

Herbert A. Simon



The Sciences of the Artificial

Third Edition

Contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Preface to Third Edition | ix |
| Preface to Second Edition | xi |
| 1 Understanding the Natural and Artificial Worlds | 1 |
| 2 Economic Rationality: Adaptive Artifice | 25 |
| 3 The Psychology of Thinking: Embedding Artifice in Nature | 51 |
| 4 Remembering and Learning: Memory As Environment for Thought | 85 |
| 5 The Science of Design: Creating the Artificial | 111 |
| 6 Social Planning: Designing the Evolving Artifact | 139 |
| 7 Alternative Views of Complexity | 169 |
| 8 The Architecture of Complexity: Hierarchic Systems | 183 |
| Name Index | 217 |
| Subject Index | 221 |

Preface to Third Edition

As the Earth has made more than 5,000 rotations since *The Sciences of the Artificial* was last revised, in 1981, it is time to ask what changes in our understanding of the world call for changes in the text.

Of particular relevance is the recent vigorous eruption of interest in complexity and complex systems. In the previous editions of this book I commented only briefly on the relation between general ideas about complexity and the particular hierarchic form of complexity with which the book is chiefly concerned. I now introduce a new chapter to remedy this deficit. It will appear that the devotees of complexity (among whom I count myself) are a rather motley crew, not at all unified in our views on reductionism. Various among us favor quite different tools for analyzing complexity and speak nowadays of "chaos," "adaptive systems," and "genetic algorithms." In the new chapter 7, "Alternative Views of Complexity" ("The Architecture of Complexity" having become chapter 8), I sort out these themes and draw out the implications of artificiality and hierarchy for complexity.

Most of the remaining changes in this third edition aim at updating the text. In particular, I have taken account of important advances that have been made since 1981 in cognitive psychology (chapters 3 and 4) and the science of design (chapters 5 and 6). It is gratifying that continuing rapid progress in both of these domains has called for numerous new references that record the advances, while at the same time confirm and extend the book's basic theses about the artificial sciences. Changes in emphases in chapter 2 reflect progress in my thinking about the respective roles of organizations and markets in economic systems.

Preface to Second Edition

This work takes the shape of fugues, whose subject and counter subject were first uttered in lectures on the opposite sides of a continent and the two ends of a decade but are now woven together as the alternating chapters of the whole.

The invitation to deliver the Karl Taylor Compton lectures at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the spring of 1968 provided me with a welcome opportunity to make explicit and to develop at some length a thesis that has been central to much of my research, at first in organization theory, later in economics and management science, and most recently in psychology.

In 1980 another invitation, this one to deliver the H. Rowan Gaither lectures at the University of California, Berkeley, permitted me to amend and expand this thesis and to apply it to several additional fields.

The thesis is that certain phenomena are "artificial" in a very specific sense: they are as they are only because of a system's being moulded, by goals or purposes, to the environment in which it lives. If natural phenomena have an air of "necessity" about them in their subservience to natural law, artificial phenomena have an air of "contingency" in their malleability by environment.

The contingency of artificial phenomena has always created doubts as to whether they fall properly within the compass of science. Sometimes these doubts refer to the goal-directed character of artificial systems and the consequent difficulty of disentangling prescription from description. This seems to me not to be the real difficulty. The genuine problem is to show how empirical propositions can be made at all about systems that, given different circumstances, might be quite other than they are.

Almost as soon as I began research on administrative organizations, some forty years ago, I encountered the problem of artificiality in almost its pure form:

. . . administration is not unlike play-acting. The task of the good actor is to know and play his role, although different roles may differ greatly in content. The effectiveness of the performance will depend on the effectiveness of the play and the effectiveness with which it is played. The effectiveness of the administrative process will vary with the effectiveness of the organization and the effectiveness with which its members play their parts. [*Administrative Behavior*, p. 252]

How then could one construct a theory of administration that would contain more than the normative rules of good acting? In particular, how could one construct an empirical theory? My writing on administration, particularly in *Administrative Behavior* and part IV of *Models of Man*, has sought to answer those questions by showing that the empirical content of the phenomena, the necessity that rises above the contingencies, stems from the inabilities of the behavioral system to adapt perfectly to its environment from the limits of rationality, as I have called them.

As research took me into other areas, it became evident that the problem of artificiality was not peculiar to administration and organizations but that it infected a far wider range of subjects. Economics, since it postulated rationality in economic man, made him the supremely skillful actor, whose behavior could reveal something of the requirements the environment placed on him but nothing about his own cognitive makeup. But the difficulty must then extend beyond economics into all those parts of psychology concerned with rational behavior thinking, problem solving, learning.

Finally, I thought I began to see in the problem of artificiality an explanation of the difficulty that has been experienced in filling engineering and other professions with empirical and theoretical substance distinct from the substance of their supporting sciences. Engineering, medicine, business, architecture, and painting are concerned not with the necessary but with the contingent not with how things are but with how they might be in short, with design. The possibility of creating a science or sciences of design is exactly as great as the possibility of creating any science of the artificial. The two possibilities stand or fall together.

These essays then attempt to explain how a science of the artificial is possible and to illustrate its nature. I have taken as my main examples the

fields of economics (chapter 2), the psychology of cognition (chapters 3 and 4), and planning and engineering design (chapters 5 and 6). Since Karl Compton was a distinguished engineering educator as well as a distinguished scientist, I thought it not inappropriate to apply my conclusions about design to the question of reconstructing the engineering curriculum (chapter 5). Similarly Rowan Gaither's strong interest in the uses of systems analysis in public policy formation is reflected especially in chapter 6.

The reader will discover in the course of the discussion that artificiality is interesting principally when it concerns complex systems that live in complex environments. The topics of artificiality and complexity are inextricably interwoven. For this reason I have included in this volume (chapter 8) an earlier essay, "The Architecture of Complexity," which develops at length some ideas about complexity that I could touch on only briefly in my lectures. The essay appeared originally in the December 1962 *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*.

I have tried to acknowledge some specific debts to others in footnotes at appropriate points in the text. I owe a much more general debt to Allen Newell, whose partner I have been in a very large part of my work for more than two decades and to whom I have dedicated this volume. If there are parts of my thesis with which he disagrees, they are probably wrong; but he cannot evade a major share of responsibility for the rest.

Many ideas, particularly in the third and fourth chapters had their origins in work that my late colleague, Lee W. Gregg, and I did together; and other colleagues, as well as numerous present and former graduate students, have left their fingerprints on various pages of the text. Among the latter I want to mention specifically L. Stephen Coles, Edward A. Feigenbaum, John Grason, Pat Langley, Robert K. Lindsay, David Neves, Ross Quillian, Laurent Siklóssy, Donald S. Williams, and Thomas G. Williams, whose work is particularly relevant to the topics discussed here.

