

Author's Response Beyond Application

Ben Sweeting

> **Upshot** • I reinforce the idea of broad connections between cybernetics, design and science that become apparent when the messy processes implicit in each are reflected on more explicitly. In so doing, I treat design not as a field in which cybernetic ideas are to be applied, but one in which they are reflected on and pursued.

« 1 » I wish to thank all commentators for their stimulating contributions. The first thing to note in response to these seven commentaries is the range of ground they cover, indicating the wide potential of the relation between cybernetics and design research to inform both fields. It is significant that many of the aspects raised by commentators are focused on core topics of cybernetic research: computing technology (Mateus van Stralen; Christiane Herr); cognition (Andrea Jelić); and, broadly, the relationship between research/theory and action/practice, which is a focus of Herr and Michael Hohl, and underlies the concerns of Jose Cabral, Dai Griffiths and Tom Scholte. As Karl Müller (2010) has noted, there is a need to focus on core topics in order to reinforce the coherence of radical constructivism (RC) and second-order cybernetics (SOC) as a research field. Müller's remarks could be taken as a call for a turn away from topics such as design that have been prominent in recent cybernetics. These commentaries, and the research to which they point, suggest that design may instead offer a focus in which a number of such core issues can be explored.

« 2 » In this context, Scholte's introduction to the work of Ann and Lawrence Halprin may be valuable even beyond the project of connecting cybernetics-inspired discussions in design and theatre studies (see also Scholte's target article in this issue). Building connections such as this would seem to be a way to help broaden the relationship of cybernetics with both design and theatre beyond one of application, releasing their potential to explore central cybernetic concerns through practice (cf. Müller 2010: 36f).

« 3 » Of the commentaries, those of Griffiths and Cabral put forward the most explicit questions, and I therefore concentrate on these below. In line with my approach in the target article, I have attempted to remain focused primarily on how issues raised in design can contribute to questions in cybernetics.

Ill-defined problems

« 4 » Griffiths (§8) suggests that the account of design that I have given applies to a particular subset of design, whereas at least some other areas of design deal with well-defined problems. Some design tasks or components of design tasks are, indeed, characterised by more constrained problems than others. Yet even apparently clear and familiar design tasks regularly involve incomplete criteria or contestable premises, and a clearly-defined goal is no guarantee of a well-defined problem (cf. Griffiths §6). This is because design is always concerned with the new (target article §8), which is the case even when designers are not attempting to be especially innovative (that is, when we design a building, we are concerned with creating something new even when we stick to an established typology). This can be seen within the scope of the definition that Griffiths (§5) cites: the process of preparing a plan for constructing something is not solely a matter of setting out production information (the working drawings and specifications that will guide manufacture) but of devising what is proposed in these. This process involves forms of reflective, conversational activity whenever such a plan is considered in more than arbitrary terms (that is to say, when it is designed).

« 5 » Take, for instance, some of the questions posed in the design of a new motorway (an example within the compass of engineering, and one to which Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber refer, Rittel & Webber 1973: 163). Different configurations of road junctions will be both better and worse according to different terms of reference. Even considering only the efficiency of traffic flow, there will be trade offs between congestion at different points in the road system. There are also many other relevant criteria, such as, for instance: safety, other road users, cost, construction sequencing,

maintenance, noise pollution, air quality and impact on natural habitats. While these criteria are mostly easily recognisable, they are not all commensurable with each other, such that there is no one way to resolve definitively between them, nor is it possible to optimise against an overall goal without this being distorting. Further, the interactions between these different criteria and the limitations they set on each other in the specific situation that is at hand only become clear as particular solutions are developed, discussed and enacted. Taking a broader scope, one might also challenge the premises under which the project is advanced: having explored the likely consequences of the new motorway, we may take a different view on whether it is a worthwhile project and consider alternative options instead.

« 6 » While such situations resist exhaustive analysis and conventional linear problem solving, designers deal with them as a matter of course and without regarding them as being problematic. In so doing, they develop and refine not just their design proposals but also the questions to which these proposals respond. Indeed, as Nigel Cross (2007a: 100) points out, designers treat even well-formed problems as if they are ill-defined, an approach that has the benefits of testing the assumptions that are given at the outset and searching for new opportunities.

« 7 » Griffiths (§6) gives two counter examples – those of scientific and musical instruments – where questions are very tightly constrained. Indeed, these situations are so constrained that they might well not be considered as instances of design activity in that they respond to a plan rather than create one. The musical instrument example, which is perhaps better understood in terms of craft, is closely related to the existing tradition of musical performance in which each instrument must be usable. These constraints can, however, be understood as a result of a wider design process, one where the configuration of the musical instrument has co-evolved slowly over several generations together with the traditions of musical performance to which it is related (this is comparable in architecture to the development of a vernacular tradition). The development of scientific instruments can be thought of, similarly, as blur-

ring with that of scientific experimentation itself, as is reflected in accounts of scientific practice (target article §10). What is learnt in experiments using the instruments generates new criteria for further experiments and so new or refined instruments. Thus we can think of this as one overall process, which we could characterise either in terms of science or design, encompassing scientific experimentation and the construction of the instruments that support this.

