

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY  
Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science  
6.01—Introduction to EECS I  
Fall Semester, 2007  
**Lecture 1 Notes**

## Goals for 6.01

We have a number of goals for this course. Our primary goal is to enhance your ability to solve complex problems by strengthening your skill in the most pervasive strategy for dealing with complexity: using abstraction and modularity. We will examine the use of abstraction and modularity in a number of contexts associated with problems in electrical engineering (EE) and computer science (CS), as we hope to help you develop a more fundamental understanding of abstraction and modularity. We also hope that you will see more than just the similarities in broad perspective, but will also develop skills in using several specific abstraction strategies that have persisted in importance. To accomplish our primary goal, we will study how to analyze and design systems that interact with, and attempt to control, an external environment. Such systems include everything from low-level controllers like heat regulators or cardiac pacemakers, to medium-level systems like automated navigation or virtual surgery, to high-level systems that provide more natural human-computer interfaces.

Our second goal is for you to learn that making mathematical models of real systems can help in the design and analysis of those systems; and to give you practice with building those models. In particular, we hope you will develop insight in to the difficult step of deciding which aspects of the real world are important to the problem being solved, and then how to model in ways that give insight into the problem.

We also hope to engage you more actively in the educational process. Most of the work of this course will not be like typical problems from the end of a chapter. You will work individually and in pairs to solve problems that are deeper and more open-ended. There will not be a unique right answer. Argument, explanation, and justification of approach will be more important than the answer. We hope to expose you to the ubiquity of trade-offs in engineering design. It is rare that a single approach will be best in every dimension; some will excel in one way, others in a different way. Deciding how to make such trade-offs is a crucial part of engineering.

Another way in which we hope to engage you in the material is by having many of you return to the course as a lab assistant. Having a large number of lab assistants in the course means that you can be given more interesting open-ended design problems, because there will be staff readily available to make sure you do not get stuck. Even more important, the lab assistants will question you as you go; to challenge your understanding and help you see and evaluate a variety of approaches. This Socratic method has proven to be of great intellectual value to both classroom students and lab assistants.

Finally, of course, we have the more typical goals of teaching exciting and important basic material from electrical engineering and computer science, including modern software engineering, linear systems analysis, electronic circuits, and estimation and decision-making. This material all has an internal elegance and beauty, as well as crucial role in building modern EE and CS systems.

## Modularity, abstraction, and modeling

Whether proving a theorem by building up from lemmas to basic theorems to more specialized results, or designing a circuit by building up from components to modules to complex processors, or designing a software system by building up from generic procedures to classes to class libraries, humans deal with complexity by exploiting the power of abstraction and modularity. And this is because there is only so much complexity a single person can hold in their head at a time.

Modularity is the idea of building components that can be re-used; and abstraction is the idea that after constructing a module (be it software or circuits or gears), most of the details of the module construction can be ignored and a simpler description used for module interaction (the module computes the square root, or doubles the voltage, or changes the direction of motion).

One can move up a level of abstraction and construct a new module by putting together several previously-built modules, thinking only of their abstract descriptions, and not their implementations. This process gives one the ability to construct systems with complexity far beyond what would be possible if it were necessary to understand each component in detail.

Any module can be described in a large number of ways. We might describe the circuitry in a digital watch in terms of how it behaves as a clock and a stopwatch, or in terms of voltages and currents within the circuit, or in terms of the heat produced at different parts of the circuitry. Each of these is a different *model* of the watch. Different models will be appropriate for different tasks: there is no single correct model.

The primary theme of this course will be to learn about different methods for building modules out of primitives, and of building different abstract models of them, so that we can analyze or predict their behavior, and so we can recombine them into even more complex systems. The same fundamental principles will apply to software, to control systems, and to circuits.