Previous versions of chapter 8 incorporated valuable suggestions and data contributed by George W. Corner, Richard H. Meier, John R. Platt, Andrew Schoene, Warren Weaver, and William Wise.

A large part of the psychological research reported in this book was supported by the Public Health Service Research Grant MH-07722 from the National Institute of Mental Health, and some of the research on

design reported in the fifth and sixth chapters, by the Advanced Research Projects Agency of the Office of the Secretary of Defense (SD-146). These grants, as well as support from the Carnegie Corporation, the Ford Foundation, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, have enabled us at Carnegie-Mellon to pursue for over two decades a many-pronged exploration aimed at deepening our understanding of artificial phenomena.

Finally, I am grateful to the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and to the University of California, Berkeley, for the opportunity to prepare and present these lectures and for the occasion to become better acquainted with the research in the sciences of the artificial going forward on these two stimulating campuses.

I want to thank both institutions also for agreeing to the publication of these lectures in this unified form, The Compton lectures comprise chapters 1, 3, and 5, and the Gaither lectures, chapters 2, 4, and 6. Since the first edition of this book (The MIT Press, 1969) has been well received, I have limited the changes in chapters 1, 3, 5, and 8 to the correction of blatant errors, the updating of a few facts, and the addition of some transitional paragraphs.

5

The Science of Design: Creating the Artificial

Historically and traditionally, it has been the task of the science disciplines to teach about natural things: how they are and how they work. It has been the task of engineering schools to teach about artificial things: how to make artifacts that have desired properties and how to design.

Engineers are not the only professional designers. Everyone designs who devises courses of action aimed at changing existing situations into preferred ones. The intellectual activity that produces material artifacts is no different fundamentally from the one that prescribes remedies for a sick patient or the one that devises a new sales plan for a company or a social welfare policy for a state. Design, so construed, is the core of all professional training; it is the principal mark that distinguishes the professions from the sciences. Schools of engineering, as well as schools of architecture, business, education, law, and medicine, are all centrally concerned with the process of design.

In view of the key role of design in professional activity, it is ironic that in this century the natural sciences almost drove the sciences of the artificial from professional school curricula, a development that peaked about two or three decades after the Second World War. Engineering schools gradually became schools of physics and mathematics; medical schools became schools of biological science; business schools became schools of finite mathematics. The use of adjectives like "applied" concealed, but did not change, the fact. It simply meant that in the professional schools those topics were selected from mathematics and the natural sciences for emphasis which were thought to be most nearly relevant to professional practice. It did not mean that design continued to be taught, as distinguished from analysis.

The movement toward natural science and away from the sciences of the artificial proceeded further and faster in engineering, business, and medicine than in the other professional fields I have mentioned, though it has by no means been absent from schools of law, journalism, and library science. The stronger universities were more deeply affected than the weaker, and the graduate programs more than the undergraduate. During that time few doctoral dissertations in first-rate professional schools dealt with genuine design problems, as distinguished from problems in solid-state physics or stochastic processes. I have to make partial exceptions for reasons I shall mention of dissertations in computer science and management science, and there were undoubtedly some others, for example, in chemical engineering.

Such a universal phenomenon must have had a basic cause. It did have a very obvious one. As professional schools, including the independent engineering schools, were more and more absorbed into the general culture of the university, they hankered after academic respectability. In terms of the prevailing norms, academic respectability calls for subject matter that is intellectually tough, analytic, formalizable, and teachable. In the past much, if not most, of what we knew about design and about the artificial sciences was intellectually soft, intuitive, informal, and cook-booky. Why would anyone in a university stoop to teach or learn about designing machines or planning market strategies when he could concern himself with solid-state physics? The answer has been clear: he usually wouldn't.

The damage to professional competence caused by the loss of design from professional curricula gradually gained recognition in engineering and medicine and to a lesser extent in business. Some schools did not think it a problem (and a few still do not), because they regarded schools of applied science as a superior alternative to the trade schools of the past. If that were the choice, we could agree.¹ But neither alternative is

¹ That was in fact the choice in our engineering schools a generation ago. The schools needed to be purged of vocationalism; and a genuine science of design did not exist even in a rudimentary form as an alternative. Hence, introducing more fundamental science was the road forward. This was a main theme in Karl Taylor Compton's presidential inaugural address at MIT in 1930:

I hope . . . that increasing attention in the Institute may be given to the fundamental sciences; that they may achieve as never before the spirit and results of re-

(footnote continued on next page)

satisfactory. The older kind of professional school did not know how to educate for professional design at an intellectual level appropriate to a university; the newer kind of school nearly abdicated responsibility for training in the core professional skill. Thus we were faced with a problem of devising a professional school that could attain two objectives simultaneously: education in both artificial and natural science at a high intellectual level. This too is a problem of design organizational design.

The kernel of the problem lies in the phrase "artificial science." The previous chapters have shown that a science of artificial phenomena is always in imminent danger of dissolving and vanishing. The peculiar properties of the artifact lie on the thin interface between the natural laws within it and the natural laws without. What can we say about it? What is there to study besides the boundary sciences those that govern the means and the task environment?

The artificial world is centered precisely on this interface between the inner and outer environments; it is concerned with attaining goals by adapting the former to the latter. The proper study of those who are concerned with the artificial is the way in which that adaptation of means to environments is brought about and central to that is the process of design itself. The professional schools can reassume their professional responsibilities just to the degree that they discover and teach a science of design, a body of intellectually tough, analytic, partly formalizable, partly empirical, teachable doctrine about the design process.

It is the thesis of this chapter that such a science of design not only is possible but also has been emerging since the mid-1970s. In fact, it is fair to say that the first edition of this book, published in 1969, was influential in its development, serving as a call to action and outlining the form that the action could take. At Carnegie Mellon University, one of the first engineering schools to move toward research on the process of design, the

(footnote continued from previous page)

search; that all courses of instruction may be examined carefully to see where training in details has been unduly emphasized at the expense of the more powerful training in all-embracing fundamental principles.

Notice that President Compton's emphasis was on "fundamental" an emphasis as sound today as it was in 1930. What is called for is not a departure from the fundamental but an inclusion in the curriculum of the fundamental in engineering along with the fundamental in natural science. That was not possible in 1930; but it is possible today.

initial step was to form a Design Research Center, about 1975. The Center (since 1985 called the "Engineering Design Research Center") facilitated collaboration among the faculty and students undertaking research on the science and practice of design and developed elements of a theory of design that found their way back into the undergraduate and graduate curricula. The Center continues to play an important role in the modernization and strengthening of education and research in design at Carnegie Mellon and elsewhere in the United States.

