Criteria.
      - a. What are the metrics of "good" and of "bad"?
        - i. For example, does "good" always increase when GDP increases?
        - ii. See also II.A.7.
      - b. Systems necessarily have competing arrays of explicit goals and arrays of implicit goals.
      - c. EXAMPLE: Sustainability.
        - i. **Strong sustainability.**  
Infinitely repeatable until an exogenous force alters the system. Does not require the assertion, but is totally consistent with the assertion, that human technology *can not* be a close substitute for natural processes. (e.g., formula *can not* equal mother's breast milk)
        - ii. **Weak sustainability.**  
A short long term (i.e., not long run) repeatable. Weak sustainability does require the assertion that human technology can be *at least* a close substitute for natural processes (e.g., formula *does* equal mother's breast milk).
        - iii. **Profitable.**  
For period of firm's planning horizon TR received exceeds TC paid.
  3. Consequences.
    - a. Feasible.
      - i. Reality.
      - ii. Reasonable expectations.
      - iii. Actually expected.
      - iv. Known knowns versus known unknowns versus unknown knowns versus **unknown unknowns.**

- II. A. 3. a. iv. [I.] If  
the set of  
unknown unknowns is not a null set,  
then  
is the set of  
known knowns a null set?
- b. Countable.
- c. Counts.
4. Social: is it "us" versus "them"; or is it "us" and "them"?
- a. Who are "us" and who are "them"?
- i. Are "them" necessary for "us"?
- b. When are "us" and when are "them"?
- i. Intra-generational transfers.
- ii. Inter-generational transfers.
- [I.] Rule of 72: see, II.B.2.
- c. What are "us" and what are "them"?
- i. Prioritization of life forms.
- d. Where are "us" and where are "them"?
- i. Are "us" three dimensional beings in a  
four dimensional time/space; and "them"?
- e. Be here now.  $\approx 11! * 20! * 13! \approx 6.0 \times 10^{36}$  versions.
5. Technological.
- a. Combination of idea(s) and physical embodiment(s).
- b. Feasible combination of inputs.
- i. Knowledge.
- ii. Skills.
- iii. Tools.
- c. Implicit blinders (e.g., See {literally} *My Diner with Andre*).
- i. Can not see (e.g., II.A.3.a.iv.; especially [I.] )
- ii. Acutely see.
- iii. Criteria of appraisal changed by change itself.
- [I.] Unpredictable consequences.  
[A.] Good idea  
experienced as bad consequence.
- iv. Coherent (i.e., stable across contexts) criteria are  
superior criteria for appraisal.
- [I.] Money is objective rather than coherent.
- [II.] As scope of consequence increases  
both  
the coherence of objective criteria decreases  
and  
social urge to use objective criteria increases.
- d. Implicit value structure.
- i. When is a technological change an "advance"?
- [I.] Schumpeter: creative destruction.  
[A.] Shut down rule *ala*  $AVC_{old} > ATC_{new}$ .

- II. A. 5. d. i. [II.] Schumacher: contextual appraisal.
  - [A.] Bigger is not always cheaper (e.g., *Small is Beautiful*).
  - [III.] Veblen: conspicuous consumption.
- ii. Which tool for change appraisal is correct?
  - [I.] Static versus dynamic.
  - [II.] Mechanical versus biological.
  - [III.] Equilibrium versus chaotic.
- e. Law can not anticipate.
  - i. Reasonable expectations by definition are historical.
- f. Due to the relatively minimal constraints attributable to the physical embodiment component of technology, technology is an economically distinctive input.
  - i. *Within bounds that are far less bounded than is ordinary, technological change often incorrectly is viewed as allowing economies of scale to be feasible.*
    - [I.] Economies of **scale** = proportional increase in *all inputs* generates a disproportionate decrease in ATC of output.
    - [II.] Economies of **size** = proportional increase in *most inputs* generates a disproportionate decrease in ATC of output.
    - [III.] Economies of **scope** (a.k.a., **network effect**) = proportional increase in the market(s) generating and/or receiving the inputs and/or the outputs generates a disproportionate decrease in ATC of output.
      - [A.] Within a process and across processes are linkages for obtaining inputs and sending outputs
        - [1.] A **feedback loop** connects past outputs back to future inputs.
      - [B.] Feedback loops accentuate other processes.
    - [IV.] But, recall II.A.2.c.; especially II.A.2.c.i. versus II.A.2.c.ii.
    - [V.] In these estimations of ATC how broadly (e.g., II.A.2.c.i.) is "total" estimated?
- 6. Ecological.
  - a. What is the priority ranking of every life form?
    - i. Which life forms on Earth are *sine qua non* for human life?
    - ii. Recall II.A.4. and II.A.5.f.i.