### Example problem

Imagine that you needed to make a robot that would roll up close to a light bulb and stop a fixed distance from it. The first question is, how can we get electrical signals to relate to the physical phenomena of light readings and robot wheel rotations? There is a whole part of electrical engineering related to the design of physical devices that connect to the physical world in such a way that some electrical property of the device relates to a physical process in the world. For example, a light-sensitive resistor (photoresistor) is a sensor whose resistance changes depending on light intensity; a motor is an effector whose rotor speed is related to the voltage across its two terminals. In this course, we will not examine the detailed physics of sensors and effectors, but will concentrate on ways of designing systems that use sensors and effectors to perform both simple and more complicated tasks. To get a robot to stop in front of a light bulb, the problem will be to find a way to connect the photoresistor to the motor, so that the robot will stop at an appropriate distance from the bulb.

### An abstraction hierarchy of mechanisms

Given the light-sensitive resistor and the motor, we could find all sorts of ways of connecting them, using bits of metal and ceramic of different kinds, or making some kind of magnetic or mechanical linkages. The space of possible designs of machines is enormous.




Figure 1: Increasingly constrained systems.

One of the most important things that engineers do, when faced with a set of design problems, is to standardize on a *basis set* of components to use to build their systems. There are many reasons for standardizing on a basis set of components, mostly having to do with efficiency of understanding and of manufacturing. It's important, as a designer, to develop a repertoire of standard bits and pieces of designs that you understand well and can put together in various ways to make more complex systems. If you use the same basis set of components as other designers, you can learn the techniques from them, rather than having to re-invent them yourself. And other people will be able to readily understand and modify your designs.

We can often make a design job easier by limiting the space of possible designs, and by standardizing on:

- a basis set of *primitive* components;
- ways of *combining* the primitive components to make more complex systems; and
- ways of “packaging” or *abstracting* pieces of a design so they can be reused.

Very complicated design problems can become tractable using such a *primitive-combination-abstraction* (PCA) approach. In this course, we will examine and learn to use a variety of PCA strategies common in EE and CS, and will even design some of our own, for special purposes. In the rest of this section, we will hint at some of the PCA systems we'll be developing in much greater depth throughout the course. Figure 1 shows one view of this development, as a successive set of restrictions of the design space of mechanisms.

One very important thing about abstract models is that once we have fixed the abstraction, it will usually be possible for it to be implemented using a variety of different underlying substrates. So, as shown in figure 2, we can construct general-purpose computers out of a variety of different systems, including digital circuits and Turing machines (a “thought-experiment” construction of a machine that can follow instructions and read and write symbols on an infinite tape). And systems satisfying the digital circuit abstraction can be constructed from analog circuits, but also from gears or water or light.




Figure 2: A single abstraction may have a variety of different underlying implementations.

Another demonstration of the value of abstracted models is that we can use them, by analogy, to describe quite different systems. So, for example, the constraint models of circuits can be applied to describing transmission of neural signals down the spinal cord, or of heat through a network of connected bodies.

**Circuits** Typical circuits are built out of a basis set of primitive components such as voltage sources, resistors, capacitors, inductors and transistors. This set of component types was chosen to be closely related to primitive concepts in our physical understanding of electronic systems in terms of voltage, current, resistance, and the rate of change of those quantities over time. So, when we buy a physical resistor, we tend to think only of its resistance; and when we buy a capacitor, we think of its ability to store energy. But, of course, that physical resistor has some capacitance, and the capacitor, some resistance. Still, it helps us in our designs to have devices that are as close to the ideal models as possible; and it helps that people have been designing with these components for years, so that we can adopt the strategies the generations of clever people have developed.


The method of combining elements is to connect their terminals together, usually with wire. And our method of abstraction is to describe the *constraints* that a circuit element exerts on the currents and voltages of terminals to which the element is connected.