In substantial part, design theory is aimed at broadening the capabilities of computers to aid design, drawing upon the tools of artificial intelligence and operations research. Hence, research on many aspects of computer-aided design is being pursued with growing intensity in computer science, engineering and architecture departments, and in operations research groups in business schools. The need to make design theory explicit and precise in order to introduce computers into the process has been the key to establishing its academic acceptability its appropriateness for a university. In the remainder of this chapter I will take up some of the topics that need to be incorporated in a theory of design and in instruction in design.

The Logic of Design: Fixed Alternatives

We must start with some questions of logic.² The natural sciences are concerned with how things are. Ordinary systems of logic the standard propositional and predicate calculi, say serve these sciences well. Since the concern of standard logic is with declarative statements, it is well suited for assertions about the world and for inferences from those assertions.

Design, on the other hand, is concerned with how things ought to be, with devising artifacts to attain goals. We might question whether the

². I have treated the question of logical formalism for design at greater length in two earlier papers: "The Logic of Rational Decision," *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 16(1965):169-186; and "The Logic of Heuristic Decision Making," in Nicholas Rescher (ed.), *The Logic of Decision and Action* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1967), pp. 1-35. The present discussion is based on these two papers, which have been reprinted as chapters 3.1 and 3.2 in my *Models of Discovery* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel Pub. Co., 1977).

forms of reasoning that are appropriate to natural science are suitable also for design. One might well suppose that introduction of the verb "should" may require additional rules of inference, or modification of the rules already imbedded in declarative logic.

Paradoxes of Imperative Logic

Various "paradoxes" have been constructed to demonstrate the need for a distinct logic of imperatives, or a normative, deontic logic. In ordinary logic from "Dogs are pets" and "Cats are pets," one can infer "Dogs and cats are pets." But from "Dogs are pets," "Cats are pets;" and "You should keep pets," can one infer "You should keep cats and dogs"? And from "Give me needle and thread!" can one deduce, in analogy with declarative logic, "Give me needle or thread! "? Easily frustrated people would perhaps rather have neither needle nor thread than one without the other, and peace-loving people, neither cats nor dogs, rather than both.

As a response to these challenges of apparent paradox, there have been developed a number of constructions of modal logic for handling "shoulds," "shalts;" and "oughts" of various kinds. I think it is fair to say that none of these systems has been sufficiently developed or sufficiently widely applied to demonstrate that it is adequate to handle the logical requirements of the process of design.

Fortunately, such a demonstration is really not essential, for it can be shown that the requirements of design can be met fully by a modest adaptation of ordinary declarative logic. Thus a special logic of imperatives is unnecessary.

I should like to underline the word "unnecessary," which does not mean "impossible." Modal logics can be shown to exist in the same way that giraffes can namely, by exhibiting some of them. The question is not whether they exist, but whether they are needed for, or even useful for, design.

Reduction to Declarative Logic

The easiest way to discover what kinds of logic are needed for design is to examine what kinds of logic designers use when they are being careful about their reasoning. Now there would be no point in doing this if designers were always sloppy fellows who reasoned loosely, vaguely, and

intuitively. Then we might say that whatever logic they used was not the logic they *should* use.

However, there exists a considerable area of design practice where standards of rigor in inference are as high as one could wish. I refer to the domain of so-called "optimization methods," most highly developed in statistical decision theory and management science but acquiring growing importance also in engineering design theory. The theories of probability and utility, and their intersection, have received the painstaking attention not only of practical designers and decision makers but also of a considerable number of the most distinguished logicians and mathematicians of recent generations. F. P. Ramsey, B. de Finetti, A. Wald, J. von Neumann, J. Neyman, K. Arrow, and L. J. Savage are examples.

The logic of optimization methods can be sketched as follows: The "inner environment" of the design problem is represented by a set of given alternatives of action. The alternatives may be given *in extenso*: more commonly they are specified in terms of *command variables* that have defined domains. The "outer environment" is represented by a set of parameters, which may be known with certainty or only in terms of a probability distribution. The goals for adaptation of inner to outer environment are defined by a utility function a function, usually scalar, of the command variables and environmental parameters perhaps supplemented by a number of constraints (inequalities, say, between functions of the command variables and environmental parameters). The optimization problem is to find an admissible set of values of the command variables, compatible with the constraints, that maximize the utility function for the given values of the environmental parameters. (In the probabilistic case we might say, "maximize the expected value of the utility function," for instance, instead of "maximize the utility function.")

A stock application of this paradigm is the so-called "diet problem" shown in figure 6. A list of foods is provided, the command variables being quantities of the various foods to be included in the diet. The environmental parameters are the prices and nutritional contents (calories, vitamins, minerals, and so on) of each of the foods. The utility function is the cost (with a minus sign attached) of the diet, subject to the constraints, say, that it not contain more than 2,000 calories per day, that it




Figure 6
The paradigm for imperative logic

meet specified minimum needs for vitamins and minerals, and that rutabaga not be eaten more than once a week. The constraints may be viewed as characterizing the inner environment. The problem is to select the quantities of foods that will meet the nutritional requirements and side conditions at the given prices for the lowest cost.

The diet problem is a simple example of a class of problems that are readily handled, even when the number of variables is exceedingly large, by the mathematical formalism known as linear programming. I shall come back to the technique a little later. My present concern is with the logic of the matter.

Since the optimization problem, once formalized, is a standard mathematical problem to maximize a function subject to constraints it is evident that the logic used to deduce the answer is the standard logic of the predicate calculus on which mathematics rests. How does the formalism avoid making use of a special logic of imperatives? It does so by dealing with sets of *possible worlds*: First consider all the possible worlds that meet the constraints of the outer environment; then find the particular world in the set that meets the remaining constraints of the goal and

maximizes the utility function. The logic is exactly the same as if we were to adjoin the goal constraints and the maximization requirement, as new "natural laws," to the existing natural laws embodied in the environmental conditions.³ We simply ask what values the command variables *would* have in a world meeting all these conditions and conclude that these are the values the command variables *should* have.

Computing the Optimum

Our discussion thus far has already provided us with two central topics for the curriculum in the science of design:

1. *Utility theory and statistical decision theory as a logical framework for rational choice among given alternatives.*
2. *The body of techniques for actually deducing which of the available alternatives is the optimum.*

Only in trivial cases is the computation of the optimum alternative an easy matter (Recall Chapter 2). If utility theory is to have application to real-life design problems, it must be accompanied by tools for actually making the computations. The dilemma of the rational chess player is familiar to all. The optimal strategy in chess is easily demonstrated: simply assign a value of + 1 to a win, 0 to a draw, 1 to a loss; consider all possible courses of play; mini max backward from the outcome of each, assuming each player will take the most favorable move at any given point. This procedure will determine what move to make now. The only trouble is that the computations required are astronomical (the number 10^{120} is often mentioned in this context) and hence cannot be carried out not by humans, not by existing computers, not by prospective computers.

