

UNITED WISDOM

Stability and Fragility: Different Responses to Disturbance

World and Consciousness

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

W-14-N03 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Stability and Fragility: Different Responses to Disturbance

Epigraph

That is one view of the world.

C. S. Holling, “Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems,” Introduction, page 1. This complete sentence refers to the preceding view through existence, disappearance, and extinction, before contrasting attention to numbers and constancy. The Russian version is our own translation.

What this article is about

Calling a system stable often implies several merits: it changes little, returns after disruption, persists, and continues useful work. These can answer different questions. Combining them is convenient in ordinary speech but obscures what survived change and which vulnerabilities remain. Fragility also needs qualification: against which influence, concerning which property, and over what period?

The article compares selected primary contexts from Holling, Ashby, Carlson, and Doyle. Ecological persistence of relationships, formal states and transitions, and robustness of a selected property do not become one universal measure. We examine questions about disturbance, return, structure, and inference limits. Contemporary examples involving schedules, copies, and a catalogue are invented. They clarify a claim’s conditions, proposing no failure tests of real systems, character assessment, or treatment inferred from an ecological model.

I. Stability of Which Property

Imagine an invented catalogue of cards. After pages are rearranged, every card name remains, but some links no longer open. We can say that content is unchanged without concluding that accessibility survived. “The catalogue withstood change” combines different outcomes unless the property is named. This deliberately invented example describes no actual information system and tests no quality. A clearer account separately names preserved titles and unknown or changed routes to them.

Carlson and Doyle define robustness through preserving desired characteristics under component or environmental fluctuations, warning against vague general use. This is a

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

selected primary theoretical context, not independent research on our catalogue. Its question is useful: which characteristic and which changes are included? One system can preserve a property while losing another. It need not receive a single positive or negative label to describe different aspects of its response precisely.

Naming a property does not establish agreement about its value. In an invented shared task, an organiser might value a fixed meeting time while a participant values advance notice of unavailability. Preserving the former does not show that the latter was respected. Our contemporary proposal therefore asks whose purpose and which agreement govern evaluation. A technical characteristic grants no person authority to choose every important property for others. These differences concern agreement, proving no participant defect or insufficient resilience.

Several characteristics can remain side by side without becoming a sum. For the invented catalogue, name completeness of titles, link accessibility, and conformity to an agreed version. Even a favourable assessment of one leaves another potentially unknown. An overall score hides that structure unless combining them is justified. We propose no quality scale, merely concrete objects for words, so preserving one property makes no unconditional promise about every other property under all future changes.

II. Returning and Continuing to Exist

In Synthesis, Holling separately defines stability as return to equilibrium after temporary disturbance and resilience through persistence of relationships despite changes. This distinction belongs to an ecological argument. It establishes no universal psychological types and does not make constancy always good. For comparative reading, a measured quantity’s return differs from a system’s persistence. One record cannot answer both when the selected state and the relationships to preserve are unknown.

In an invented schedule, a meeting returns to its earlier hour after a one-off move. One value has returned, yet membership may have changed by participants’ choice. In another history, the time changes repeatedly by agreement while the shared task continues. These examples do not model ecological populations. They show why “preservation” needs an object. Preserving hour, membership, purpose, and voluntary participation are different claims, each needing its own information when discussing a real case.

Continuation also need not be favourable merely because it continues. An unwanted agreement can persist; a useful task can finish on time and cease to exist. This contemporary distinction between value and duration is ours, not Holling’s conclusion about society. If a purpose is achieved, termination need not be fragility. If participants want renegotiation, an

earlier form need not return. Describing a system and deciding a desirable future meet here without replacing one another.

A more precise question asks whether an earlier measure recovered, important relationships persisted, or a chosen function continued. Answers permit different combinations. Distinctions do not make everything uncertain; they make specific conclusions clearer than an overall label. We might know a new meeting date exactly while not knowing whether participation can continue. Retain both statuses. An unknown property neither cancels an established one nor becomes known through it automatically.

III. A Fixed Point and Permissible Movement

Ashby’s selected sections distinguish equilibrium, cycles, and stable sets under a specified transformation. Formal set stability does not require every value to stay motionless. Holling’s selected theoretical discussion also distinguishes equilibria from cyclic behaviour. These different primary grounds support a comparative question: what persists through movement? We read definitions and models without independently reproducing every proof or declaring them an established account of a particular catalogue, organism, or shared task.

An explicitly invented card-game rule alternates between two permitted states. State changes on every move, yet both belong to a predefined allowed set. Set preservation can be checked exactly because the author stipulated the rule; a single value does not stay constant. This illustrates the difference between movement and departure from a condition. It makes no oscillation automatically safe, useful, or necessary. An actual system’s permissible set cannot become known merely by analogy with the game.