- II. A. 6. b. Can rape be stewardship?
- i. **Private goods**, generically, are notable for their characteristics of rivalry of consumption and exclusivity of possession.
  - ii. **Public goods**, generically, are notable for their characteristics of externalities springing from muted rivalry and exclusivity.
  - iii. Waste (i.e., real property law) is breach of duty.
    - [I.] **Waste** is misappropriation of the ownership rights of either concurrent or subsequent owners.
- c. What are the minimum feasible number of generations for an evolutionary consequence in a life form (i.e., what is minimally necessary fraction of total population that must carry gene; as well as what is the relevant average fecundity)?
- i. Is it the "seventh generation of the seventh generation"?
    - [I.] E.g., approximately 266 years if assuming Thomas Jefferson's generational estimate of 19 years times 14 generations.
    - [A.] See, II.B.2.a.iv.[I.].
  - ii. How does the metric "generation" vary across life forms?
    - [I.] Which existing technologies have generated an evolutionary consequence in some life form (e.g., antibiotic resistance)?
    - [II.] Which technologies have done so in humans (e.g., speech; but not graphs)?
    - [III.] Given how you answered II.A.6.c. and II.A.6.c.ii, relative to which other life forms on Earth, moving into the future, do humans have and do humans not have an advantage over most other life forms for gaining beneficial evolutionary consequence?
7. Positive versus Normative.
- a. Recall Einstein counting.
  - b. Science strives to be positive and science strives to minimize being normative.
  - c. **Positivism** (a.k.a., scientific method) seeks to avoid values (e.g., observer bias) and instead seeks to solely focus on facts.

- II. A. 7. d. **Normative**  
 explicitly recognizes and seeks to inventory  
 the values explicit and implicit in all "facts".
- i. Normative asserts  
 it is impossible to extinguish observer bias.
  - ii. Normative asserts  
 that the *choice* of the "facts" is inherently normative.  
 [I.] But note, New York Senator Daniel Patrick  
 Moynihan, former U.S.A. Ambassador to the  
 U.N., was fond of observing that  
*"Everyone is entitled to his own opinion,  
 but not his own facts."*
- B. Conceptions of time influence what is perceived.
1. Stream of time.
    - a. Unidirectional causation (i.e., past then present then future).
    - b. Clock time is an artificial human abstraction created to foster  
 positivist objective perceptions. See below, V.K.
      - i. Infinitely divisible and aggregatable units of  
 clock time.
      - ii. Risk of specifying use of a time unit (e.g., large) and  
 thus precluding ability to perceive a process that is  
 completed relative to a vastly different unit of time  
 (e.g. study days when process takes place in seconds;  
 or, *visa versa*;  
 study days when process takes place in decades).
  2. Discounting of time.
    - a. Value varies with magnitude of temporal separation.
      - i. E.g., **Rule of 72:**  
 $72 / i =$  periods to double or to halve a quantity.
      - ii. Helps answer II.A.4.b.
      - iii. Typically ignores both II.B.3. and III.A.B.C.
      - iv. Discounted present value  
 routinely requires an implicit assumption that  
 rarely is accurate.  
 [I.] At 7.2% simple annual interest, \$1 borrowed  
 today and payable at the end of 10 years is  
 doubled by the debt's interest payment of \$1;  
 similarly, in this way, at 7.2% interest a  
 $\$1.0 \times 10^6$  cost imposed 276 years in the  
 future is today worth but  $\$1.0 \times 10^{-2}$ .  
 [A.] When a future externality is  
 currently estimated and discounted,  
*rarely* is a sinking fund currently  
 created and that penny deposited so in  
 that future 276 years hence that future  
 million dollar harm is compensated  
 (e.g., II.A.4.b.ii.).