A theory of design as applied to the game of chess would encompass not only the utopian mini max principle but also some practicable pro-

³ The use of the notion of "possible worlds" to embed the logic of imperatives in declarative logic goes back at least to Jørgen Jørgensen, "Imperatives and Logic," *Erkenntnis*, 7(1937 1938):288 296. See also my *Administrative Behavior* (New York: Macmillan, 1947), chapter 3. Typed logics can be used to distinguish, as belonging to different types, statements that are true under different conditions (i.e., in different possible worlds), but, as my example shows, even this device is not usually needed. Each new equation or constraint we introduce into a system reduces the set of possible states to a subset of those previously possible.

cedures for finding good moves in actual board positions in real time, within the computational capacities of real human beings or real computers. The best procedures of this kind that exist today are still those stored in the memories of grandmasters, having the characteristics I described in chapters 3 and 4. But there are now several computer programs that can rather regularly defeat all but a few of the strongest human grandmasters. Even these programs do not possess anything like the chess knowledge of human masters, but succeed by a combination of brute-force computation (sometimes hundreds of millions of variations are analysed) with a good deal of "book" knowledge of opening variations and a reasonably sophisticated criterion function for evaluating positions.

The second topic then for the curriculum in the science of design consists in the efficient computational techniques that are available for actually finding optimum courses of action in real situations, or reasonable approximations to real situations. As I mentioned in chapter 2, that topic has a number of important components today, most of them developed at least to the level of practical application within the past years. These include linear programming theory, dynamic programming, geometric programming, queuing theory, and control theory.

Finding Satisfactory Actions

The subject of computational techniques need not be limited to optimization. Traditional engineering design methods make much more use of inequalities specifications of satisfactory performance than of maxima and minima. So-called "figures of merit" permit comparison between designs in terms of "better" and "worse" but seldom provide a judgment of "best." For example, I may cite the root-locus methods employed in the design of control systems.

Since there did not seem to be any word in English for decision methods that look for good or satisfactory solutions instead of optimal ones, some years ago I introduced the term "satisficing" to refer to such procedures. Now no one in his right mind will satisfice if he can equally well optimize; no one will settle for good or better if he can have best. But that is not the way the problem usually poses itself in actual design situations.

In chapter 2 I argued that in the real world we usually do not have a choice between satisfactory and optimal solutions, for we only rarely have

a method of finding the optimum. Consider, for example, the well-known combinatorial problem called the traveling salesman problem: given the geographical locations of a set of cities, find the routing that will take a salesman to all the cities with the shortest mileage.⁴ For this problem there is a straightforward optimizing algorithm (analogous to the mini max algorithm for chess): try all possible routings, and pick the shortest. But for any considerable number of cities, the algorithm is computationally infeasible (the number of routes through N cities will be $N!$). Although some ways have been found for cutting down the length of the search, no algorithm has been discovered sufficiently powerful to solve the traveling salesman problem with a tolerable amount of computing for a set of, say, fifty cities.

Rather than keep our salesman at home, we shall prefer of course to find a satisfactory, if not optimal, routing for him. Under most circumstances, common sense will probably arrive at a fairly good route, but an even better one can often be found by one or another of several heuristic methods.

An earmark of all these situations where we satisfice for inability to optimize is that, although the set of available alternatives is "given" in a certain abstract sense (we can define a generator guaranteed to generate all of them eventually), it is not "given" in the only sense that is practically relevant. We cannot within practicable computational limits generate all the admissible alternatives and compare their respective merits. Nor can we recognize the best alternative, even if we are fortunate enough to generate it early, until we have seen all of them. We satisfice by looking for alternatives in such a way that we can generally find an acceptable one after only moderate search.

Now in many satisficing situations, the expected length of search for an alternative meeting specified standards of acceptability depends on how high the standards are set, but it depends hardly at all on the total size of the universe to be searched. The time required for a search through a haystack for a needle sharp enough to sew with depends on the density of distribution of sharp needles but not on the total size of the stack.

⁴. "The traveling salesman problem" and a number of closely analogous combinatorial problems such as-the "warehouse location problem" have considerable practical importance, for instance, in siting central power stations for an interconnected grid.

Hence, when we use satisficing methods, it often does not matter whether or not the total set of admissible alternatives is "given" by a formal but impracticable algorithm. It often does not even matter how big that set is. For this reason satisficing methods may be extendable to design problems in that broad range where the set of alternatives is not "given" even in the quixotic sense that it is "given" for the traveling salesman problem. Our next task is to examine this possibility.

The Logic of Design: Finding Alternatives

When we take up the case where the design alternatives are not given in any constructive sense but must be synthesized, we must ask once more whether any new forms of reasoning are involved in the synthesis, or whether again the standard logic of declarative statements is all we need.

In the case of optimization we asked: "Of all possible worlds (those attainable for some admissible values of the action variables), which is the best (yields the highest value of the criterion function)?" As we saw, this is a purely empirical question, calling only for facts and ordinary declarative reasoning to answer it.

In this case, where we are seeking a satisfactory alternative, once we have found a candidate we can ask: "Does this alternative satisfy all the design criteria?" Clearly this is also a factual question and raises no new issues of logic. But how about the process of *searching* for candidates? What kind of logic is needed for the search?

Means-Ends Analysis

The condition of any goal-seeking system is that it is connected to the outside environment through two kinds of channels: the afferent, or sensory, channels through which it receives information about the environment and the efferent, or motor, channels through which it acts on the environment.⁵ The system must have some means of storing in its memory information about states of the world afferent, or sensory, information

⁵. Notice that we are not saying that the two kinds of channels operate independently of each other, since they surely do not in living organisms, but that we can distinguish conceptually, and to some extent neurologically, between the incoming and outgoing flows.

and information about actions efferent, or motor, information. Ability to attain goals depends on building up associations, which may be simple or very complex, between particular changes in states of the world and particular actions that will (reliably or not) bring these changes about. In chapter 4 we described these associations as productions.

Except for a few built-in reflexes, an infant has no basis for correlating its sensory information with its actions. A very important part of its early learning is that particular actions or sequences of actions will bring about particular changes in the state of the sensed world. Until the infant builds up this knowledge, the world of sense and the motor world are two entirely separate, entirely unrelated worlds. Only as it begins to acquire experience as to how elements of the one relate to elements of the other can it act purposefully on the world.

