



These are Dr. D's suggested "Outcome Goals" for this Meeting – Did You Aim for and Attain these Goals?

What will be a great set of results from the time we are going to now spend together:

[1] We are all glad that we came here, we know a lot more about each other than when we started, and we feel that we are coming away with useful information.

[2] We sense that some particular values can be realized for our institutions, the regional community and our close circles.

[3] There is at least one common objective on which we have achieved some agreement that it is a goal toward which we can work constructively, with practical and attainable value for our respective institutions.

[4] We see that there are multiple, diverse possibilities for what we (students, employees, benefactors, customers, community residents and families) can do in the foreseeable future, as different people and groups take ownership, sponsorship and/or leadership.

[5] We have a "proto-understanding," at least, of some specific next-steps which we can and may want to make, and about who can accept some of the AR's (actions and response-abilities) for those steps.

[6] We have a workable and realistic plan for achieving some milestones and goalposts, with a sense of resilience and fault-tolerance for what needs to be done in order to reach them.

[7] We feel more comfortable, at ease and optimistic than when we first walked into this room.

Martin Dudziak

ECOADUNA Foundation and TetraDyn Ltd.

martinjd@tetradyn.com

(202) 415-7295

APPENDIX

[1]

Paul Krugman: The Decline of E-Empires

The biggest companies eventually become complacent and lose their leading role in the marketplace. Does that mean we shouldn't worry about their monopoly power?:

[The Decline of E-Empires, by Paul Krugman, Commentary, NY Times](#): Steve Ballmer's surprise announcement that he will be resigning as Microsoft's C.E.O. ... has me thinking about network externalities and Ibn Khaldun. ...

First, about network externalities: Consider the state of the computer industry circa 2000... By all accounts, Apple computers were better than PCs... Yet the vast majority of desktop and laptop computers ran Windows. Why?

The answer, basically, is that everyone used Windows because everyone used Windows. ... Software was designed to run on PCs; peripheral devices were designed to work with PCs. That's network externalities in action, and it made Microsoft a monopolist. ...

The trouble for Microsoft came with the rise of new devices whose importance it famously failed to grasp.

"There's no chance," declared Mr. Ballmer in 2007, "that the iPhone is going to get any significant market share."

How could Microsoft have been so blind? ... [Ibn Khaldun](#) ... was a 14th-century Islamic philosopher... Desert tribesmen, he argued, always have more courage and social cohesion than settled, civilized folk, so every once in a while they will sweep in and conquer lands whose rulers have become corrupt and complacent. They create a new dynasty — and, over time, become corrupt and complacent themselves, ready to be overrun by a new set of barbarians.

I don't think it's much of a stretch to apply this story to Microsoft, a company that did so well with its operating-system monopoly that it lost focus, while Apple — still wandering in the wilderness after all those years — was alert to new opportunities. And so the barbarians swept in from the desert. ...

Anyway, the funny thing is that Apple's position in mobile devices now bears a strong resemblance to Microsoft's former position in operating systems. ...Apple ... products ... are, by most accounts, little if any better than those of rivals, while selling at premium prices.

So why do people buy them? Network externalities: lots of other people use iWhatever, there are more apps for iOS... Meet the new boss, same as the old boss.

Is there a policy moral here? ... Microsoft was a monopolist, it did extract a lot of monopoly rents, and it did inhibit innovation. Creative destruction means that monopolies aren't forever, but it doesn't mean that they're harmless while they last. This was true for Microsoft yesterday; it may be true for Apple, or Google, or someone not yet on our radar, tomorrow.

[2]

(from, "The Tsunami That refreshes," March 2009)

The mathematician and philosopher Alfred North Whitehead wrote, "The tragedy of the world is that those who are imaginative have but slight experience, and those who are experienced have feeble imagination. Fools act on imagination without knowledge; pedants act on knowledge without imagination. The task ... is to weld together imagination and experience."¹ Prof. Whitehead wrote this more than eighty years ago within an essay entitled, *Universities and their Function*, regarding the integrative and balancing roles of universities. He saw the university as an institution bringing youth, highly energetic and imaginative, together with mature, experienced, and often less imaginative adult mentors and teachers. This was certainly a vision and a practice in the past within many centers of learning and not only at colleges and universities.

Today, there is an amazing phenomenon that has been sweeping across our society, especially in business and political circles, and quite evident by the words and practices of many of today's so-called pundits of the financial world, particularly those of the venture capitalist species. We find that an almost hypnotic spell has taken force over the minds of many people, an infatuation and a clear-cut prejudice in favor of the image and appearance of imagination, innovation and genius. Alas, it is an infatuation nonetheless, lacking in substance, and clearly lacking in experience and deep knowledge. It is a disease and a disability of our economy and of our whole society, threatening not merely to put brakes upon progress but to stall and even reverse our abilities of withstanding highly nonlinear and unpredictable events and sequences of events – from nature, accident, and man – that threaten even our existence as a civilization, even as a species, upon this planet.

