

**ARE
WE
DROWNING
IN
COMPLEXITY
?**

**By M. A. Biot,
Mem. ASME**



The winner of this
on complexity. The

THE name of Timoshenko—the teacher, scholar, engineer, and scientist—evokes a brilliant phase and tradition in the practice of science and engineering which unfortunately seems to be on the decline. This is the tradition of clarity, simplicity, intuitive understanding, unpretentious depth, and a shunning of the irrelevant.

There is, of course, no merit in sophistication for its own sake. In the understanding of the physical world and particularly in the area of technological applications, it is important to perceive what is irrelevant. The level of irrelevance involves a value judgment which usually requires subtle habits of thought related to natural endowment and previous experience.

We should not overlook the importance of simplicity combined with depth of understanding not only for its cultural value, but as a technological tool. It leads to quantitative predictions without laborious and costly calculations; it suggests new inventions and simple solutions of engineering problems. Aside from obvious economic advantages, it also provides an important quality in engineering design, namely, reliability. In this respect one cannot help reflect on our dismal record of staggering cost and repeated failures in the field of rocketry.

Deeper physical insight combined with theoretical simplicity provides the shortcuts leading immediately to the core of extremely complex problems and to straightforward solutions. This cannot be achieved by methods which are sophisticated and ponderous even in simple cases.

The Red Tape of Formalism

The process of thought which is involved here may be described as “cutting through the scientific red tape” and bypassing the slow-grinding mills of formal scientific knowledge. Of course, formal knowledge is essential, but as for everything in life the truth involves a matter of balance. The instinctive embodiment of this truth is to be found more often in the politician than in the scientist. However, it is essential to the makeup of a competent engineer.

Doubt about the engineer’s function in our increasingly complex technological culture has been expressed by the blunt questions, “Is the engineer obsolete? Should he be replaced by the scientist?” Although such questions are the product of ignorance, the situation is such that, in this country at least, they find a respectable echo.

What about the physicist? Speaking in general and with due respect for exceptional personalities endowed with outstanding natural ability, I think the physicist has turned away from his own tradition and has tended

Based on an address delivered at the Applied Mechanics Dinner during the 1962 ASME Winter Annual Meeting. The occasion was the presentation to Dr. Biot of the Timoshenko Medal, an annual award in recognition of distinguished contributions to applied mechanics.

ARE WE DROWNING IN COMPLEXITY ?

By M. A. Biot,
Mem. ASME

year's Timoshenko Medal reminds us that engineering is more than piling complexity great engineers cut through to simple concepts, simple solutions. It is a creative art.

to become a victim of narrow specialization. Nuclear and particle physics, solid state, spectroscopy, plasma physics—all claim their victims. Many are almost totally ignorant of classical mechanics and are not able to understand the formulation of even simple problems unless it can be reduced to the solution of a Schroedinger equation.

As for the mathematician, a situation has developed which is a complete reversal of what existed in the past. Many of the great names in the history of mathematics of the nineteenth century have been those of distinguished engineers. An outstanding example is Cauchy, who graduated as a civil engineer and was engaged in the practice of engineering for many years. These men were of a different breed. They had a deeper grasp of scientific knowledge, a much broader outlook than the professional mathematician of today.

Ingrowing Mathematics

Mathematical science has become dominated by abstract formalism. It is increasingly dehumanized and cut off from its roots in the rich and nourishing soil of physics and engineering. What should be referred to as applied mathematics does not exist on its own, but describes essentially a function and a craft by which the science of mathematics finds its nourishment.

Much of the so-called applied mathematics practiced today is almost diametrically opposite to this function. It is permeated with legalistic hair-splitting, shrouded in pretentious language, as if the purpose were to obscure and surround with an aura of mystery and profundity what is very often a simple and even trivial subject.

This trend toward a formalism devoid of humanistic content, this emphasis on form at the expense of substance is found not just in engineering. It also prevails in our contemporary art and literature and obviously results from deeper, and perhaps self-destructive, undercurrents in our culture.

It constitutes a retrogression toward the abuses of medieval scholasticism and away from that intimate union of craftsmanship and science so characteristic of the Renaissance period. I recall a quotation from Ortega y Gasset¹:

"Life is not to be lived for the sake of intelligence, science, culture, but the reverse; intelligence, science, culture, have no other reality than that which accrues to them as tools for life. To believe the former is to fall into the intellectualistic folly which, several times in history, has brought about the downfall of intelligence."

Generally speaking, the professional mathematician of today is a specialist in logical systems and rigor. His lack of flexibility makes him unable to exercise one of the very essential functions of mathematics in the natural sciences and engineering, which is to separate

the relevant from the irrelevant, to simplify the formulation of complex phenomena, to synthesize and to unify the substance rather than the form.

For contrast, let me cite only the brilliant treatment of the Navier-Stokes equations by Prandtl in his famous theory of the boundary layer.

There is, however, a more ominous aspect of this situation which brings up the matter of education of scientist and engineers.

The Engineering Talent

We should remember that intuitive ability closely resembles artistic talent. It may be developed or it may be smothered, depending on the environment and the training. Rigor and abstract formalism are technical aspects of mathematics which may actually impede invention. They are for the specialist. The engineering student should be exposed to them only as an experience. They should not pervade his thinking nor exceed the point at which the intuitive faculties become inhibited.

In many schools the hard core of mathematical and physical knowledge is submerged in a flood of special courses characterized by abstract-formalistic overtones. There is an emphasis on formal knowledge rather than understanding, and the climate is not favorable to creative talent. It should be remembered that one of the important functions of a school is to discover, encourage, and develop talent.

To make the situation worse, we are now witnessing the introduction of the abstract axiomatic approach in high-school mathematics. Such a development involves great dangers to our future scientific and technological standing. It has been said that "Learning is the kind of ignorance distinguishing the studios." I don't want to downgrade studiosity, but I don't think knowledge should be an obstacle to understanding.

One could formulate a principle of degradation of knowledge entirely analogous to the second principle of thermodynamics. It represents a powerful force which can be defeated only by a hard and difficult struggle. The burden of it must be carried, not by teams and organizations, but by a few individuals. In this connection there is much to be said for the smaller schools. They should provide a better environment for unhurried maturing of thought and for the nucleation process by a small number of qualified people.

Revival of Humanism

Let us hope for a revival of humanism and a spirit of synthesis. Let us put new emphasis on engineering as a professional craft, requiring high skill, natural talent, deserving social recognition, and distinctly different from the scientific professions as such. New stirrings are appearing in this direction. I believe that engineers and engineering schools will play an important part in restoring the unity and central viewpoint in the natural sciences.

¹ *Man and Crisis* (1958).