« 8 » Griffiths (§8) asks the question of to what extent an SOC account of design can be convincing to those that do not share its epistemological position. I do not see this as a question of different design epistemologies but of different degrees of explicitness about the epistemology that is acted out in design, and different ways of making this explicit. What designers do in practice is not always what they describe themselves as doing, as discussed by Herr and Hohl. It is in retrospect that the paths taken seem clear and, as it is this clarity that is what designers need to communicate, the messy process by which this clarity is developed usually remains unremarked on. Making these sorts of processes explicit is a core concern of design research and something to which SOC can contribute. The purpose of this is not, as I see it, to reconfigure design practice in some specific way. Rather, articulating what would otherwise remain tacit helps maintain what is already special about design (including attitudes towards values, as raised by both Herr §2 and Hohl §§7f), something that can otherwise become lost.

« 9 » This relation of SOC to design practice in terms of making the implicit explicit may, as Griffiths (§8) suggests, inform how SOC might be advanced more generally. Cybernetic processes are implicit in everyday life and, as with design, making these processes explicit reinforces what is special about them, which can otherwise become lost in the context of other concerns. Looked at in these terms, SOC's relation to practice is not limited to where its epistemological position is explicitly shared. It can enjoy a broad relation to practice in terms of implicitly cybernetic processes, while still contesting the ways in which particular practices are conventionally understood.

Material agency and viability

« 10 » Griffiths points out tensions between RC and Andrew Pickering's (1995) account of material agency. As Griffiths (§11) notes, there is not necessarily a conflict here and it seems to me that such tensions can be defused, or at least sharpened to more precisely the points at issue.

« 11 » This is supported by the case of design, which while constructivist in orientation is compatible with ideas of material agency, even if this was not emphasised in my account. This is both in terms of the media with which designers think and the technologies and industries with and in which they work:

- Media plays an active role in how designers work. It is important to how they deal with complexity (Gedenryd 1998), model the material and spatial (Sweeting 2011), and construct new possibilities (the process of sketching that Ranulph Glanville 2006a, 2007c emphasises is one that needs to be embodied in media of some kind). This includes the digital technologies discussed by van Stralen, as well as the more obvious materiality of the analogue. Accounts of the active role of instruments in science, such as that given by Pickering (1995), can be read as if referring to the design studio (target article §10).
- What is materially and technologically feasible is a crucial constraint on what designers propose. This is especially the case where designers try to use materials in forms to which they are particularly suited, as can be summarised by architect Louis Kahn's oft-quoted conversation with a brick – “You say to a brick, ‘What do you want, brick?’ And brick says to you, ‘I like an arch.’ And you say to brick, ‘Look, I want one, too, but arches are expensive and I can use a concrete lintel.’ And then you say: ‘What do you think of that, brick?’ Brick says: ‘I like an arch.’”¹ As well as this material-focused approach, material agency can be seen in the way that technological changes have transformed the nature of material constraints (discussed by van Stralen

1 | <https://www.theguardian.com/artand-design/2013/feb/26/louis-kahn-brick-whisperer-architect>

§§2, 4), and it remains an important factor even where design approaches are focused elsewhere.

« 12 » The principle move in RC is to change the orientation of epistemology from a concern with how we know (or do not know) about any real world beyond our experience, to a focus on this experience itself. This relocates epistemology to the realm of experience, in which (our experience of) the material is important to include (as is evident in design). While, therefore, RC can be contrasted with the material where this is meant in the sense of the real, there is no conflict between RC and our material experience. Indeed, the latter can be encompassed in the notion of viability, which is central to Ernst von Glasersfeld's account. RC is not a licence for unconstrained construction. Von Glasersfeld (1990) gives the example of not being able to walk through a desk, and thus being unable to maintain a viable idea of the world that would allow him to do this. This is an example of a material condition in which we experience epistemological, not just practical, resistance.

« 13 » Von Glasersfeld sometimes referred to viability in terms of “fit.” In RC, this is in the sense of “fitting with” or evolutionary fit, and so perhaps better phrased in terms of the elimination of the unfit. There is no sense of correspondence to the real and much room for contradictory explanations to be viable in our experience at different times. This is not to be confused with the athlete's notion of fit, of an idea becoming fitter and fitter in the sense of a closer match to the goal of the real. In this latter view, while it may still be acknowledged that we do not have access to the real, our experience is claimed to be a good guide to it in any case because of the constraints that are imposed on it, thus returning to a correspondence view of epistemology. The main point at issue here is, as I see it, not about material agency per se but whether this is understood in terms of the real or in the realm of experience, and about how this is then put to work epistemologically.

« 14 » Similarly to what I have said above regarding the relation between SOC and design, I think that RC is agile enough to engage with the material and the performative across the “whole range of scientific and design activities” (Griffiths §11), while

also contesting what is at stake epistemologically in these. Indeed, RC can help provide the honesty that Glanville (2014c) suggests will efface the differences between different research traditions (target article §14; and as expanded on by Hohl).