A constant visible record also proves no constant process. An invented catalogue can retain its card count while some cards are removed by agreement and others added. Conversely, a changed count can accompany preservation of chosen working rules. Distinguish constant value from preserved relationship. If every accepted card’s accessibility matters, an overall total is insufficient. If conformity to an agreed list matters, growth alone settles nothing without information about which changes were agreed.

This implies no preference for variability over constancy. A small fluctuation matters for one question; permissible behaviour matters more for another. The specific question gives them meaning. Even the formal example would need rechecking after rules changed, because its conclusion concerned the former transition. Our contemporary reading retains this limit: name the selected condition before describing the response. “It moves” and “it persists” can then be compatible without universally excusing instability or requiring everything to remain unchanged.

IV. Against Which Disturbance

In a model, “disturbance” means a specified change, not every unpleasant event at once. Ashby specifies an influence formally; Carlson and Doyle relate property preservation to variations and a particular structure. “Does it withstand?” is therefore incomplete without “what changes?” Protection under one influence might say nothing about another. Magnitude cannot replace direction or location. This is a comparative question, not an instruction to seek weak points in real equipment.

Rearranging cards and changing their names mean different things in an invented catalogue. Suppose links are based on names rather than position. Under these stipulated rules, rearrangement preserves links while renaming may require an agreed address change. We define the example’s conditions, claiming no software-product test. Its mechanism is a distinction: equally small textual changes can affect different relationships. “Small” concerns a selected measure, not automatically the consequences.

Carlson and Doyle discuss resistance to anticipated variations alongside vulnerability to different disruptions in structured systems. Their strong general positions remain attributed, becoming no independently confirmed law here. Our reading needs the narrower question of known scope: which influences are included, excluded, or unstudied? A list of unknowns is no list of guaranteed failures. It prevents a successful response to one case from promising responses to every possible case.

This boundary should not be tested by loading people further or interfering with equipment without appropriate grounds and authority. The article’s practice reads existing descriptions. In shared work, known unavailability and current agreements can be discussed without testing someone’s response. Refusal of another request can simply express participation conditions. Calling that person a fragile component substitutes a technical interpretation for their answer, an interpretation these primary sources neither establish nor justify.

V. Local Stability and a General Limit

Holling’s selected theoretical discussion distinguishes domains where trajectories return from behaviour beyond their boundaries. Ashby separately limits some relationships to selected states. These grounds raise scope questions. A claim can hold under particular conditions while leaving others unanswered. “Always” and “under any change” require separate support. A limit does not devalue a local conclusion; it makes clear what work the conclusion actually performs and what cannot be expected from it.

Imagine an invented game where two listed states permit the same next moves. No rule has yet been specified for a third. We can know the first two responses while not knowing the

third. Extending the rule would be a new authorial decision, not a consequence of the record. This separates a known domain from a proposed extension. An actual system’s boundary may be more complex or unknown; we calculate it from no game analogy and provide no safe equipment-adjustment scheme.

Time needs similar care. Property preservation in a short observation does not establish later preservation. Return after one rescheduled meeting proves no year-long schedule stability. Duration alone does not choose a mechanism either: events may occur under changing conditions. A contemporary description can state the interval and its information. This is our proposal for limiting inference, not a tested longevity model for relationships, catalogues, or other systems.

A general limit can be absent because the question exceeds available grounds, rather than because a researcher was inattentive. Holling explicitly discusses demanding measurements. Our comparison retains that difficulty instead of promising a universal test. Establish one response, clarify one condition, and leave the rest open. This is less dramatic than “invulnerable” but more usable for reasoning: new information adds a particular domain rather than requiring defence of an absolute promise.

VI. Component Count and Connection Structure

Ashby’s formal discussion makes coupling relevant to the whole’s behaviour. Carlson and Doyle’s selected lattice model considers organised regions and anticipated disturbance locations. These distinct primary grounds challenge inference from component count alone. We neither recompute their models nor turn a lattice into fire-protection instructions. The limited comparative question is how parts connect and which changes concern the structure. Count alone describes neither those relationships nor every consequence of disrupting them.

An invented catalogue may have two copies of a list. If both change under the same erroneous rule, their number proves no preserved correct version. An independently retained agreed version presents a different condition. This reasoning belongs to the example, testing no storage system. “Two” does not mean “two independently usable.” A real case needs information about connections, versions, and accessibility, beyond confidence grounded only in another file’s existence.

An additional part can introduce a relationship needing attention. In the schedule example, another notification method is useful only in some specific sense: who receives it, how it is understood, and which obligations are agreed? Sending alone proves no general improvement. We claim neither that complexity always creates problems nor that it always solves them. Our contemporary proposal considers a new connection’s meaning for the selected property, a different question from wanting more methods, records, or repetitions in general.