So, armed with the standard basis set of analog circuit components, we can try to build a circuit to control our robot. We have a resistance that varies with the light level, but we need a voltage that does so, as well. We can achieve this by using a *voltage divider*, which is shown in figure 3(a). Using an abstract, constraint-based model of the behavior of circuit components that we'll study in detail later in the course, we can determine the following relationship between  $V_{\text{out}}$  and  $V_{\text{in}}$ :


$$V_{\text{out}} = \frac{R_B}{R_A + R_B} V_{\text{in}} .$$

So, for example, if  $R_A = R_B$ , then  $V_{\text{out}} = V_{\text{in}}/2$ . Or, in our case, if  $R_A$  actually varies with the amount of light shining on it, then  $V_{\text{out}}$  will also vary with the light.


That's great. So, now, we might imagine that we could use this voltage difference that we've created to drive the motor at different speeds, depending on the light hitting the resistor, using a circuit



(a) Resistor divider.



(b) Connected to a motor.



(c) Connected to a motor with a buffer.

Figure 3: Voltage dividers.

something like the one shown in figure 3(b). But, sadly, that won't work. It turns out that once we connect the motor to the circuit, it actually changes the voltages.

So, although we have developed an abstract model of the behavior of circuit components, which lets us analyze the behavior of a particular complete circuit design, it doesn't give us *modularity*. That is, we can't design two parts of a circuit, understand their behavior, and then predict the behavior of the composite system based on the behavior of the separate components. Instead, we'd have to re-analyze the joint behavior of the whole composite system. Lack of modularity makes it very difficult to design large systems, because two different people, or the same person at two different times, cannot design pieces and put them together without understanding the whole.

To solve this problem, we can augment our analog-circuit toolbox with some additional components that allow us to design components with modular behavior; they “buffer” or “isolate” one part of the circuit from another in ways that allow us to combine the parts more easily. In this course, we'll use op-amps to build buffers, which will let us solve our sample problem using a slightly more complex circuit, as shown in figure 3(c).

**Digital circuits** In analog circuits, we think about voltages on terminals ranging over real values. This gives us the freedom to create an enormous variety of circuits, but sometimes that freedom actually makes the design process more difficult. To design ever more complex circuits, we can move to a much stronger, *digital* abstraction, in which the voltages on the terminals are thought of as only taking on values that are either “low” or “high” (often called 0 and 1). This PCA system is made up of a basis set of elements, called gates, that are built out of simpler analog circuit components, such as transistors and resistors. Adopting the digital abstraction is a huge limitation on the kinds of circuits that can be built, but because it actually simplifies the basic components and increases modularity, it affords designers the cognitive simplicity they need to build incredibly complex machines by designing small parts and putting them together into increasingly larger pieces. Digital watches, calculators, and computers are all built this way.

Elements are combined by wiring, as they were in analog circuits. But we can model their effects on one another can be isolated to simple input/output relationships at the connections. So now the modularity is very powerful, and each circuit can be described with a Boolean-logic description of how its output values depend on the history of values of its inputs.

Digital design is a very important part of EECS, and it is treated in a number of our courses at basic and advanced levels, but is not one of the topics we'll go into in detail in 6.01.

**Computers** One of the most important developments in the design of digital circuits is that of the general-purpose “stored program” computer. Computers are a particular class of digital circuits that are general purpose: the same actual circuit can perform (almost) any transformation between its inputs and its outputs. Which particular transformation it performs is governed by a program, which is some settings of physical switches, or information written on an external physical memory, such as cards or a tape, or information stored in some sort of internal memory.

The “almost” in the previous section refers to the actual memory capacity of the computer. Exactly what computations a computer can perform depends on the amount of memory it has; and also on the time you're willing to wait. So, although a general-purpose computer can do anything a special-purpose digital circuit can do, in the information-processing sense, the computer might be slower or use more power. However, using general-purpose computers can save an enormous amount of engineering time and effort. It is *much* cheaper and easier to debug and modify and manufacture

software than hardware. The modularities and abstractions that software PCA systems give us are even more powerful than those derived from the digital circuit abstraction.