Designing systems

« 15 » Cabral's call for an increased focus on the systemic nature of objects is something that I support. The issue as I see it, and as Cabral (§3) points to, comes back to what, especially in architecture, is a surprising gulf between theories regarding how we understand, on the one hand, what is designed and, on the other, the process through which design occurs. Recent work has addressed this in part by seeing architecture in terms of its place within the building industry (Lloyd Thomas, Amhoff & Beech 2016). From the vantage point of SOC, there are further,

more designerly opportunities for bridging between these areas. The work of Jelić is significant in this regard, establishing an account of architectural experience in commensurable terms to constructivist accounts of design practice. I have previously suggested there is potential in connecting conversational accounts of design with conversational accounts of architectural experience (Sweeting 2011), while in the context of the target article one can also understand particular examples such as the Fun Palace as being part of SOC enquiry not just resulting from it (Cabral §9; Jelić §4; Sweeting 2015a).

« 16 » The building of such bridges does not, however, guarantee in what manner they will be crossed. In making the argument in the target article – that design is a form of SOC even where SOC is not explicitly referenced – it was important for me to refer to work in design beyond figures such as Ce-

dric Price, Nicholas Negroponte and John Frazer, who were explicitly influenced by cybernetic ideas. My reference to Peter Eisenman is not therefore intended to validate his architecture but to point to the formal similarities between his work and second-order science (SOS) that are of interest whatever we think of his proposals. Indeed, the sort of critiques put forward by Cabral and others, such as that of Robin Evans (1985), may inform how SOS and SOC can be developed: as Cabral (§8) puts it, “it is not enough to be self-reflexive and simply engaged to explore the full potential of being an SOC observer.” The question of how to design such systems is an open one, and a topic on which design research and cybernetics might collaborate.

RECEIVED: 4 JULY 2016

ACCEPTED: 4 JULY 2016

Combined References

- Alexander C. (1964) Notes on the synthesis of form. Harvard University Press, Cambridge MA.
- Alexander C. (1984) The state of the art in design methods. In: Cross N. (ed.) *Developments in design methodology*. Wiley, Chichester: 309–316. Originally published in 1971.
- Alroe H. F. & Noe E. (2014) Second-order science of interdisciplinary research: A polyocular framework for wicked problems. *Constructivist Foundations* 10(1): 65–76.
► <http://constructivist.info/10/1/065>
- Arbib M. A. (2013) (Why) should architects care about neuroscience? In: Tidwell P. (ed.) *Architecture and neuroscience: A tapio Wirkkala-Rut Bryk Foundation, Espoo*: 43–76.
- Archer B. (1979) Design as a discipline. *Design Studies* 1(1): 17–20.
- Ashby W. R. (1957) *An introduction to cybernetics*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Ashby W. R. (1991) General systems theory as a new discipline. In: Klir G. J. (ed.) *Facets of systems science*. Plenum Press, New York: 249–257. Originally published in 1958.
- Baron P., Glanville R., Griffiths D. & Sweeting B. (eds.) (2015) *Living in Cybernetics: Papers from the 50th Anniversary Conference of the American Society for Cybernetics*. Special double issue of *Kybernetes* 44(8/9).
- Boden M. (2006) *Mind as machine, a history of cognitive science*. Volume 1. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Brand S., Bateson G. & Mead M. (1976) *For God's sake, Margaret: Conversation with Gregory Bateson and Margaret Mead*. *CoEvolutionary Quarterly* 10: 32–44. <http://www.oikos.org/forgod.htm>
- Bremaud I. (2012) Acoustical properties of wood in string instruments soundboards and tuned idiophones: Biological and cultural diversity. *Journal of the Acoustical Society of America*, *Acoustical Society of America* 2012: 131(1): 807–818. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00808347>.
- Broadbent G. & Ward A. (1969) *Design methods in architecture*. Lund Humphries, London.
- Bédard J.-F. (ed.) (1994) *Cities of artificial excavation: The work of Peter Eisenman, 1978–1988*. Rizzoli International, New York.
- Crease R. P. & Lutterbie J. (2010) *Technique*. In: Krastner D. & Saltz D. A. (eds.) *Staging philosophy: Intersections of theater, performance, and philosophy*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor: 160–179.
- Cross N. (1982) Designerly ways of knowing. *Design Studies* 3(4): 221–227.
- Cross N. (2007a) *Designerly ways of knowing*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Cross N. (2007b) From a design science to a design discipline: Understanding designerly ways of knowing and thinking. In: Michel R. (ed.) *Design research now: Essays and selected projects*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Downton P. (2004) *Studies in design research: Ten epistemological pavilions*. RMIT University Press, Melbourne.
- Dubberly H. & Pangaro P. (2007) *Cybernetics and service-craft: Language for behavior-focused design*. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1301–1317.
- Dubberly H. & Pangaro P. (2015) How cybernetics connects computing, counterculture, and design. In: *Hippie modernism: The struggle for utopia*. Walker Art Center, Minneapolis MN: 1–12. <http://www.dubberly.com/articles/cybernetics-and-counterculture.html>
- Durrant A. C., Vines J., Wallace J. & Yee J. (2015) Developing a dialogical platform for disseminating research through design. *Constructivist Foundations* 11(1): 401–434.
► <http://constructivist.info/11/1/401>
- Eno B. (2011) Composers as gardeners. *Edge* 11.10.11. <https://www.edge.org/conversation/composers-as-gardeners>.
- Evans R. (1985) Not to be used for wrapping purposes: Peter Eisenman: Fin d'Ou T Hou

