

letter.oz2

Dear Oz,

4 Sept, 1987

We received the copy of your thesis and letter two days ago.

I typed up a reply that day; switched the PC off when I went to bed and the rest you know. I am still a mug at this game having only taken the plunge seven weeks ago. Went for an NEC Multispeed. A very happy choice of a laptop as it is loaded with on-tap software and is no more conspicuous than my typewriter. (I do not want to turn a part of the house into an electronics lab - not good for the image!). Merrelyn went for an Apple II straight after we got back but the support systems were poor so she dropped it. She has now gotten into the systems at the Centre.

Your observations about Francisco, Tom and Eric were not the product of Middle Eastern paranoia. You were spot on. It was I who put Francisco's nose out of joint at the Canadian conference. He was very interested in our discussions of sortition and I had the temerity to suggest that when he went home to advise Garcia he might try out some such idea. That sort of upset him! No doubt he has now discussed this with Russ and is convinced that I am out of touch with reality. He is a bloke we both like very much and I am quite sure that we do not begin to understand the realities of Peru. The descendants of the conquistadores have not changed much in their contempt for the Indians, and the ferocity of the Indian resistance movement might be seen as a measure of that.

You are quite right that Eric's name was not second on the causal texture paper for reasons of alphabetical order. I am amazed that anyone from S3 could think so. Eric was not even involved in the discussions around the paper when it appeared for the European Informal Group in early 1963. In 1964 he asked me whether I would be prepared to make it a joint paper for a speaking engagement he had in Washington for the International Psychology Conference. He did not have time, as Chairman of Tavistock, to prepare one. I agreed, and we worked out a version for public presentation. At his insistence the theoretical side was cut back (I recovered that in the 1967 paper) and we had to find verbal labels for types 1, 2, 3 & 4. I was not at all happy about that because the types were stages in an emergent serial order, not ideal types of the Weber kind. Note that the type 4 environment had been defined long before Eric insisted that we find a verbal label. *Ipsa facto*, finding the label of "turbulence" had absolutely nothing to do with conceptual creativity. Eric's story about the label is misleading bullshit. The label came from the already existing definition of the type 4 and work I was doing on modelling the flow of staff through the Irish banking system as a hydrodynamic model: in that exercise we were concentrating on the paradox, the Karman effect, where a further increase in the pressure actually reduces the rate of flow because of the onset of turbulence.

My feeling, after all of these years, is that Eric never tried to get deeper into the matter of the L22 than the labels I created for him. You might recall that after the S3 symposium that Eric and I gave in 1982 he asked me to join him in replying to an attack, published in *Futures*, on a paper he had given to the AMA. I agreed, in principle, read the paper he had given and reneged on the offer. The critic should have read the earlier papers to make sure of his grounds but Eric's paper did leave itself wide open to the charge that turbulence was simply in the mind of the beholder. Quite bluntly, Eric can no more accept the existence of a knowable L22 than can Russ and the rest of the Singer school. As far as I can see it Eric is frozen into the Locke-Hume position and the Singerians are locked into Kant. None of them appreciate Peirce's breakthrough - the breakthrough that has, at last, been re-affirmed by Heider and Gibson.

If I am right about this then there is little wonder that Eric's students do not understand: little wonder that MBSC took their stand against Russ on such pathetic grounds as not liking his a-clinical style.