**Python programs** Every general-purpose computer has a different detailed design, which means that the way its program needs to be specified is different. Furthermore, the “machine languages” for describing computer programs, at the most primitive level, are awkward for human programmers. So, we have developed a number of computer *programming languages* for specifying a desired computation. These languages are converted into instructions in the computer’s native machine language by other computer programs, called compilers or interpreters. One of the coolest and most powerful things about general-purpose computers is this ability to write computer programs that process or create or modify other computer programs.

Computer programming languages are PCA systems. They provide primitive operations, ways of combining them, and ways of abstracting over them. We will spend a considerable amount of time in this course studying the particular primitives, combination mechanisms, and abstraction mechanisms made available in Python. But the choice of Python is relatively unimportant. Virtually all modern programming languages supply a similar set of mechanisms, and the choice of programming language is primarily a matter of taste and convenience.

In a computer program we have both data primitives and computation primitives. At the most basic level, computers generally store binary digits (bits) in groups of 32 or 64, called *words*. These words of data are the primitives, and they can be interpreted by our programs as representing integers, floating-point numbers, strings, or addresses of other data in the computer’s memory. The computational primitives supported by most computers include numerical operations such as addition and multiplication, and going and finding the contents of a memory at a given address. In Python, we will work at a level of abstraction that doesn’t require us to think very much about addresses of data, but it is useful to understand that level of description, as well.

Primitive data and computation elements can be combined and abstracted in a variety of different ways, depending on choices of programming style. We’ll explore these in more detail in section .

## Models

So far, we have discussed a number of ways of framing the problem of designing and constructing mechanisms. Each PCA system is accompanied by a modeling system, that lets us make mathematical models of the systems we construct.

What is a model? It is a new system that is considerably simpler than the system being modeled, but which captures the important aspects of the original system. We might make a physical model of an airplane to test in a wind tunnel. It doesn’t have to have passenger seats or landing lights; but it has to have surfaces of the correct shape, in order to capture the important properties for this purpose. Mathematical models can capture properties of systems that are important to us, and allow us to discover things about the system much more conveniently than by manipulating the original system itself.

One of the hardest things about building models is deciding what aspects of the original system to model and which ones to ignore. Many classic, dramatic engineering failures can be ascribed to failing to model important aspects of the system.

Another important dimension in modeling is whether the model is deterministic or not. We might, for example, model the effect of the robot executing a command to set its velocity as making an

instantaneous change to the commanded velocity. But, of course, there is likely to be some delay and some error. We have to decide whether to ignore that delay and error in our model and treat it as if it were ideal; or, for example, to make a probabilistic model of the possible results of that command. Generally speaking, the more different the possible outcomes of a particular action or command, and the more spread out the probability distribution over those outcomes, the more important it is to explicitly include uncertainty in the model.

Once we have a model, it can be used in a variety of different ways, which we explore below.

**Analytical models** By far the most prevalent use of models is in analysis: Given a circuit design, what will the voltage on this terminal be? Given a computer program, will it compute the desired answer? How long will it take? Given a control system, implemented as a circuit or as a program, will the system stop at the right distance from the light bulb?

Analytical tools are important. It can be hard to verify the correctness of a system by trying it in all possible initial conditions with all possible inputs; sometimes it's easier to develop a mathematical model and then prove a theorem about the model.

For some systems, such as pure software computations, or the addition circuitry in a calculator, it is possible to analyze their correctness or speed with just a model of the system in question. For other systems, such as fuel injectors, it is impossible to analyze the correctness of the controller without also modeling the environment (or “plant”) to which it is connected and analyzing the behavior of the coupled system of the controller and environment.