- II. B. 2. b. Time preference.
  - i. Discounting  
implicitly prefers the present over the future
  - ii. Adequate deposits into a  
II.B.2.a.iv.[I.][A.] sinking fund  
might reflect a balanced time preference  
rather than a biased time preference.
  - iii. Given II.A.3.a.iv.[I.],  
use of II.B.4.b.i. might be required to demonstrate a  
balanced rather than a biased time preference.
- 3. **Synchronicity.**
  - a. Sequencing of process inputs and outputs.
    - i. Time is certain to be:
      - [I.] Linear;
      - [II.] Cyclical  
(e.g., feedback loop); **and/or**
      - [III.] Alternating  
(e.g., contextually defined directionality  
for a feedback loop).
  - b. Punctuality of process inputs and outputs.
  - c. Duration of process inputs and outputs.
  - d. Coordination of process inputs and outputs.
- 4. Preferences for Risk.
  - a. Speaking technically,  
"uncertainty" does not equal "probability";  
nor equals "risk".
    - i. **"Risk"** =  
probabilities mathematically coupled with  
reward and loss distributions  
(e.g., Bayesian decision tree weighted average).
    - ii. Rarely will you encounter a human who  
consistently speaks technically about  
risk, hazard, reward, probability, and/or uncertainty.
  - b. **Risk Averse** =  
decision maker prioritizes avoidance of large hazards;  
thus, voluntary acceptance of large risks requires  
rewards to be disproportionately larger  
(since probabilities are assumed not alterable).
    - i. **Precautionary Principle** =  
for major risks shared broadly (e.g., externalities) the  
decision maker ought prioritize  
avoidance of worst case outcomes even if  
probabilistic assessment forecasts  
profitable risk taking.

- II. B. 4. c. **Risk Neutral** =
    - voluntary acceptance of all risks as long as hazards and rewards track proportionally with the risk.
    - i. Economics, seeking to be positivist, assumes a rational person and then assumes all rational persons are risk neutral.
      - [I.] Based upon the flip of fair coin, what reward do you require to voluntarily accept your slavery as a hazard?
  - d. **Risk Seeking** =
    - decision maker prioritizes large rewards over smaller rewards, thus voluntary acceptance of large risks does not require rewards to be grow proportionately with risks.
  - e. What is a "**Black Swan**"?
    - i. What are the differences in consequences between a *positive* "Black Swan" and a *negative* "Black Swan"?
  - f. When is a characteristic:
    - i. "random"?
    - ii. "chaotic" (e.g., **Butterfly Effect**)?
    - iii. "unpredictable"?
    - iv. Recall II.A.3.a.iv.[I.].
- III. A network as a context for consequence alters the array of feasible consequences.
    - A. Size.
      - 1. Maximum size of an individual unit is exceeded by aggregation of units.
        - a. Across multiple dimensions, ***the whole is greater than the mere sum of the parts.***
      - 2. Recall relative consequences discussed in II.B.2.a.iv.[I.] as well as in II.B.4.b.i.
    - B. Scale.
      - 1. Proportional increase in output with proportional increase in all inputs is more feasible and more likely with aggregations of units versus with individual units.
    - C. Scope.
      - 1. Classic definition of "network effect" springs from scope.
      - 2. Proximately caused consequences both on distant processes and in distant systems via alteration of synchronicity across feedback loops.
      - 3. Scope consequences alter:
        - a. parts,
        - b. subunits,
        - c. aggregations of parts and of subunits, and/or
        - d. the whole.

- III. C. 4. Scope, with no change in technology, can be similar in consequence to a change in technology (i.e., change in the *feasible* combination of inputs).
- a. Feedback loops can alter positively and can alter negatively what is feasible.
- D. Optimization.
1. Whose utils are to be maximized?
    - a. Recall II.A.4.
  2. Benefit / Cost Analysis.
    - a. What are the implicit values expressed when the ratio is phrased as "cost/benefit"?
  3. Pareto Optimality: change only is "good" if improve one without harm any.
    - a. Contrast with Pareto Principle: 20% of inputs yield 80% of outputs.
  4. Coase Theorem:
 

**if** few transactions  
**and if** small transaction costs individually and in aggregate,  
*then (but not so if either of the above ifs is not satisfied)*  
 initial allocation does not preclude efficient end allocation via market transactions.