The computer problem-solving program called GPS, designed to model some of the main features of human problem solving, exhibits in stark form how goal-directed action depends on building this kind of bridge between the afferent and the efferent worlds. On the afferent, or sensory, side, GPS must be able to represent desired situations or desired objects as well as the present situation. It must be able also to represent *differences* between the desired and the present. On the efferent side, GPS must be able to represent *actions* that change objects or situations. To behave purposefully, GPS must be able to select from time to time those particular actions that are likely to remove the particular differences between desired and present states that the system detects. In the machinery of GPS, this selection is achieved through a *table of connections*, which associates with each kind of detectable difference those actions that are relevant to reducing that difference. These are its associations, in the form of productions, which relate the afferent to the efferent world. Since reaching a goal generally requires a sequence of actions, and since some attempts may be ineffective, GPS must also have means for detecting the progress it is making (the changes in the differences between the actual and the desired) and for trying alternate paths.

The Logic of Search

GPS then is a system that searches selectively through a (possibly large) environment in order to discover and assemble sequences of actions that

will lead it from a given situation to a desired situation. What are the rules of logic that govern such a search? Is anything more than standard logic involved? Do we require a modal logic to rationalize the process?

Standard logic would seem to suffice. To represent the relation between the afferent and the efferent worlds, we conceive GPS as moving through a large maze. The nodes of the maze represent situations, described afferently; the paths joining one node to another are the actions, described as motor sequences, that will transform the one situation into the other. At any given moment GPS is always faced with a single question: "What action shall I try next?" Since GPS has some imperfect knowledge about the relations of actions to changes in the situation, this becomes a question of choice under uncertainty of a kind already discussed in a previous section.

It is characteristic of the search for alternatives that the solution, the complete action that constitutes the final design, is built from a sequence of component actions. The enormous size of the space of alternatives arises out of the innumerable ways in which the component actions, which need not be very numerous, can be combined into sequences.

Much is gained by considering the component actions in place of the sequences that constitute complete actions, because the situation when viewed afferently usually factors into components that match at least approximately the component actions derived from an efferent factorization. The reasoning implicit in GPS is that, if a desired situation differs from a present situation by differences D_1, D_2, \dots, D_n , and if action A_1 removes differences of type D_1 , action A_2 removes differences of type D_2 , and so on, then the present situation can be transformed into the desired situation by performing the sequence of actions $A_1 A_2 \dots A_n$.

This reasoning is by no means valid in terms of the rules of standard logic in all possible worlds. Its validity requires some rather strong assumptions about the independence of the effects of the several actions on the several differences. One might say that the reasoning is valid in worlds that are "additive" or "factorable" in a certain sense. (The air of paradox about the cat-dog and needle-thread examples cited earlier arises precisely from the non additivity of the actions in these two cases. The first is, in economists' language, a case of decreasing returns; the second, a case of increasing returns.)

Now the real worlds to which problem solvers and designers address themselves are seldom completely additive in this sense. Actions have side consequences (may create new differences) and sometimes can only be taken when certain side conditions are satisfied (call for removal of other differences before they become applicable). Under these circumstances one can never be certain that a partial sequence of actions that accomplishes *certain* goals can be augmented to provide a solution that satisfies *all* the conditions and attains *all* the goals (even though they be satisficing goals) of the problem.

For this reason problem-solving systems and design procedures in the real world do not merely *assemble* problem solutions from components but must *search* for appropriate assemblies. In carrying out such a search, it is often efficient to divide one's eggs among a number of baskets that is, not to follow out one line until it succeeds completely or fails definitely but to begin to explore several tentative paths, continuing to pursue a few that look most promising at a given moment. If one of the active paths begins to look less promising, it may be replaced by another that had previously been assigned a lower priority.

Our discussion of design when the alternatives are not given has yielded at least three additional topics for instruction in the science of design:

3. *Adaptation of standard logic to the search for alternatives.* Design solutions are sequences of actions that lead to possible worlds satisfying specified constraints. With satisficing goals the sought-for possible worlds are seldom unique; the search is for *sufficient*, not *necessary*, actions for attaining goals.

4. *The exploitation of parallel, or near-parallel, factorizations of differences.* Means-end analysis is an example of a broadly applicable problem-solving technique that exploits this factorization.

5. *The allocation of resources for search to alternative, partly explored action sequences.* I should like to elaborate somewhat on this last-mentioned topic.

Design As Resource Allocation

There are two ways in which design processes are concerned with the allocation of resources. First, conservation of scarce resources may be one of the criteria for a satisfactory design. Second, the design process itself

involves management of the resources of the designer, so that his efforts will not be dissipated unnecessarily in following lines of inquiry that prove fruitless.

There is nothing special that needs to be said here about resource conservation cost minimization, for example, as a design criterion. Cost minimization has always been an implicit consideration in the design of engineering structures, but until a few years ago it generally *was* only implicit, rather than explicit. More and more cost calculations have been brought explicitly into the design procedure, and a strong case can be made today for training design engineers in that body of technique and theory that economists know as "cost-benefit analysis."

An Example from Highway Design

The notion that the costs of designing must themselves be considered in guiding the design process began to take root only as formal design procedures have developed, and it still is not universally applied. An early example, but still a very good one, of incorporating design costs in the design process is the procedure, developed by Marvin L. Manheim as a doctoral thesis at MIT, for solving highway location problems.⁶

Manheim's procedure incorporates two main notions: first, the idea of specifying a design progressively from the level of very general plans down to determining the actual construction; second, the idea of attaching values to plans at the higher levels as a basis for deciding which plans to pursue to levels of greater specificity.

In the case of highway design the higher-level search is directed toward discovering "bands of interest" within which the prospects of finding a good specific route are promising. Within each band of interest one or more locations is selected for closer examination. Specific designs are then developed for particular locations. The scheme is not limited of course to this specific three-level division, but it can be generalized as appropriate.

Manheim's scheme for deciding which alternatives to pursue from one level to the next is based on assigning costs to each of the design activities and estimating highway costs for each of the higher-level plans. The

⁶ Marvin L. Manheim, *Hierarchical Structure: A Model of Design and Planning Processes* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1966).

highway cost associated with a plan is a prediction of what the cost would be for the actual route if that plan were particularized through subsequent design activity. In other words, it is a measure of how "promising" a plan is. Those plans are then pursued to completion that look most promising after the prospective design costs have been offset against them.

In the particular method that Manheim describes, the "promise" of a plan is represented by a probability distribution of outcomes that would ensue if it were pursued to completion. The distribution must be estimated by the engine, a serious weakness of the method but, once estimated, it can be used within the framework of Bayesian decision theory. The particular probability model used is not the important thing about the method; other methods of valuation without the Bayesian superstructure might be just as satisfactory.

In the highway location procedure the evaluation of higher-level plans performs two functions. First, it answers the question, "Where shall I search next?" Second, it answers the question, "When shall I stop the search and accept a solution as satisfactory?" Thus it is both a steering mechanism for the search and a satisficing criterion for terminating the search.

