

Robust yet fragile

Extremes of

- Robust yet fragile
- Simplicity and complexity
- Constrained and flexible
- Frozen and evolvable
- Digital and analog
- Diverse and conserved





Lego hourglass



Lego hourglass



Lego system requirements

	Alternative designs?			
Performance				
Trauma				
Allowed connections				
Reuse				
Evolvable parts				
Evolvable systems				
Labor cost				
Parts cost				



Lego



Limited environmental uncertainty needs minimal control

Huge variety





The snap is a static interface specification.











Assembly is a control process that evolves in time, and respects the snap, but adds to it.





It inputs instructions and components and outputs assembled systems.

Instructions















Random, uncontrolled, snap connection of Lego parts yields "nonfunctional" toys.











Robustness/ Evolvability



- A huge variety of new and different toys can be built
- From a huge variety of different components
- Both toys and components can be rearranged and added in new





Yet fragile

- Add or remove a tiny, indistinguishable amount of material from either side of a key interface.
- → Complete failure.
- Other parts of the bricks may be nicked or cut with minimal impact
- This robust, yet fragile (RYF) feature of protocols is a candidate for a universal law
- What robustness/fragility properties do alternative protocols have?



Glue



Consider some alternative interfaces and their tradeoffs...



No interface. Simple blocks.

Standard interface. (Wild type.)

Add glue to hold the parts together.

Injection mold the whole toy from scratch.

	Glue		↑ better
			worse

	Smooth	WT	Glue	Mold
Performance	\checkmark			11
Trauma	$\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow$		1	11
Allowed connections	↑ ↑			↓ ↓
Reuse			↓ ↓	↓ ↓
Evolvable parts	Ļ			Ļ
Evolvable systems	$\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow$			Ļ
Labor cost	V		V	$\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow$
Parts cost	1		\checkmark	1

- Lego is "optimally robust" (Pareto) not "optimal."
- Similar to complex engineering systems and biology.

↑ better ↓ worse			Glue	
	Smooth	WT	Glue	Mold
Performance	V			<u>↑</u> ↑
Trauma	↓ ↓		↑	<u>↑</u> ↑
Allowed connections	↑ ↑			$\checkmark \checkmark$
Reuse			↓ ↓	$\checkmark \checkmark$
Evolvable parts	Ļ			V
Evolvable systems	↓ ↓			V
Labor cost	V		V	↓ ↓
Parts cost	1		V	1

Fragility: Perturbing the snap connector?



Smooth is robust

WT is *very* fragile



No connections, no fragility



Glued is less fragile



Robust or fine-tuned?

- Set of all possible interconnections is a (combinatorial) huge set.
- Set of interesting toys is also large, but an infinitesimally small subset. Very special and finely tuned.
- Similarly, among the potential toy *systems* using the same basic plastic material, Lego is highly structured and finely tuned.
- At the component level, the stud-andtube coupling is very finely machined.
- Robust yet fragile (RYF) is universal

The evolution of complexity









Suppose you want to put a structure on wheels?

Easy: Find Lego parts with wheels.

Suppose you want to motorize a vehicle with wheels?

Easy: Add Lego motors,gears and battery. Suppose you want to motorize a vehicle with wheels?

Easy: Add Lego motors,gears and battery.

This adds additional protocols:
Electrical protocols for batteries and motors.
Mechanical protocols for gear

• Mechanical protocols for gears and axles.



Additional protocols and modules. This cart/motor/gear configuration could be a module that is reused in many toys.



Complex toys can be created, and require additional layers of control.







Random







NXT controller



NXT controller






























Lessons from Lego:

- Hourglass organization of control
- Infinitely *diverse* toys from moderately diverse parts
- Conserved control mechanisms
- Bowties within layers
- *Complexity* in individual toys is overwhelmingly in the conserved control parts
- This complexity is largely hidden in ordinary operation
- Greater internal complexity means more *robust yet fragile* external behavior

Diverse



control

Conserved



assembly

Diverse



- Describe systems/components in terms of constraints on what is possible
- Decompose constraints into component, systemlevel, protocols, and emergent
- Not necessarily unique, but hopefully illuminating nonetheless



Essential ideas

- Listening to engineers and physicians
- Robust yet fragile (RYF)
- "Constraints that deconstrain" (G&K)
- Network architecture
- Layering
- Control and dynamics (C&D)
- Hourglasses and Bowties
- Unity and diversity