- S. AA Files 10: 68–78. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29543477>
- Feyerabend P. K. (1970) Against method. In: Radner M. & Winokur S. (eds.) *Analyses of theories and methods of physics and psychology*. Volume IV. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis: 17–130. Retrieved from <http://www.mcps.umn.edu/philosophy/completeVol4.html>
- Feyerabend P. K. (1982) *Science in a free society*. Verso, London. Originally published in 1978.
- Feyerabend P. K. (1993) Against method. Third edition. Verso, London. Originally published in 1975.
- Fischer T. (2015) Wiener's prefiguring of a cybernetic design theory. *IEEE Technology and Society Magazine* 34(3): 52–59.
- Fischer T. & Herr C. (2007) The designer as toolbreaker? Probing tool use in applied generative design. In: CAADRIA2004: Proceedings of the 12th international conference on computer aided architectural design research in Asia, Nanjing, China 19–21 April 2007: 367–375.
- Fischer T. & Richards L. D. (2015) From goal-oriented to constraint-oriented design: The cybernetic intersection of design theory and systems theory. *Leonardo Journal*, in press. ► <http://cepa.info/2299>
- Flusser V. (2011) *Into the universe of technical images*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.
- Foerster H. von (1962) Perception of form in biological and man-made systems. In: Zagorski E. J. (ed.) *Transactions of the I. D. E. A. Symposium*. University of Illinois, Urbana IL: 10–37. ► <http://cepa.info/1612>
- Foerster H. von (1992) Ethics and second-order cybernetics. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 1(1): 9–20. ► <http://cepa.info/1742>
- Foerster H. von (ed.) (1995) *Cybernetics of cybernetics: Or, the control of control and the communication of communication*. Second edition. Future Systems, Minneapolis MN. Originally published in 1974.
- Foerster H. von (2003a) Cybernetics of cybernetics. In: *Understanding understanding: Essays on cybernetics and cognition*. Springer, New York: 283–286. Originally published in: Krippendorff K. (ed.) (1979) *Communication and control*. Gordon and Breach, New York: 5–8. ► <http://cepa.info/1707>
- Foerster H. von (2003b) *Understanding understanding: Essays on cybernetics and cognition*. Springer, New York.
- Foerster H. von & Poerksen B. (2002) *Understanding systems*. Translated by K. Leube. Kluwer Academic, New York.
- Frayling C. (1993) Research in art and design. *Royal College of Art Research Papers* 1(1): 1–5.
- Frazer J. (1993) The architectural relevance of cybernetics. *Systems Research* 10(3): 43–48.
- Frazer J. (1995) *An evolutionary architecture*. Architectural Association, London. <http://www.aaschool.ac.uk/publications/ea/intro.html>
- Furtado Cardoso Lopes G. M. (2008) Cedric Price's generator and the Frazers' systems research. *Technoetic Arts* 6(1): 55–72.
- Furtado Cardoso Lopes G. M. (2009) Gordon Pask: Exchanges between cybernetics and architecture and the envisioning of the IE. *Kybernetes* 38(7/8): 1317–1331.
- Furtado Cardoso Lopes G. M. (2010) Pask's encounters: From a childhood curiosity to the envisioning of an evolving environment: Exchanges between cybernetics and architecture. Edition Echoraum, Vienna.
- Gage S. (2006) The wonder of trivial machines. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 23(6): 771–778.
- Gage S. (2007a) Constructing the user. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 24(3): 313–322.