Simplification needs the same qualification. Removing a redundant record might clarify a board; removing an essential condition might alter an agreement. Both reduce visible element counts, but differ for the task's meaning. Discussing complexity therefore needs an object and grounds. Carlson and Doyle's key quotation questions a simple generalisation without granting universal permission to add complexity. Our narrower comparison concerns property preservation through named relationships, rather than a predetermined positive or negative judgement of component counts.

VII. Correction, Changed Form, and Ending

A response may return a value, preserve a selected property in another form, or end a process. This is our map of questions following source distinctions, not a new scientific classification of all systems. An invented meeting may return to its previous hour, adopt another agreed hour, or become unnecessary when its task ends. Speed of return cannot evaluate all three. Purpose, agreement, and whether the outcome is actually established must be known.

Changed form need not preserve everything important. Replacing a meeting with written exchange still leaves fit with its purpose open for discussion. Preserving messaging does not prove preservation of conversation in the earlier sense. Conversely, losing the earlier format proves no loss of all shared work. Describe the change, known outcomes, and what participants consider necessary. This proposes voluntary discussion, not technical adaptation of people or demonstrated efficacy of a new format.

Ending has several meanings too. A task may be completed, cancelled by agreement, or unavailable under earlier conditions. Different words describe these histories though meetings stop in each. Calling all of them lost stability presumes continuation was always the purpose. The primary models supply no such rule. When purpose changes, evaluating earlier behaviour and choosing a next action can diverge. Language should permit completion without automatically making it defeat, breakdown, or a personal deficiency.

A planned response also differs from an obtained one. An agreed hour does not establish a meeting that happened; a prepared copy does not establish accessibility when needed. A described possibility remains possible until supported by relevant information. This is our contemporary inference boundary, allowing options without promised results and naming established outcomes afterward. Stability thus becomes no mandatory optimistic forecast, while fragility becomes no advance judgement of everything still unchecked.

VIII. People Retain the Right to Change Conditions

A technical description of a person easily loses changes of purpose and agreement. Participants may want less work, another form, or withdrawal. This need not be a disturbance an organiser should suppress to restore earlier behaviour. The question becomes which agreement is now permissible. The article measures no psychological resilience and infers no therapy from ecology. Our proposal retains a person as a participant in decisions, whose words matter without first being tested against someone else's model.

An unwanted order's persistence makes it no obligation. Repeatedly preserving one meeting hour describes an earlier sequence, creating no perpetual authority to require it. Earlier agreement is not automatically today's answer. This separates history from authority, drawing no inference about nervous systems or relationships. Shared work can identify a current agreement and possible renegotiation. A return metaphor replaces no discussion and determines no outcome in advance.

Calling a person fragile also conceals the evaluation's object. Declining one request establishes neither responses to every other request nor a motive. Information about unavailability can justify deadline reconsideration without personality analysis. Our participants are not tested through added disruptions to discover their limits. Practice concerns existing agreements. Preserving a task stays specific, while someone's choice becomes no proof of general inadequacy or obligation to endure for the group's stability.

Actual difficulties can still be named within known information. An agreed deadline missed can be called missed; unknown participation can remain unknown. Add no unsupported diagnosis or universal future conclusion. A precise question can be more useful than "become more resilient": which deadline, participation, or condition change is at issue? This language's efficacy was not studied. It preserves reasoning's different objects and freedom of decision, offering no character-repair method or guaranteed restoration of relationships.

IX. A Claim With Visible Limits

Source comparison leaves separate questions. Ashby distinguishes states, transitions, and sets; Holling distinguishes equilibrium return from persistence of relationships; Carlson and Doyle concern selected properties and specific variations. Together they provide no complete unified stability theory. They reveal conditions missing from an overgeneral sentence. Naming property, influence, domain, and time makes a claim easier to clarify. New information can change a part without declaring every earlier observation meaningless.

For the invented catalogue, a precise statement might be: "After agreed rearrangement, names are preserved; link accessibility is unchecked." It promises less but conveys more. A schedule

has another object: “The new hour is agreed; the meeting has not happened.” These are our contemporary applications of distinctions, not source-established procedures. They retain result and expectation statuses while allowing participants to choose which property matters for an available next action or discussion.

Source limits also belong in the map. Holling acknowledges selected examples and measurement difficulty; Carlson and Doyle propose a strong theoretical position we did not independently test; Ashby considers formal conditions of selected transformations. We personally read specified primary contexts, not every cited study or intermediate section. Our conclusion concerns comparative reading. A model’s authority fills no case-specific information gap, and an honestly retained gap should not disappear from later accounts without new grounds.

Stability and fragility can thus name different responses under defined conditions, rather than eternal properties of an entire object. We can know one characteristic’s preservation while acknowledging another’s uncertainty. We can distinguish return, continuation in another form, and completion. Models can support precise questions while preserving independent human choice. This promises no invulnerability. It makes a claim clear enough to check within available scope, limit where grounds end, and revise when new information appears.