This “grand infatuation” has mesmerized so many people in finance, business, and particularly in areas of small business including entrepreneurial ventures connected with technologies, be they in energy, telecommunications, security, medicine or other fields. This is the same kind of infatuation that has led major financial institutions into the whirlpool and cesspool of highly toxic investment malpractices of the sort that have generated our present recession-depression. Furthermore, we see evidence of our chronic infatuation with the “image and appearance of brilliance and innovation” extending into a kind of permanent disability or disfigurement as an entire government administration pursues and perpetuates an economic plan that some have likened to trying to cross over the Niagara River above the great Falls on a hastily built bridge of logs and ropes. We are looking left and right at plans, schemes, and especially investments, many made by so-called “experts” within private equity and the venture capital fields, that read like prescriptions for certain failure and loss. At the heart of these are some common trends, centermost being one of avoidance to precisely those ideas, persons, teams, companies, and endeavors that bring in squarely and soundly both imagination and experience, youth and maturity, high-energy and caution, vision and pragmatism.

Our “persons of potential” appear to be deeply under the spell of the “old guard” thinking that is determinedly pursuing courses of action with apparently little place or time for minds and methods that do in fact synthesize creative imagination with sound, solid living experience. In my opinion, this is a recipe for disappointment and failure, on both the personal level and on that of the entire society.

I am going to quote from a book on an abstract mathematical topic, Poincare's Conjecture, because in that book are a few referential statements that really “hit the nail on the head” and drive it home.ⁱⁱ In a chapter on the life and work of Bernhard Riemann (1826 - 1866), one of the first to clearly explore and enunciate non-euclidean geometry and to pave the way for the later progress in the field that transformed mathematics and physics (e.g., general relativity), the author writes:

“In an influential recent book, *Good to Great*,ⁱⁱⁱ American management consultant Jim Collins and a team of researchers identified eight major corporations that consistently outperformed other companies. They found that all were headed by self-effacing CEOs who shared a number of personal traits that Collins dubbed level-five leadership. One of the traits was that no one, except those in the know, had ever heard of the leaders. They were not on magazine covers. They were not flashy. They lived simply and attributed their company's success to luck. They were very modest, attributed their success to others, were determined and extremely focused, and were bold. The combination of modesty with extreme daring and the courage of one's convictions sounds quite a bit like Riemann.”^{iv}

Bernhard Riemann changed the way people think about space and geometry. His work, expressed in the manner that it was, in the time and era in which it was, triggered profound new explorations and investigations that

ushered in nearly all of the developments leading in turn to modern technological achievements in electronics, aerospace, nuclear power, genetics, and computer science. Much of this was because of what Riemann catalyzed and triggered, by breaking out of old molds and patterns of doing mathematics; once begun, the revolution of imagination and innovation did not stop. “He completely changed the terms of discourse. It was as if one were nearly blind, and could suddenly see. ... Recognizably modern mathematics begins with Riemann.”^v

I would like every reader to pause and reflect upon this extended quote about the Collins book in the paragraph before last, and to do so without thinking about the identity of those eight corporations and their leading CEOs. Instead, one should please think carefully about the following topics and questions. There are no singular answers, but I believe that with careful reflection some of my deeper meaning and *Ur*-intention may be gleaned, and understood.

1. Who are the persons most visible, most published and “seen” today upon the covers of magazines, on the front pages of CNN and other news websites, on TV?
2. What are the most prominent, media-visible, talked-about, blogged-about companies today?
3. What are some of the companies that are or have been (purportedly) receiving noteworthy investments from the private equity and venture capital communities during the past few years?
4. What are the main or major activities that are associated with (conducted by, “in the news about”) these prominent persons and companies?
5. How do these activities and their public words, their “expertise” – or shall we say, their imagination and their experience – support long-term steady and stable life for the company and for the society in which any company must abide?
6. How do these persons and these companies compare - in terms of imagination and experience, and ability to produce worthwhile, significant, dominant, “disruptive breakthrough” products and services for the times and economies of our present world, looking forward to five and even ten years ahead – with a company and a team such as exists within the relatively unknown partnership of TETRADYN?

Those “persons of potential” who have the courage and openness of mind to examine clearly, critically, unabashedly, what is our present and future economy and society, and what is of value and importance within personal relationships, bonds, and commitments among honorable men and women, and what is of value and importance to large numbers of fellow citizens and residents in countries that are undergoing unexpected and unpredictable changes in every aspect life – such persons will be able to quickly understand that there are very few times in life when a remarkably brilliant opportunity comes along, an invitation, an open door, such as there has been of late with the TETRAD family and its teams – Ecoduna, IIS, TetraDyn, and Forte Horizons.

Contact:

Dr. M. J. Dudziak, PhD
Science Officer, TetraDyn Ltd.
+1 (202) 415-7295 martinjd@tetradyn.com

Mr. Rao Mandava
Business Development Manager, TetraDyn Ltd.
+1 (708) 349-7318 rao@tetradyn.com

ⁱ A. N. Whitehead, *The Aims of Education and Other Essays* (New York: Macmillan, 1967), 93.

ⁱⁱ D. O'Shea, *The Poincare Conjecture* (New York: Walker & Company, 2007)

ⁱⁱⁱ J. Collins, *Good to Great: Why Some companies Make the Leap ... and Others Don't* (New York: HarperCollins, 2001)

^{iv} ref. 2, p. 100

^v ref. 2, p. 100