Schemes for Guiding Search

Let us generalize the notion of schemes for guiding search activity beyond Manheim's specific application to a highway location problem and beyond his specific guidance scheme based on Bayesian decision theory. Consider the typical structure of a problem-solving program. The program begins to search along possible paths, storing in memory a "tree" of the paths it has explored. Attached to the end of each branch each partial path is a number that is supposed to express the "value" of that path.

But the term "value" is really a misnomer. A partial path is not a solution of the problem, and a path has a "true" value of zero unless it leads toward a solution. Hence it is more useful to think of the values as estimates of the gain to be expected from further search along the path than to think of them as "values" in any more direct sense. For example, it may be desirable to attach a relatively high value to a partial exploration that *may* lead to a very good solution but with a low probability. If the prospect fades on further exploration, only the cost of the search has been lost. The disappointing outcome need not be accepted, but an alternative

path may be taken instead. Thus the scheme for attaching values to partial paths may be quite different from the evaluation function for proposed complete solutions.⁷

When we recognize that the purpose of assigning values to incomplete paths is to guide the choice of the next point for exploration, it is natural to generalize even further. All kinds of information gathered in the course of search may be of value in selecting the next step in search. We need not limit ourselves to valuations of partial search paths.

For example, in a chess-playing program an exploration may generate a continuation move different from any that was proposed by the initial move generator. Whatever the context the branch of the search tree on which the move was actually generated, it can now be removed from the context and considered in the context of other move sequences. Such a scheme was added on a limited basis by Baylor to MATER, a program for discovering check-mating combinations in chess, and it proved to enhance the program's power significantly.⁸

Thus search processes may be viewed as they have been in most discussions of problem solving as processes for seeking a problem solution. But they can be viewed more generally as processes for gathering information about problem structure that will ultimately be valuable in discovering a problem solution. The latter viewpoint is more general than the former in a significant sense, in that it suggests that information obtained along any particular branch of a search tree may be used in many contexts besides the one in which it was generated. Only a few problem-solving programs exist today that can be regarded as moving even a modest distance from the earlier, more limited viewpoint to the newer one.⁹

⁷ That this point is not obvious can be seen from the fact that most chess-playing programs have used similar or identical evaluation procedures both to guide search and to evaluate the positions reached at the ends of paths.

⁸ George W. Baylor and Herbert A. Simon, "A Chess Mating Combinations Program" *Proceedings of the Spring Joint Computer Conference*, Boston, April 26-28, (1966):431-447 (Washington: Spartan Books, 1966), reprinted in *Models of Thought*, chapter 4.3.

⁹ A formal theory of the optimal choice of search paths can be found in H. A. Simon and J. B. Kadane, "Optimal Problem-Solving Search: All-or-none Solutions;" *Artificial Intelligence*, 6(1975):235-247.

The Shape of the Design: Hierarchy

In my first chapter I gave some reasons why complex systems might be expected to be constructed in a hierarchy of levels, or in a boxes-within-boxes form. The basic idea is that the several components in any complex system will perform particular sub functions that contribute to the overall function. Just as the "inner environment" of the whole system may be defined by describing its functions, without detailed specification of its mechanisms, so the "inner environment" of each of the subsystems may be defined by describing the functions of that subsystem, without detailed specification of *its* submechanisms.¹⁰

To design such a complex structure, one powerful technique is to discover viable ways of decomposing it into semi-independent components corresponding to its many functional parts. The design of each component can then be carried out with some degree of independence of the design of others, since each will affect the others largely through its function and independently of the details of the mechanisms that accomplish the function.¹¹

There is no reason to expect that the decomposition of the complete design into functional components will be unique. In important instances there may exist alternative feasible decompositions of radically different kinds. This possibility is well known to designers of administrative organizations, where work can be divided up by sub functions, by sub processes, by subareas, and in other ways. Much of classical organization theory in fact was concerned precisely with this issue of alternative decompositions of a collection of interrelated tasks.

The Generator-Test Cycle

One way of considering the decomposition, but acknowledging that the interrelations among the components cannot be ignored completely, is to think of the design process as involving, first, the generation of alterna-

¹⁰. I have developed this argument at greater length in my essay "The Architecture of Complexity," chapter 8.

¹¹. For a recent discussion of functional analysis in design, see Clive L. Dym, *Engineering Design* (New York, NY: Cambridge University Press, 1994), pp. 134 139.

tives and, then, the testing of these alternatives against a whole array of requirements and constraints. There need not be merely a single generate-test cycle, but there can be a whole nested series of such cycles. The generators implicitly define the decomposition of the design problem, and the tests guarantee that important indirect consequences will be noticed and weighed. Alternative decompositions correspond to different ways of dividing the responsibilities for the final design between generators and tests.

To take a greatly oversimplified example, a series of generators may generate one or more possible outlines and schemes of fenestration for a building, while tests may be applied to determine whether needs for particular kinds of rooms can be met within the outlines generated. Alternatively the generators may be used to evolve the structure of rooms, while tests are applied to see whether they are consistent with an acceptable over-all shape and design. The house can be designed from the outside in or from the inside out.¹²

Alternatives are also open, in organizing the design process, as to how far development of possible subsystems will be carried before the over-all coordinating design is developed in detail, or vice-versa, how far the overall design should be carried before various components, or possible components, are developed. These alternatives of design are familiar to architects. They are familiar also to composers, who must decide how far the architectonics of a musical structure will be evolved before some of the component musical themes and other elements have been invented. Computer programmers face the same choices, between working downward from executive routines to subroutines or upward from component subroutines to a coordinating executive.

A theory of design will include principles for deciding such questions of precedence and sequence in the design process. As examples, the approach to designing computer programs called structured programming is concerned in considerable part with attending to design sub problems

¹². I am indebted to John Grason for many ideas on the topic of this section. J. Grason, "Fundamental Description of a Floor Plan Design Program," EDRA1, *Proceedings of the First Environmental Design Association Conference*, H. Sanoff and S. Cohn (eds.), North Carolina State University, 1970.

in the proper order (usually top-down); and much instruction in schools of architecture focuses on the same concerns.

Process As a Determinant of Style

When we recall that the process will generally be concerned with finding a satisfactory design, rather than an optimum design, we see that sequence and the division of labor between generators and tests can affect not only the efficiency with which resources for designing are used but also the nature of the final design as well. What we ordinarily call "style" may stem just as much from these decisions about the design process as from alternative emphases on the goals to be realized through the final design.¹³ An architect who designs buildings from the outside in will arrive at quite different buildings from one who designs from the inside out, even though both of them might agree on the characteristics that a satisfactory building should possess.