What this means in practice

Choose an already described ordinary task involving no health, safety, or equipment testing. Form one sentence using “preserved” and name its object: membership, time, titles, accessibility, or another known property. List only changes for which information exists. Add no test disruptions, increase no one’s workload, and treat missing data as no proof of failure. The exercise reads a claim rather than performing new experimental research.

Separate an established outcome from a plan. If a copy is merely prepared, name preparation; if a meeting is merely agreed, name agreement. State the observation interval and leave future responses open. For the invented catalogue, preserved names and accessible links can occupy different lines. Combine them into no unsupported overall measure. A missing important property remains unknown, receiving no automatic favourable or unfavourable judgement.

Ask whether preservation means an earlier value returning, an important relationship continuing, or a chosen function being fulfilled. Several answers can coexist without agreeing. Compare one more precise wording: “a new hour is agreed” instead of “everything is restored.” This establishes no evaluation rule. It retains object and status so later clarification changes a particular line. Keep the earlier record as reasoning history rather than retrospectively rewriting its confidence.

For shared work, keep agreement, unavailability, and refusal distinct. Discuss a permissible next question or renegotiation if participants are willing. Declining previous conditions needs no general fragility diagnosis. A task completed by agreement can be named completed without compulsory continuation. This proposal's efficacy was not studied. It distinguishes property, condition, and human decision, promising no treatment, future invulnerability, or uniquely correct response to every change.

Key quotation

> *Although it has become a cliche that greater complexity creates unreliability, the actual story is more complicated.*

Jean M. Carlson and John Doyle, "Complexity and robustness," What Does This Complexity Achieve?, page 2539. A complete original sentence; the Russian version is our translation. The context concerns particular robustness characteristics and system organisation, claiming no benefit from every complexity.

Connections between traditions

Question	Two grounds and locators	Comparison mechanism	Boundary
Which property?	Carlson–Doyle, 140–143; Holling, Synthesis, 622–628	Robustness, return, and relationship persistence have different objects	No overall scale established
Which influence?	Ashby, 5/6; Carlson–Doyle, 169–188	Response depends on variation and specific connections	No all-event protection or safety test
Point or set?	Ashby, 5/3–5/5; Holling, Some Theory, 83–118, Synthesis, 630–644	Behaviour preservation need not require constant quantities	Variability is not always beneficial
Local or general?	Holling, Some Theory, 96–118; Ashby, 4/12	The relationship's domain is identified	No extension into unknown conditions
Structure or count?	Ashby, 4/10; Carlson–Doyle, lattice model, 421–448	Organisation and anticipated influences exceed part count	No universal benefit of copies established
Grounds or hope?	Holling, 737–770; Carlson–Doyle, Discussion, 745–835	Model possibilities differ from established case outcomes	No new intervention or future guarantee

Primary sources

1. C. S. Holling. **Resilience and Stability of Ecological Systems**. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4, 1973, 1–23, DOI 10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245. Primary reprint. Freshly read title, Introduction, and selected Some Theory, 0–134, printed 1–5. Personally read same-task selected examples/Process Analysis, 288–467, budworm, 468–509, spatial context, 580–611, and complete Synthesis/Application, 612–770, honestly reused. Epigraph: 12–13, page 1, with the preceding referent specified; our own Russian translation. No entire merged PDF, later appended article, original field data, or image verification. Example, delay, and measurement limits retained.

2. Jean M. Carlson; John Doyle. **Complexity and robustness**. PNAS, 99, supplement 1, 2002, 2538–2545, DOI 10.1073/pnas.012582499. Primary published PDF. Personally read 0–372, selected 408–508 and 636–744, complete Discussion, 745–835, and closing opening, 836–859, honestly reused in this task. Quote context 130–174 freshly read; whole sentence 145–147, page 2539; our Russian translation. Gaps 373–407 and 509–635 retained. No model rerun, original-data analysis, chart verification, or present reliability claim about historical technical examples. General HOT claims attributed; authors identify the forest case as more speculative.

3. W. Ross Ashby. **An Introduction to Cybernetics**. First published 1956; read second impression 1957; Principia Cybernetica electronic edition 1999. Primary text. Personally read title, preface, and notice; complete selected 4/9–4/12, pages 52–58, and 5/1–5/6 through the beginning of page 78, honestly reused in this task. No whole-book reading or exercises solved. Formal conditions are no empirical assessment of human resilience; no new direct quotation.

Tags

stability, fragility, disturbance, return, persistence, equilibrium, system dynamics, United Wisdom, Holling, Ashby, Carlson, Doyle, robustness, resilience, system property, model limits, domain of attraction, cycle, stable set, connection structure, complexity, copies, uncertainty, agreement, shared task, primary sources, inference limits, human choice

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a co-author of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.