- Gage S. (2007b) How to design a black and white box. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1329–1339.
- Gedenryd H. (1998) How designers work: Making sense of authentic cognitive activities. *Cognitive Studies* 75. Lund University, Sweden. <http://lup.lub.lu.se/record/18828/file/1484253.pdf>
- Glanville R. (1992) CAD Abusing Computing. In: Mortola E. et al. (eds.) *CAAD instruction: The new teaching of an architect?* 10th eCAADe Conference Proceedings, Barcelona: 213–224.
- Glanville R. (1994) Variety in design. *Systems Research* 11(3): 95–103. ► <http://cepa.info/2785>
- Glanville R. (1997) A ship without a rudder. In: Glanville R. & de Zeeuw G. (eds.) *Problems of excavating cybernetics and systems*. BKS+, Southsea. ► <http://cepa.info/2846>
- Glanville R. (1999) Researching design and designing research. *Design Issues* 15(2): 80–91.
- Glanville R. (2002) Second order cybernetics. In: Parra-Luna F. (ed.) *Systems science and cybernetics*. In: *Encyclopaedia of life support systems (EOLSS)*. EoLSS, Oxford (Web publication). ► <http://cepa.info/2708>
- Glanville R. (2004a) Appropriate theory. In: Durling D., de Bono A. & Redmond J. (eds.) *Futureground: Proceedings of the Design Research Society international conference 2004*. Monash University, Melbourne.
- Glanville R. (2004b) Desirable ethics. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 11(2): 77–88.
- Glanville R. (2004c) The purpose of second-order cybernetics. *Kybernetes* 33(9/10): 1379–1386. ► <http://cepa.info/2294>
- Glanville R. (2006a) Construction and design. *Constructivist Foundations* 1(3): 103–110. ► <http://constructivist.info/1/3/103>
- Glanville R. (2006b) Design and mentation: Piaget's constant objects. The Radical Designer 0. Retrieved from http://www.iade.pt/designist/pdfs/000_05.pdf
- Glanville R. (ed.) (2007a) Cybernetics and design. Special double issue of *Kybernetes* 36(9/10).
- Glanville R. (2007b) Designing complexity. *Performance Improvement Quarterly* 20(2): 75–96. ► <http://cepa.info/2694>
- Glanville R. (2007c) Try again. Fail again. Fail better: The cybernetics in design and the design in cybernetics. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1173–1206. ► <http://cepa.info/2464>
- Glanville R. (2009a) A (cybernetic) musing: Design and cybernetics. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 16(3–4): 175–186.
- Glanville R. (2009b) A (cybernetic) musing: Certain propositions concerning prepositions. In: *The black box, volume III: 39 steps*. Edition Echoraum, Vienna: 319–329. Originally published as: (2005) *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 12(3): 87–95.
- Glanville R. (2009c) A (cybernetic) musing: Design and cybernetics. In: *The black box, volume III: 39 steps*. Edition Echoraum, Vienna: 423–425. Originally published as: (2009) *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 16(3–4): 175–186.
- Glanville R. (2011a) A (cybernetic) musing: Wicked problems. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 19(1–2): 163–173.
- Glanville R. (2011b) Introduction: A conference doing the cybernetics of cybernetics. *Kybernetes* 40(7/8): 952–963.
- Glanville R. (ed.) (2012) *Trojan horses: A rattle bag from the 'Cybernetics: Art, design, mathematic – A meta-disciplinary conversation' post-conference workshop*. Edition echoraum, Vienna.
- Glanville R. (2013) Radical constructivism = second order cybernetics. *Cybernet-*

