Invention before theory: how the practical often leads theory

Author	Marinez, Jose;Goodman, Lizbeth
Title	Invention before theory: how the practical often leads theory
Publication date	2025
Link to Item	https://hdl.handle.net/20.500.14069/1277

Invention before Theory: How the Practical Often Leads Theory

Jose Marinez[1], Lizbeth Goodman[2]

[1]College of Engineering and Architecture, SMARTlab, Inclusive Design and Creative Technology Innovation, Inclusive Design Research Centre, University College Dublin, Ireland

jose.marinez1@ucdconnect.ie lizbeth.goodman@ucd.ie

[2]King's Academy, King's College London, United Kingdom

Abstract

The world faces unprecedented sustainability challenges that demand solutions not tomorrow, but yesterday. This urgency compels a re-evaluation of engineering education, which often overlooks a provocative pattern in its own history: practical invention frequently precedes formal theory. This paper argues that to cultivate the innovators needed for a sustainable future, engineering curricula must shift from a theory-first model to one that embraces practice-led discovery. We frame this argument through two lenses: the Mind of engineering, which explores the intellectual history of how practitioners like the Wright brothers and modern AI pioneers achieved breakthroughs through empirical iteration, often ahead of scientific consensus; and the Soul, which addresses the ethical, social, and humanistic dimensions frequently missing from technical training.

Drawing on the ethos of practice-led research and hands-on problem-solving, we present a critique of an education that ill-prepares students for real-world complexity. We introduce concepts from economics and anthropology, such as the Jevons Paradox and Cultural Relativism, as essential tools for a sustainability-conscious engineer. The paper confronts the moral dilemmas engineers face when their work conflicts with sustainability goals, proposing that wisdom from the humanities offers an antidote to paralysis and nihilism. Finally, we propose concrete reforms—including tactical integration of interdisciplinary seminars and legitimizing failure as a vital form of data—to foster resilient, creative, and ethically grounded engineers. By aligning education with the reality that building the possible often paves the way for understanding it, we can empower students to become the crew our "Spaceship Earth" urgently needs.

1 Introduction

Engineering history reveals a provocative pattern: practical invention often precedes formal theory (Basalla, 1988). The steam engine roared into existence nearly a century before thermodynamics matured to describe its principles (Cardwell, 1971). Flying machines took to the skies well ahead of the refined aerodynamic theories that now inform aircraft design (Vincenti, 1990). This dynamic is not an anomaly; it is a fundamental insight into how innovation unfolds. Yet, engineering education often treats practical creation as secondary to theoretical mastery. This paper argues for flipping that script.

The impetus for this argument is one of profound urgency. Faced with wicked problems like climate change and resource depletion, we need solutions immediately. We need a generation of engineers who are not just proficient technicians but bold inventors, capable of creating novel solutions where no textbook provides a clear answer. This perspective is grounded in the authors' experiences within practice-led research environments, where experienced practitioners create technologies for social impact through a multidisciplinary, inclusive design approach. It is an ethos shaped by the hands-on, community-driven spirit of the global maker movement and the "hacker ethos" of pragmatic problem-solving (Gershenfeld, 2005). This background informs our central thesis: to produce true innovators, we must educate them in a way that reflects how innovation actually happens.

To explore this, we structure our paper around two complementary concepts: the Mind and the Soul of engineering. The "Mind" represents the intellectual and historical argument for practice-led discovery, examining how engineers have consistently acted as pioneers who pushed boundaries through hands-on experimentation. The "Soul" addresses the missing dimensions in engineering curricula—the social, economic, and ethical complexities that are essential for genuine sustainable development. We contend that by training only the engineering Mind, we leave graduates ill-equipped to handle the moral and systemic realities of their profession. To be true catalysts for a sustainable future, engineers need both.

2 The Mind: When Practice Leads Theory: Lessons from History

Far from being passive applicators of science, engineers have repeatedly blazed new trails through tinkering, trial-and-error, and intuitive leaps, forcing science to play catch-up. As Albert Einstein noted, "We cannot solve our problems with the same thinking we used when we created them." We see this as a recurring cycle: an innovation can spark a new theory, which science refines and engineering applies. This dynamic—innovation prompting theory, science validating it, and engineering applying it—shows how a practical invention can lead to fundamental theories that fuel further technological progress. The following historical cases are powerful illustrations of the first, crucial step in this cycle: where innovation precedes and provokes theoretical understanding.

Consider a few emblematic examples:

- Steam Engines vs. Thermodynamics: Early steam engines in the 18th century powered mines and mills long before scientists understood the principles of heat, work, and energy. James Watt's revolutionary steam engine of the 1760s was invented out of practical necessity, predating the formal laws of thermodynamics by nearly a century. Theory followed to explain and optimize the invention (Cardwell, 1971).
- Powered Flight vs. Aerodynamic Theory: The Wright brothers achieved sustained powered flight in 1903 using pragmatic experimentation—wind-tunnel tests, prototype gliders, and constant iteration—without a complete aerodynamic theory (Vincenti, 1990). Early aeronautical engineers generated vital insights from the act of design and flight itself, with systematic aviation science emerging only after these practical successes.
- Optical Instruments vs. Optical Science: Humans crafted lenses, microscopes, and telescopes for generations, refining their art through observation long before the physics of light was understood (Smith, 2010). Devices like Galileo's telescope revealed phenomena such as Jupiter's moons and diffraction, which drove scholars to formulate the wave and particle theories of light. The artifact came first; the unifying theory came later.