    - a. Coase Theorem helps define the efficient boundary between the firm and the market.
    - b. Coase Theorem is routinely *mis*applied to justify gross inequalities coupled with governmental non-response (e.g., externalities).
- III. D. 5. Cobb-Douglas function:  
 $Y = A L^\alpha K^\beta$   
 where  
 Y = total production; A = total factor productivity;  
 L = labor;  $\alpha$  = elasticity; K = capital; and  $\beta$  = elasticity.
- a. These elasticities are used to define economies of scale.
6. Subunit optimization at the expense of the whole becomes a discrete source of subunit "profit".
- a. Also known as the **principle / agent problem**.
  - b. Can be explored from the perspective of **rent seeking**.
- IV. General Systems Analysis (GSA) prioritizes a focus on relationships, structure, and interdependency rather than a focus on constant attributes of objects.
- A. Openness, complexity, wholeness, hierarchy, and regulation set up those relationships, structure, and interdependence.
  - B. Within a dynamic whole a part functions differently than when the part is examined in isolation.

- V. Twelve Principles of Systems.
- A. A system is a set of objects together with relationships between objects and their attributes.
1. Objects are elements.
  2. Attributes are properties.
  3. Relationships connect with iterations.
    - a. Due to our Bounded Rationality we are prone to tell ourselves the lie of uni-dimensionality.
- B All systems are open.
1. Openness is a flow (i.e., inputs and outputs) between the system being examined and the environment.
  2. State of system influenced by flows.
  3. Environment routinely viewed as a black box that is source of:
    - a. Natural good production (e.g., forest);
    - b. Natural resources (e.g., oil);
    - c. Living Systems (a.k.a., Life Support Services [e.g., atmosphere]);
    - d. Sink Function (e.g., absorb and process pollution).
- C. Systems are nonisomorphic (i.e., whole is greater than sum of parts).
1. a.k.a., holistic.
  2. Rejects reductionist thinking of objects viewed in isolation.
- D. Systems stress equifinality.
1. Posits multiple feasible paths rather than focus on equilibrium.
    - a. Forecasting the future (e.g., start with an ice cube and end with ?) is far easier than forecasting the past (e.g., now a puddle of water having started with ?).
  2. Recall *can* versus *may* versus *should* (i.e., power v. law v. ethics)
- E. System components interact.
1. Cultural values (e.g., golden rule versus invisible hand).
  2. Social beliefs (e.g., free will versus fate).
  3. Personal attitudes (e.g., risk preference).
  4. Technology: recall II.A.5.
  5. Natural Environment (e.g., wild versus depleted).
- F. Systems operate within constraints imposed by system controls and system regulations.
1. Magnitude of constraints vary.
    - a. Necessary.
    - b. Sufficient.
    - c. Adequate.
    - d. Viable.
  2. Subsystem linkages provide venues for control and regulation.
  3. Rules of control and regulation are both alterable and interactive.

- V. F. 4. Technology  
interacts with control and regulation in a multitude of ways  
(e.g., *mechanism* for control versus *alters* controls).
- 5. Social beliefs  
interact with control and regulation in a multitude of ways  
(e.g., view of what is feasible  
[e.g., USA racism prior to Martin Luther King]).
- G. Systems contain hierarchies.
  - 1. Outputs of some subsystems provide inputs to other subsystems.
  - 2. Hierarchies increase scope of reasonably foreseeable consequences.
- H. A system can be viewed via its flows, deliveries, and sequences.
  - 1. Threshold levels trigger reaction.
  - 2. Tolerance levels exceeded trigger transformation.
- I. Feedback loops can be positive or negative.
  - 1. Positive feedback is self reinforcing.
    - a. If both above threshold and below tolerance levels,  
then fosters growth.
      - i. But, tendency towards instability and/or decay
    - b. Positive feedback often serves as  
both intra-system and inter-system communication.
  - 2. Negative feedback is self-regulating and fosters goal direction.
- J. Systems foster differentiation and elaboration.
  - 1. Evolution towards complexity.
- K. Systems use real time rather than classical time.
  - 1. Newtonian time relies upon strict deterministic causality.
    - a. Contrast with equifinality, above at item V.D.
  - 2. Time is a social construct rather than a natural phenomena.
    - a. Focus on process synchronicity; not clock time.
      - i. Recall II.B.3.
- L. Evaluation of a system's objects, attributes, and relationships requires  
prior specification of values.
  - 1. Recall II.A.2.
  - 2. System viability typically requires both  
sufficiency and redundancy.