When we come to the design of systems as complex as cities, or buildings, or economies, we must give up the aim of creating systems that will optimize some hypothesized utility function, and we must consider whether differences in style of the sort I have just been describing do not represent highly desirable variants in the design process rather than alternatives to be evaluated as "better" or "worse." Variety, within the limits of satisfactory constraints, may be a desirable end in itself, among other reasons, because it permits us to attach value to the search as well as its outcome to regard the design process as itself a valued activity for those who participate in it.

We have usually thought of city planning as a means whereby the planner's creative activity could build a system that would satisfy the needs of a populace. Perhaps we should think of city planning as a valuable creative activity in which many members of a community can have the opportunity of participating if we have wits to organize the process that way. I shall have more to say on these topics in the next chapter.

However that may be, I hope I have illustrated sufficiently that both the shape of the design and the shape and organization of the design process

¹³ H. A. Simon, "Style in Design," *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Conference of the Environmental Design Research Association*, Pittsburgh, PA: Carnegie Mellon University (1971), pp. 1-10.

are essential components of a theory of design. These topics constitute the sixth item in my proposed curriculum in design:

6. The organization of complex structures and its implication for the organization of design processes.

Representation of the Design

I have by no means surveyed all facets of the emerging science of design. In particular I have said little about the influence of problem representation on design. Although the importance of the question is recognized today, we are still far from a systematic theory of the subject in particular, a theory that would tell us how to generate effective problem representations.¹⁴ I shall cite one example, to make clear what I mean by "representation."

Here are the rules of a game, which I shall call number scrabble. The game is played by two people with nine cards let us say the ace through the nine of hearts. The cards are placed in a row, face up, between the two players. The players draw alternately, one at a time, selecting any one of the cards that remain in the center. The aim of the game is for a player to make up a "book," that is, a set of exactly three cards whose spots add to 15, before his opponent can do so. The first player who makes a book wins; if all nine cards have been drawn without either player making a book, the game is a draw.

What is a good strategy in this game? How would you go about finding one? If the reader has not already discovered it for himself, let me show how a change in representation will make it easy to play the game well. The magic square here, which I introduced in the third chapter, is made up of the numerals from 1 through 9.

4 9 2

3 5 7

8 1 6

¹⁴. As examples of current thinking about representation see chapters 5 ("Representing Designed Artifacts") and 6 ("Representing Design Processes") in C. L. Dym, *op. cit.*, and chapter 6 ("Representation in Design") in Ömer Akin, *op. cit.* For a more general theoretical discussion, see R. E. Korf, "Toward a Model of Representational Changes," *Artificial Intelligence*, 14(1980):41-78.

Each row, column, or diagonal adds to 15, and every triple of these numerals that add to 15 is a row, column, or diagonal of the magic square. From this, it is obvious that "making a book" in number scrabble is equivalent to getting "three in a row" in the game of tic-tac-toe. But most people know how to play tic-tac-toe well, hence can simply transfer their usual strategy to number scrabble.¹⁵

Problem Solving As Change in Representation

That representation makes a difference is a long-familiar point. We all believe that arithmetic has become easier since Arabic numerals and place notation replaced Roman numerals, although I know of no theoretic treatment that explains why.

That representation makes a difference is evident for a different reason. All mathematics exhibits in its conclusions only what is already implicit in its premises, as I mentioned in a previous chapter. Hence all mathematical derivation can be viewed simply as change in representation, making evident what was previously true but obscure.

This view can be extended to all of problem solving. Solving a problem simply means representing it so as to make the solution transparent.¹⁶ If the problem solving could actually be organized in these terms, the issue of representation would indeed become central. But even if it cannot if this is too exaggerated a view a deeper understanding of how representations are created and how they contribute to the solution of problems will become an essential component in the future theory of design.

Spatial Representation

Since much of design, particularly architectural and engineering design, is concerned with objects or arrangements in real Euclidean two-

¹⁵ Number scrabble is not the only isomorph of tic-tac-toe. John A. Michon has described another, JAM, which is the dual of tic-tac-toe in the sense of projective geometry. That is, the rows, columns, and diagonals of tic-tac-toe become points in JAM, and the squares of the former become line segments joining the points. The game is won by "jamming" all the segments through a point a move consists of seizing or jamming a single segment. Other isomorphs of tic-tac-toe are known as well.

¹⁶ Saul Amarel, "On the Mechanization of Creative Processes," *IEEE Spectrum* 3 (April 1966):112 114.

dimensional or three-dimensional space, the representation of space and of things in space will necessarily be a central topic in a science of design. From our previous discussion of visual perception, it should be clear that "space" inside the head of the designer or the memory of a computer may have very different properties from a picture on paper or a three-dimensional model.

These representational issues have already attracted the attention of those concerned with computer-aided design the cooperation of human and computer in the design process. As a single example, I may mention Ivan Sutherland's pioneering SKETCHPAD program which allowed geometric shapes to be represented and conditions to be placed on these shapes in terms of constraints, to which they then conformed.¹⁷

Geometric considerations are also prominent in the attempts to automate completely the design, say, of printed or etched circuits, or of buildings. Grason, for example, in a system for designing house floor plans, constructs an internal representation of the layout that helps one decide whether a proposed set of connections among rooms, selected to meet design criteria for communication, and so on, can be realized in a plane.¹⁸

The Taxonomy of Representation

An early step toward understanding any set of phenomena is to learn what kinds of things there are in the set to develop a taxonomy. This step has not yet been taken with respect to representations. We have only a sketchy and incomplete knowledge of the different ways in which problems can be represented and much less knowledge of the significance of the differences.

In a completely pragmatic vein we know that problems can be described verbally, in natural language. They often can be described mathematically, using standard formalisms of algebra, geometry, set theory, analysis, or topology. If the problems relate to physical objects, they (or their solutions) can be represented by floor plans, engineering drawings,

¹⁷. I. E. Sutherland, "SKETCHPAD, A Man-Machine Graphical Communication System," *Proceedings, AFIPS Spring Joint Computer Conference, 1963* (Baltimore: Spartan Books), pp. 329-346.

¹⁸. See also C. E. Pfefferkorn, "The Design Problem Solver: A System for Designing Equipment or Furniture Layouts," in C. M. Eastman (ed.), *Spatial Synthesis in Computer-Aided Building Design* (London: Applied Science Publishers, 1975).

renderings, or three-dimensional models. Problems that have to do with actions can be attacked with flow charts and programs.