We can do a very simple analysis of a robot moving toward a lamp. Imagine that we arrange it so that the robot's velocity at time  $t$ ,  $V[t]$ , is proportional to the difference between the actual light level,  $X[t]$  and a desired light level (that is, the light level we expect to encounter when the robot is the desired distance from the lamp),  $X_{\text{desired}}$ ; that is, we can model our control system with the difference equation

$$V[t] = k(X[t] - X_{\text{desired}}) .$$

Now, we need to model the world. For simplicity, imagine that the light level is equal (after a units conversion) to the robot's position, and that the robot's position at time  $t$  is its position at time  $t - 1$  plus its velocity at time  $t - 1$ . When we couple these models, we get the difference equation

$$X[t] = X[t - 1] + k(X[t - 1] - X_{\text{desired}}) ,$$

where  $k$  is the constant of proportionality of the controller. Now, for a given value of  $k$ , we can determine how the system will behave over time, by solving the difference equation in  $X$ .

Later in the course, we will see how easily determined mathematical properties of a difference equation model can tell us whether a control system will have the desired behavior and whether or not the controller will cause the system to oscillate. These same kinds of analyses can be applied to robot control systems as well as to the temporal properties of voltages in a circuit, and even to problems as unrelated as the consequences of a monetary policy decision in economics.

**Synthetic models** One goal of many people in a variety of sub-disciplines of computer science and electrical engineering is automatic synthesis of systems from formal descriptions of their desired behavior. For example, you might describe some properties you would want the input/output behavior of a circuit or computer program to have, and then have a computer system discover a circuit or program with the desired property.



This is a well-specified problem, but generally the search space of possible circuits or programs is much too large for an automated process; the intuition and previous experience of an expert human designed cannot yet be matched by computational search methods.

**Internal models** As we wish to build more and more complex systems with software programs as controllers, we find that it is often useful to build additional layers of abstraction on top of the one provided by a generic programming language. This is particularly true as the nature of the exact computation required depends considerably on information that is only received during the execution of the system.

Consider, for example, an automated taxi robot (or, more prosaically, the navigation system in your new car). It takes, as input, a current location in the city and a goal location, and gives, as output, a path from the current location to the goal. It has a map built into it.

It is theoretically possible to build an enormous digital circuit or computer program that contains a look-up table, so that whenever you get a pair of locations, you can look it up and read out the path. But the size of that table is too huge to contemplate. Instead, what we do is construct an abstraction of the problem as one of finding a path from any start state to any goal state, through a graph (an abstract mathematical construct of “nodes” with “arcs” connecting them). We can develop and implement a general-purpose algorithm that will solve *any* shortest-path problem in a graph. That algorithm and implementation will be useful for a wide variety of possible problems. And for the navigation system, all we have to do is represent the map as a graph, specify the start and goal states, and call the general graph-search algorithm.

We can think of this process as actually putting a model of the system’s interactions with the world inside the controller; it can consider different courses of action in the world and pick the one that is the best according to some criterion.

Another example of using internal models is when the system has some significant lack of information about the state of the environment. In such situations, it may be appropriate to explicitly model the set of possible states of the external world and their associated probabilities, and to update this model over time as new evidence is gathered. We will pursue an example of this approach near the end of the course.

## Programming embedded systems

There are lots of different ways of thinking about modularity and abstraction for software. Different models will make some things easier to say and do and others more difficult, making different models appropriate for different tasks. In the following sections, we explore different strategies for building software systems that interact with an external environment, and then different strategies for specifying the purely computational part of a system.

### Interacting with the environment

Increasingly, computer systems need to interact with the world around them, receiving information about the external world, and taking actions to affect the world. Furthermore, the world is dynamic. As the system is computing, the world is changing.

There are a variety of different ways for organizing computations that interact with an external world. Generally speaking, such a computation needs to:

- get information from sensors (light sensors, sonars, mouse, keyboard, etc.)
- perform computation, remembering some of the results
- take actions to change the outside world (move the robot, print, draw, etc.)

But these operations can be put together in different styles.