- ics & Human Knowing 19(4): 27–42.
► <http://cepa.info/2695>
- Glanville R. (2014a)** Acting to understand and understanding to act. *Kybernetes* 43(9/10): 1293–1300.
- Glanville R. (2014b)** Freedom and the machine. Text of inaugural professorial lecture. University College London, 10 March 2010. In: Glanville R., *The black box*. Volume II: Living in cybernetic circles. Edition echoraum, Vienna: 61–81.
- Glanville R. (2014c)** Why design research? In: Glanville R., *The black box*. Volume II: Living in cybernetic circles. Edition Echoraum, Vienna: 111–120. Originally published in: Jacques R. & Powell J. (eds.) (1981) *Design, science, method: Proceedings of the 1980 Design Research Society conference*. Westbury House, Guildford: 86–94.
- Glanville R. (2015)** The sometimes uncomfortable marriages of design and research. In: Rogers P. A. & Yee J. (eds.) *The Routledge companion to design research*. Routledge, London: 9–22. ► <http://cepa.info/2799>
- Glanville R., Griffiths D. & Baron P. (eds.) (2014)** A circularity in learning. Special double issue of *Kybernetes* 43(9/10).
- Glanville R. & Sweeting B. (eds.) (2011)** *Cybernetics: Art, design, mathematics – A meta-disciplinary conversation: Papers from the 2010 conference of the American Society for Cybernetics*. Special double issue of *Kybernetes* 40(7/8).
- Glaserfeld E. von (1990)** An exposition of constructivism: Why some like it radical. In: Davis R. B., Maher C. A. & Noddings N. (eds.) *Monographs of the Journal for Research in Mathematics Education #4*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Reston VA: 19–29. ► <http://cepa.info/1415>
- Glaserfeld E. von (1995)** *Radical constructivism: A way of knowing and learning*. Falmer Press, London.
- Goodbun J. (2011)** Gregory Bateson's ecological aesthetics: An addendum to urban political ecology. *Field* 4(1): 35–46.
http://www.field-journal.org/uploads/file/2011_Volume_4/field-journal_Ecology.pdf
- Gooding D. (1992)** Putting agency back into experiment. In: Pickering A. (ed.) *Science as practice and culture*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL: 65–112.
- Grand S. & Jonas W. (2012)** Mapping design research. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Halprin L. (1969)** *The RSVP cycles: Creative processes in the human environment*. George Brazillier, New York.
- Herr C. M. (2011)** Mutually arising abstract and actual. *Kybernetes* 40(7/8): 1030–1037.
- Herr C. M. (2015a)** Second order cellular automata to support designing. *Kybernetes* 44(8/9): 1251–1261.
- Herr C. M. (2015b)** The big picture: Connecting design, second order cybernetics and radical constructivism. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 22(2–3): 107–114.
► <http://cepa.info/2468>
- Herr C. & Fischer T. (2004)** Using hardware cellular automata to simulate use in adaptive architecture. In: CAADRIA2004: Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Computer Aided Architectural Design Research in Asia, Seoul, Korea 28–30 April 2004: 815–828.
- Herr C. & Fischer T. (2013)** Systems for showing and repurposing: A second-order cybernetic reflection on some cellular automata projects. *Journal of Mathematics and System Science* 3(2013): 201–216.
► <http://cepa.info/2323>
- Hohl M. & Sweeting B. (eds.) (2015)** Composing conferences. Special issue of *Constructivist Foundations* 11(1).
► <http://constructivist.info/11/1>
- Holl S., Pallasmaa J. & Pérez-Gómez A. (2006)** *Questions of perception: Phenomenology of architecture*. William Stout, San Francisco CA.
- Hollingsworth R. & Müller, K. H. (2008)** Transforming socio-economics with a new epistemology. *Socio-Economic Review* 6(3): 395–426.
- Irwin T. (2015)** Transition design: A proposal for a new area of design practice, study and research. *Design and Culture* 7(2): 229–246.
- Jelić A. (2015)** Designing “pre-reflective” architecture: Implications of neurophenomenology for architectural design and thinking. *Ambiances – International Journal of Sensory Environment, Architecture, and Urban Space*: 11 September 2015. <http://ambiances.revues.org/628>
- Jelić A., Tieri G., De Matteis F., Babiloni F. & Vecchiato G. (2016)** The enactive approach to architectural experience: A neurophysiological perspective on embodiment, motivation, and affordances. *Frontiers in Psychology* 7. <http://journal.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00481>
- Jonas W. (2007a)** Design research and its meaning to the methodological development of the discipline. In: Michel R. (ed.) *Design research now: Essays and selected projects*. Birkhäuser, Basel: 187–206.
- Jonas W. (2007b)** Research through DESIGN through research: A cybernetic model of designing design foundations. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1362–1380.
- Jonas W. (2012)** Exploring the swampy ground. In: Grand S. & Jonas W. (eds.) *Mapping design research*. Birkhäuser, Basel: 11–41.
- Jonas W. (2014)** The strengths/limits of Systems Thinking denote the strengths/limits of Practice-Based Design Research. *FORMakademisk* 7(4): Article 1: 1–11.
- Jonas W. (2015a)** A cybernetic model of design research: Towards a trans-domain of knowing. In: Rogers P. A. & Yee J. (eds.) *The Routledge companion to design research*. Routledge, London: 23–37.
- Jonas W. (2015b)** Research through design is more than just a new form of disseminating design outcomes. *Constructivist Foundations* 11(1): 32–36.
► <http://constructivist.info/11/1/032>
- Jones J. C. (1984)** How my thoughts about design methods have changed during the years. In: *Essays in design*. Wiley, Chichester: 13–27. Originally published in 1974.
- Jones P. (2014)** Design research methods in systemic design. In: Sevaldson B. & Jones P. (eds.) *Proceedings of the Third Symposium of Relating Systems Thinking to Design (RSD3)*. Oslo School of Architecture and Design, Oslo. <http://systemic-design.net/rsd3-proceedings/>
- Knorr Cetina K. (1992)** The couch, the cathedral, and the laboratory: On the relationship between experiment and laboratory in science. In: Pickering A. (ed.) *Science as practice and culture*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL: 113–138.
- Kolarevic B. (2003)** *Architecture in the digital age: Design and manufacturing*. Taylor & Francis, New York.
- Krippendorff K. (2007)** The cybernetics of design and the design of cybernetics. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1381–1392. ► <http://cepa.info/2463>
- Krueger T. (2007)** Design and prosthetic perception. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1393–1405.
- Lautenschlaeger G. & Pratschke A. (2011)** Don't give up! Media art as an endless conversational process. *Kybernetes* 40(7/8): 1090–1101.