Other items most likely will need to be added to the list, and there may exist more fundamental and significant ways of classifying its members. But even though our classification is incomplete, we are beginning to build a theory of the properties of these representations. The growing theories of computer architectures and programming languages for example, the work on functional languages and object-oriented languages illustrate some of the directions that a theory of representations can take. There has also been closely parallel progress, some of it reviewed in chapters 3 and 4, toward understanding the human use of representations in thinking. These topics begin to provide substance for the final subject in our program on the theory of design:

7. Alternative representations for design problems.

Summary Topics in the Theory of Design

My main goal in this chapter has been to show that there already exist today a number of components of a theory of design and a substantial body of knowledge, theoretical and empirical, relating to each. As we draw up our curriculum in design in the science of the artificial to take its place by the side of natural science in the whole engineering curriculum, it includes at least the following topics:

THE EVALUATION OF DESIGNS

1. Theory of evaluation: utility theory, statistical decision theory
2. Computational methods:
 - a. Algorithms for choosing *optimal* alternatives such as linear programming computations, control theory, dynamic programming
 - b. Algorithms and heuristics for choosing *satisfactory* alternatives
3. THE FORMAL LOGIC OF DESIGN: imperative and declarative logics

THE SEARCH FOR ALTERNATIVES

4. Heuristic search: factorization and means-ends analysis
5. Allocation of resources for search
6. THEORY OF STRUCTURE AND DESIGN ORGANIZATION: hierarchic systems
7. REPRESENTATION OF DESIGN PROBLEMS

In small segments of the curriculum the theory of evaluation, for example, and the formal logic of design it is already possible to organize the instruction within a framework of systematic, formal theory. In many other segments the treatment would be more pragmatic, more empirical.

But nowhere do we need to return or retreat to the methods of the cookbook that originally put design into disrepute and drove it from the engineering curriculum. For there exist today a considerable number of examples of actual design processes, of many different kinds, that have been defined fully and cast in the metal, so to speak, in the form of running computer programs: optimizing algorithms, search procedures, and special-purpose programs for designing motors, balancing assembly lines, selecting investment portfolios, locating warehouses, designing highways, diagnosing and treating diseases, and so forth.¹⁹

Because these computer programs describe complex design processes in complete, painstaking detail, they are open to full inspection and analysis, or to trial by simulation. They constitute a body of empirical phenomena to which the student of design can address himself and which he can seek to understand. There is no question, since these programs exist, of the design process hiding behind the cloak of "judgment" or "experience." Whatever judgment or experience was used in creating the programs must now be incorporated in them and hence be observable. The programs are the tangible record of the variety of schemes that man has devised to explore his complex outer environment and to discover in that environment the paths to his goals.

Role of Design in the Life of the Mind

I have called my topic "the theory of design" and my curriculum a "program in design." I have emphasized its role as complement to the natural

¹⁹. A number of these programs are described in Dym, *op. cit.*, and others are discussed in a forthcoming book on *Engineering Design in the Large*, written by faculty associated with the Engineering Design Research Center at Carnegie Mellon University. Dym concludes each chapter of his book with a commentary on other relevant publications. Dym's book has a bibliography of more than 200 items, a majority of them referring to specific design projects and systems; its extent gives some indication of the rate at which the science of design is now progressing.

science curriculum in the total training of a professional engineer or of any professional whose task is to solve problems, to choose, to synthesize, to decide.

But there is another way in which the theory of design may be viewed in relation to other knowledge. My third and fourth chapters were chapters on psychology specifically on man's relation to his biological inner environment. The present chapter may also be construed as a chapter on psychology: on man's relation to the complex outer environment in which he seeks to survive and achieve.

All three chapters, so construed, have import that goes beyond the professional work of the person we have called the "designer." Many of us have been unhappy about the fragmentation of our society into two cultures. Some of us even think there are not just two cultures but a large number of cultures. If we regret that fragmentation, then we must look for a common core of knowledge that can be shared by the members of all cultures a core that includes more significant topics than the weather, sports, automobiles, the care and feeding of children, or perhaps even politics. A common understanding of our relation to the inner and outer environments that define the space in which we live and choose can provide at least part of that significant core.

This may seem an extravagant claim. Let me use the realm of music to illustrate what I mean. Music is one of the most ancient of the sciences of the artificial, and was so recognized by the Greeks. Anything I have said about the artificial would apply as well to music, its composition or its enjoyment, as to the engineering topics I have used for most of my illustrations.

Music involves a formal pattern. It has few (but important) contacts with the inner environment; that is, it is capable of evoking strong emotions, its patterns are detectable by human listeners, and some of its harmonic relations can be given physical and physiological interpretations (though the aesthetic import of these is debatable). As for the outer environment, when we view composition as a problem in design, we encounter just the same tasks of evaluation, of search for alternatives, and of representation that we do in any other design problem. If it pleases us, we can even apply to music some of the same techniques of automatic design by computer that have been used in other fields of design. If

computer-composed music has not yet reached notable heights of aesthetic excellence, it deserves, and has already received, serious attention from professional composers and analysts, who do not find it written in tongues alien to them.²⁰

Undoubtedly there are tone-deaf engineers, just as there are mathematically ignorant composers. Few engineers and composers, whether deaf, ignorant, or not, can carry on a mutually rewarding conversation about the content of each other's professional work. What I am suggesting is that they *can* carry on such a conversation about design, can begin to perceive the common creative activity in which they are both engaged, can begin to share their experiences of the creative, professional design process.

Those of us who have lived close to the development of the modern computer through gestation and infancy have been drawn from a wide variety of professional fields, music being one of them. We have noticed the growing communication among intellectual disciplines that takes place around the computer. We have welcomed it, because it has brought us into contact with new worlds of knowledge has helped us combat our own multiple-cultures isolation. This breakdown of old disciplinary boundaries has been much commented upon, and its connection with computers and the information sciences often noted.

But surely the computer, as a piece of hardware, or even as a piece of programmed software, has nothing to do directly with the matter. I have already suggested a different explanation. The ability to communicate across fields the common ground comes from the fact that all who use computers in complex ways are using computers to design or to participate in the process of design. Consequently we as designers, or as designers of design processes, have had to be explicit as never before about what is involved in creating a design and what takes place while the creation is going on.

The real subjects of the new intellectual free trade among the many cultures are our own thought processes, our processes of judging, deciding,

²⁰ L. A. Hillier and L. M. Isaacson's *Experimental Music* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959), reporting experiments begun more than four decades ago, still provides a good introduction to the subject of musical composition, viewed as design. See also Walter R. Reitman, *Cognition and Thought* (New York: Wiley, 1965), chapter 6, "Creative Problem Solving: Notes from the Autobiography of a Fugue."

choosing, and creating. We are importing and exporting from one intellectual discipline to another ideas about how a serially organized information-processing system like a human being or a computer, or a complex of men and women and computers in organized cooperation solves problems and achieves goals in outer environments of great complexity.

The proper study of mankind has been said to be man. But I have argued that people or at least their intellectual component may be relatively simple, that most of the complexity of their behavior may be drawn from their environment, from their search for good designs. If I have made my case, then we can conclude that, in large part, the proper study of mankind is the science of design, not only as the professional component of a technical education but as a core discipline for every liberally educated person.