**Sequential** The most immediately straightforward style for constructing a program that interacts with the world is the basic imperative style. A library of special procedures is defined, some of which read information from the sensors and others of which cause actions to be performed. Example procedures might move a robot forward a fixed distance, or send a file out over the network, or move video-game characters on the screen.

In this model, we could naturally write a program that moves an idealized robot in a square, if there is space in front of it.

```
if sonarDistances()[3] > 1:
    move(1)
    turn(90)
    move(1)
    turn(90)
    move(1)
    turn(90)
    move(1)
    turn(90)
```

The major problem with this style of programming is that the programmer has to remember to check the sensors sufficiently frequently. For instance, if the robot checks for free space in front, and then starts moving, it might turn out that a subsequent sensor reading will show that there is something in front of it, either because someone walked in front of the robot or because the previous reading was erroneous. It is hard to have the discipline, as a programmer, to remember to keep checking the sensor conditions frequently enough, and the resulting programs can be quite difficult to read and understand.

For the robot moving toward the light, we might write a program like this:

```
while lightValue < desiredValue:
    move(0.1)
```

This would have the robot creep up step by step toward the light. We might want to modify it so that the robot moved a distance that was related to the difference between the current and desired light values. However, if it takes larger steps, then during the time that it's moving it won't be sensitive to possible changes in the light value and cannot react immediately to them.

**Event-Driven** User-interface programs are often best organized differently, as *event-driven* (also, interrupt driven) programs. In this case, the program is specified as a collection of functions (possibly with side effects that change some global state) that are attached to particular events that can take place. So, for example, there might be functions that are called when the mouse is clicked on each button in the interface, when the user types into a text field, or when the

temperature of a reactor gets too high. An “event loop” runs continuously, checking to see if any of triggering events happens, and, if it does, calls the associated function.

In our simple example, though, we might imagine writing a program that told the robot to drive forward by default; and then install an event handler that says that if the light level reaches the desired value, it should stop. This program would be reactive to sudden changes in the environment.

As the number and frequency of the conditions that need responses increases, it can be difficult to keep a program like this running well, and to guarantee a minimum response time to any event.

**Transducer** An alternative view is that programming a system that interacts with an external world is like building a *transducer* with internal state. Think of a transducer as a processing box that runs continuously. At regular intervals (think of this as happening many times per second), the transducer reads all of the sensors, does a small amount of computation, stores some values it will need for the next computation, and then generates output values for the actions.

This computation happens over and over and over again. Complex behavior can arise out of the temporal pattern of inputs and outputs. So, for example, a robot might try to move forward without hitting something by doing:

```
def step():
    distToFront = min(sonarDistances()[3], sonarDistances()[4])
    motorOutput(0.7 * (distToFront - 0.1), 0.0)
```

Executed repeatedly, this program will automatically modulate the robot’s speed to be proportional to the free space in front of it.<sup>1</sup> We could make it average over recent sensor values, to smooth out sensor noise, by doing something like:

```
def step():
    distToFront = min(sonarDistances()[3], sonarDistances()[4])
    robot.avgDistToFront = 0.5 * robot.avgDistToFront + 0.5 * distToFront
    motorOutput(0.7 * (avgDistToFront - 0.1), 0.0)
```

We’d have to initialize `robot.avgDistToFront` to some value (maybe 0) before this whole process started.<sup>2</sup>

The main problem with the transducer approach is that it can be difficult to do tasks that are fundamentally sequential (like the example of driving in a square, shown above). We will start with the transducer model, and then later in the course, we will build a new abstraction layer on top of it that will make it easy to do sequential commands, as well.

## Programming models

There are lots of different ways of thinking about modularity and abstraction for software. Different models will make some things easier to say and do and others more difficult, making different models appropriate for different tasks.

---

<sup>1</sup>Here, we are using the commands that our SoaR robot control system uses. The procedure `sonarDistances()` returns a list of distance readings from the sonar sensors; numbers 3 and 4 are looking out the front of the robot. The procedure `motorOutput(fvel, rvel)` tries to set the robot’s forward velocity to `fvel` and rotational velocity to `rvel`.