- Leach N. (2012) Parametrics explained. In: Leach N. & Yuan P. F. (ed.) *Scripting the future*. Tongji University Press, Shanghai. Reprinted as: Leach N. (2014) *Parametrics explained*. *Next Generation Building* 1(1): 8–15.
- Littlewood J. (1964) A laboratory of fun. *New Scientist* 22(391): 432–433.
- Lloyd Thomas K., Amhoff T. & Beech N. (eds.) (2016) *Industries of architecture*. Routledge, London.
- Lobsinger M. L. (2000) Cybernetic theory and the architecture of performance: Cedric Price's Fun Palace. In: Goldhagen S. W. & Legault R. (eds.) *Anxious modernisms: Experimentation in post-war architectural culture*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA: 119–139.
- Lynn G. (ed.) (1993) Folding in architecture. *Architectural Design Profile* 102: 8–15.
- Mallgrave H. F. (2011) The architect's brain: Neuroscience, creativity, and architecture. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Mallgrave H. F. (2013) *Architecture and embodiment: The implications of the new sciences and humanities for design*. Routledge, New York NY.
- Mathews S. (2005) The Fun Palace: Cedric Price's experiment in architecture and technology. *Technoetic Arts: A Journal of Speculative Research*, 3(2): 73–91.
- Mathews S. (2006) The Fun Palace as virtual architecture: Cedric Price and the practices of indeterminacy. *Journal of Architectural Education* 59(3): 39–48.
- Mathews S. (2007) From agit-prop to free space: The architecture of Cedric Price. London: Black Dog.
- Maturana H. R. (1990) Science and daily life: The ontology of scientific explanations. In: Krohn W., Koppers G. & Nowotny H. (eds.) *Selforganization: Portrait of a scientific revolution*. Kluwer, Dordrecht: 12–35. ► <http://cepa.info/607>
- Mead M. (1968) *Cybernetics of cybernetics*. In: Foerster H. von, White J. D., Peterson L. J. & Russell J. K. (eds.) *Purposive systems*. Spartan Books, New York: 1–11. ► <http://cepa.info/2634>
- Medawar P. (1996) Is the scientific paper a fraud? In: *The strange case of the spotted mice and other classic essays on science*. Oxford University Press, Oxford: 33–39. Originally published in 1963.
- Michel R. (2007) *Design research now: Essays and selected projects*. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Müller K. H. (2008) The new science of cybernetics: The evolution of living research designs. Volume I: Methodology. Edition Echoraum, Vienna.
- Müller K. H. (2010) The radical constructivist movement and its network formations. *Constructivist Foundations* 6(1): 31–39. ► <http://constructivist.info/6/1/031>
- Müller K. H. (2011) The new science of cybernetics: The evolution of living research designs. Volume II: Theory. Edition Echoraum, Vienna.
- Müller K. H. (2014) Towards a general methodology for second-order science. *Journal of Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics* 12(5): 33–42. ► <http://cepa.info/2786>
- Müller A. & Müller K. H. (eds.) (2007) *An unfinished revolution? Heinz von Foerster and the Biological Computer Laboratory (BCL): 1958–1976*. Edition Echoraum, Vienna.
- Müller K. H. & Müller A. (2011) Foreword: Re-discovering and re-inventing Heinz von Foerster. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 18(3–4): 5–16.
- Müller K. H. & Riegler A. (2014a) A new course of action. *Constructivist Foundations* 10(1): 1–6. ► <http://constructivist.info/10/1/001>
- Müller K. H. & Riegler A. (2014b) Second-order science: A vast and largely unexplored science frontier. *Constructivist Foundations* 10(1): 7–15. ► <http://constructivist.info/10/1/007>
- Negroponte N. (1975) *Soft architecture machines*. MIT Press, Cambridge MA.
- Nicolescu B. (2012) Transdisciplinarity: The hidden third, between the subject and the object. *Human & Social Studies* 1(1): 13–28.
- Nowotny H., Scott P. & Gibbons M. (2006) Re-thinking science: Mode 2 in societal context. In: Carayannis E. G. & Campbell D. F. J. (eds.) *Knowledge creation, diffusion, and use in innovation networks and knowledge clusters. A comparative systems approach across the United States, Europe and Asia*. Praeger, Westport CT: 39–51.
- Oxman R. (2006) Theory and design in the first digital age. *International Journal of Design Studies* 27: 229–265.
- Pallasmaa J. (2005) *The eyes of the skin: Architecture and the senses*. John Wiley & Sons, Chichester.
- Pask G. (1963) The conception of a shape and the evolution of a design. In: Jones J. C. & Thornley D. G. (eds.) *Conference on Design Methods*, September, 1962. Pergamon Press, Oxford: 153–167. Retrieved from [http://pangaro.com/pask/pask conception of shape and evolution of design.pdf](http://pangaro.com/pask/pask%20conception%20of%20shape%20and%20evolution%20of%20design.pdf)
- Pask G. (1969) The architectural relevance of cybernetics. *Architectural Design* 39(9): 494–496. ► <http://cepa.info/2696>
- Pask G. (1976) *Conversation theory: Applications in education and epistemology*. Elsevier, Amsterdam. Retrieved from <http://pangaro.com/pask/ConversationTheory.zip>
- Pickering A. (ed.) (1992) *Science as practice and culture*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- Pickering A. (1993) The mangle of practice: Agency and emergence in the sociology of science. *American Journal of Sociology* 99(3): 559–589.
- Pickering A. (1995) *The mangle of practice: Time, agency, and science*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- Pickering A. (2010) *The cybernetic brain: Sketches of another future*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago IL.
- Popper K. R. (1976) *Unended quest: An intellectual autobiography*. Routledge, London.
- Pratschke A. (2007) *Architecture as a verb: Cybernetics and design processes for the social divide*. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1458–1470.
- Price C. (2003) *Re: CP*. Edited by H. U. Obrist. Birkhäuser, Basel.
- Ramsgard Thomsen M. (2007) *Drawing a live section: Explorations into robotic membranes*. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1471–1485.
- Rawes P. (2007) Second-order cybernetics, architectural drawing and monadic thinking. *Kybernetes* 36(9/10): 1486–1496.
- Rawes P. (ed.) (2013) *Relational architectural ecologies: Architecture, nature and subjectivity*. Routledge, London.
- Richards L. D. (2010) The anticommunication imperative. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 17(1–2): 11–24. ► <http://cepa.info/925>
- Richards L. D. (2015) Designing academic conferences in the light of second-order cybernetics. *Constructivist Foundations* 11(1): 65–73. ► <http://constructivist.info/11/1/065>
- Riegler A. & Müller K. H. (eds.) (2014) *Second-order science. Special issue of Constructivist Foundations* 10(1). ► <http://constructivist.info/10/1>
- Rietveld E. (2016) Situating the embodied mind in a landscape of standing affordances for living without chairs: Materializing a philosophical worldview. *Sports Medicine*: 1–6.