<sup>2</sup>When we want a variable to maintain its value across successive calls to the transducer’s step function, we need to prefix it with `robot.` . The reasons for this will become clearer in the next few chapters.

**Imperative computation** Most of you have probably been exposed to an imperative model of computer programming, in which we think of programs as giving a sequential set of instructions to the computer to *do* something. And, in fact, that is how the internals of the processors of computers are typically structured. So, in Java or C or C++, you write typically procedures that consist of lists of instructions to the computer:

- Put this value in this variable
- Square the variable
- Divide it by pi
- If the result is greater than 1, return the result

In this model of computation, the primitive computational elements are basic arithmetic operations and assignment statements. We can combine the elements using: sequences of statements, and control structures such as **if**, **for**, and **while**. We can abstract away from the details of a computation by defining a procedure that does it. Now, the engineer only needs to know the specifications of the procedure, but not the implementation details, in order to use it.

**Functional computation** Another style of programming is the functional style. In this model, we gain power through function calls. Rather than telling the computer to do things, we ask it questions: What is  $4 + 5$ ? What is the square root of 6? What is the largest element of the list?

These questions can all be expressed as asking for the value of a function applied to some arguments. But where do the functions come from? The answer is, from other functions. We start with some set of basic functions (like “plus”), and use them to construct more complex functions.

This method wouldn’t be powerful without the mechanisms of conditional evaluation and recursion. Conditional functions ask one question under some conditions and another question under other conditions. Recursion is a mechanism that lets the definition of a function refer to the function being defined. Recursion is as powerful as iteration.

In this model of computation, the primitive computational elements are typically basic arithmetic and list operations. We combine elements using function composition (using the output of one function as the input to another), **if**, and recursion. We use function definition as a method of abstraction, and the idea of higher-order functions (passing functions as arguments to other functions) as a way of capturing common high-level patterns.

**Data structures** In either style of asking the computer to do work for us, we have another kind of modularity and abstraction, which is centered around the organization of data.

At the most primitive level, computers operate on collections of (usually 32 or 64) bits. We can interpret such a collection of bits as representing different things: a positive integer, a signed integer, a floating-point number, a boolean value (true or false), one or more characters, or an address of some other data in the memory of the computer. Python gives us the ability to use all of these primitives, except for addresses directly.

There is only so much you can do with a single number, though. We’d like to build computer programs that operate on representations of documents or maps or circuits or social networks. To do so, we need to aggregate primitive data elements into more complex *data structures*. These can include lists, arrays, dictionaries, and other structures of our own devising.

Here, again, we gain the power of abstraction. We can write programs that do operations on a data structure representing a social network, for example, without having to worry about the details of how the social network is represented in terms of bits in the machine.

**Object-oriented programming: computation + data structures** Object-oriented programming is a style that applies the ideas of modularity and abstraction to execution and data at the same time.

An *object* is a data structure, together with a set of procedures that operate on the data. Basic procedures can be written in an imperative or a functional style, but ultimately there is imperative assignment to state variables in the object.

One major new type of abstraction in OO programming is “generic” programming. It might be that all objects have a procedure called `print` associated with them. So, we can ask any object to print itself, without having to know how it is implemented. Or, in a graphics system, we might have a variety of different objects that know their x,y positions on the screen. So each of them can be asked, in the same way, to say what their position is, even though they might be represented very differently inside the objects.

In addition, most object-oriented system support inheritance, which is a way to make new kinds of objects by saying that they are mostly like another kind of object, but with some exceptions. This is another way to take advantage of abstraction.

**Conclusion** Python as well as other modern programming languages, such as Java, Ruby and C++, support all of these programming models. The programmer needs to choose which programming model best suits the task. This is an issue that we will return to throughout the course.