- Rietveld E. & Kiverstein J. (2014) A rich landscape of affordances. *Ecological Psychology* 26(4): 325–352.
- Rittel H. (1972) On the planning crisis: Systems analysis of the “first and second generations.” *Bedriftskonomen* 8: 390–396.
- Rittel H. & Webber M. (1973) Dilemmas in a general theory of planning. *Policy Sciences* 4: 155–169.
- Rittel H. & Webber M. (1984) Planning problems are wicked problems. In: Cross N. (ed.) *Developments in design methodology*. Wiley, Chichester: 135–144.
- Rogers P. A. & Yee J. (eds.) (2015) *The Routledge companion to design research*. Routledge, London.
- Schneidewind U. & Augenstein K. (2012) Analyzing a transition to a sustainability-oriented science system in Germany. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 3: 16–28.
- Schön D. A. (1988) Designing: Rules, types and worlds. *Design Studies* 9(3): 181–190.
- Schön D. A. (1991) *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Arena, Farnham. Originally published in 1983.
- Scott B. (2003) “Heinz von Foerster – An appreciation” (Revisited). *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 10(3–4): 137–149. ► <http://cepa.info/2697>
- Scott B. (2004) Second-order cybernetics: An historical introduction. *Kybernetes* 33(9/10): 1365–1378.
- Scott B. (2011) Explorations in second-order cybernetics: Reflections on cybernetics, psychology and education. Edition Echoraum, Vienna.
- Shannon C. E. (1948) A mathematical theory of communication. *The Bell System Technical Journal* 27: 379–457. <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?tp=&arnumber=6773024>
- Simon H. A. (1996) *The sciences of the artificial*. Third edition. MIT Press, Cambridge MA. Originally published in 1969.
- Snow C. P. (1961) *The two cultures and the scientific revolution*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Spiller N. (ed.) (2002) *Cyber_reader: Critical writings for the digital era*. Phaidon Press, London.
- Spiller N. (2006) *Visionary architecture: Blueprints of the modern imagination*. Thames and Hudson, London.
- Sweeting B. (2011) Conversing with drawings and buildings: From abstract to actual in architecture. *Kybernetes* 40 (7/8): 1159–1165. ► <http://cepa.info/1002>
- Sweeting B. (2014) Architecture and undecidability: Explorations in there being no right answer – Some intersections between epistemology, ethics and designing architecture, understood in terms of second-order cybernetics and radical constructivism. PhD Thesis, UCL, London. <http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1443544>
- Sweeting B. (2015a) Architecture and second order science. In: *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the ISSS* 1(1): 1–6. ► <http://cepa.info/2843>
- Sweeting B. (2015b) Conversation, design and ethics: The cybernetics of Ranulph Glanville. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 22(2–3): 99–105. ► <http://cepa.info/2845>
- Sweeting B. (2015c) Cybernetics of practice. *Kybernetes* 44(8/9): 1397–1405.
- Sweeting B. & Hohl M. (2015) Exploring alternatives to the traditional conference format: Introduction to the special issue on composing conferences. *Constructivist Foundations* 11(1): 1–7. ► <http://constructivist.info/11/1/001>
- Toffler A. (1970) *Future shock: A study of mass bewilderment in the face of accelerating change*. Bodley Head, London.
- Trimingham R. (2008) The role of values in design decision-making. *Design and Technology Education: An International Journal* 13(2): 37–52.
- Turnbull D. (2000) *Masons, tricksters and cartographers: Comparative studies in the sociology of scientific and indigenous knowledge*. Routledge, London.
- Umpleby S. A. (2003) Heinz von Foerster and the Mansfield amendment. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 10(3–4): 187–190. ► <http://cepa.info/1876>
- Umpleby S. A. (2014) Second-order science: Logic, strategies, methods. *Constructivist Foundations* 10(1): 16–23. ► <http://constructivist.info/10/016>
- Umpleby S. A. & Dent E. (1999) The origins and purposes of several traditions in systems theory and cybernetics. *Cybernetics and Systems* 30(2): 79–103. ► <http://cepa.info/2698>
- Uptis A. (2013) Alexander’s choice: How architecture avoided computer aided design c. 1962. In: Dutta A. (ed.) *A second modernism: MIT, architecture, and the “techno-social” moment*. SA+P Press, Cambridge MA: 474–505.
- van Ditmar D. F. & Glanville R. (eds.) (2013) *Listening: Proceedings of ASC conference 2011. Special double issue of Cybernetics & Human Knowing* 20(1–2).
- Vörös S. (2014) The uroboros of consciousness: Between the naturalisation of phenomenology and the phenomenologisation of nature. *Constructivist Foundations* 10(1): 96–104. ► <http://constructivist.info/10/1/096>
- Wiener N. (1950) *The human use of human beings: Cybernetics and society*. Eyre and Spottiswoode, London.
- Zumthor P. (1999) *Thinking architecture*. Birkhäuser, Basel.