These cases show that engineers often act as catalysts and pioneers, expanding the realm of the possible and compelling theorists to grapple with phenomena they had not previously confronted. George Basalla, in The Evolution of Technology (1988), celebrates engineers' creative agency in driving progress outside the linear model of science-to-technology. When an engineer like Thomas Edison tinkers with countless filaments to invent a workable light bulb (Petroski, 1985), or when Grace Hopper "hacks" early computers to create the first compiler (Beyer, 2012), they redefine what is achievable. This pioneer spirit is crucial for tackling 21st-century challenges. Solutions to climate change or global infrastructure needs will not spring fully formed from existing theory; they will emerge from bold experimentation and systems thinking.

3 Modern Evidence and the Archetypal Innovator

The dynamic of practice leading theory continues today and is best exemplified by a modern breakthrough and a legendary innovator.

3.1 Modern Evidence: Generative AI

A striking contemporary example of the INNOVATION -> THEORY portion of the cycle in action is the rise of generative AI. In 2017, Google researchers introduced the Transformer, a novel neural network architecture based on attention mechanisms (Vaswani et al., 2017). While this paper provided the theoretical foundation, its revolutionary potential was unlocked through aggressive experimentation. Researchers at OpenAI scaled up the Transformer dramatically, resulting in the Generative Pre-trained Transformer (GPT) series (Radford et al., 2019; Brown et al., 2020).

GPT-3, with its 175 billion parameters, demonstrated emergent capabilities that were not explicitly programmed, such as few-shot learning (Brown et al., 2020). This breakthrough was not guided by a pre-existing theory of scale; it was an empirical leap. Only after observing GPT-3's success did researchers formulate scaling laws to explain why bigger models performed better (Kaplan et al., 2020). This process exemplifies innovation actively attempting to forge a path toward a new theory where none currently exists. Bold experimentation is driving progress toward a formal theory of AGI or human cognition, which remains elusive.

3.2 The Archetype: Paul MacCready and the Gossamer Condor

No story better illustrates the power of rapid, iterative experimentation than that of Paul MacCready. As Albert Einstein also said, "The formulation of a problem is often more essential than its solution." MacCready embodied this by reframing the challenge of human-powered flight. For 18 years, the £50,000 Kremer Prize for the first human-powered flight in a figure-eight course went unclaimed. Well-funded teams, armed with careful calculations, built complex prototypes that took a year to test, only to fail.

MacCready, an iconoclast engineer, approached the problem differently. He understood the real challenge was not building a plane, but creating a system for learning how to build one. He focused on a "fail-fast" approach, designing a fragile plane of Mylar, aluminum, and piano wire that could be built, flown, crashed, and repaired in hours, not months (Fast Company, 2011). While expert teams managed one test per year, MacCready's team conducted up to 16 tests per day to glean insights for the next iteration (Signal v. Noise, 2011). In 1977, after just six months, the Gossamer Condor won the prize (Academy of Achievement, 1991).

MacCready's success teaches a vital lesson: failure is not the opposite of success; it is a crucial part of it (Petroski, 1985). Every crash was informative data. This "fail-fast, learn-fast" ethos has deep roots in engineering, yet traditional curricula often stigmatize failure. The Condor's story urges us to give students open-ended problems where failure is an expected and valuable part of the process.

4 The Soul: The Missing Dimensions in Engineering Education

While the "Mind" of engineering focuses on how to build, the "Soul" asks why and for whom. There is something missing in a purely technical education. Engineering curricula often treat sustainability as a checklist of technical efficiencies, ignoring the two pillars that define its complexity: the economic and the social. This omission leaves students unprepared for the nuanced reality of sustainable development.

4.1 "Reverse Consilience": Integrating Humanities and Social Sciences

E.O. Wilson's concept of consilience—the unity of knowledge—argues for merging insights across disciplines to solve global problems (Wilson, 1998). Traditionally, this is seen as engineering providing tools for other fields. We propose an "antidote" of Reverse Consilience: a deliberate flow of knowledge from the humanities and social sciences into engineering. This approach is not a rigid framework but a set of recommendations for broadening an engineer's perspective. It acknowledges that effective sustainable development is deeply context-specific; solutions that work in New York may be entirely inappropriate for Lagos or Colombo. To design sustainable systems, engineers must understand the human systems in which they operate.

4.2 Examples of Essential Concepts

To design robust solutions, engineers must be exposed to concepts from the social sciences that reveal the complex human dynamics that can support or undermine sustainability goals. An engineer aware of these dynamics can better anticipate and mitigate unintended consequences. The following concepts, for instance, highlight potential conflicts with sustainable development that every engineering student should at a minimum be aware of and discuss.

- Jevons Paradox (Economics): This 19th-century principle states that as technological improvements increase the efficiency with which a resource is used, the rate of consumption of that resource may increase rather than decrease. For example, modern LCD screens are far more energy-efficient than old CRT monitors. However, this efficiency has made screens so cheap and ubiquitous—in phones, cars, and appliances—that society as a whole uses more energy on displays than ever before. An engineer unaware of this paradox might promote an "efficient" solution that inadvertently fuels overconsumption and systemic lock-in.
- Cultural Relativism (Anthropology): This principle, championed by Franz Boas, emphasizes that values and priorities vary across cultures. A technically optimal solution may fail if it clashes with local priorities or traditions. For instance, a wind farm might be fiercely opposed by a community reliant on coal mining for its economic survival and cultural identity. In Ireland, promoting alternatives to peat briquettes for home heating confronts deep-seated cultural traditions. Engineers must learn to see their work through the eyes of the communities they serve, engaging in co-design with the mantra, "Nothing for us without us."
- Tragedy of the Commons (Economics/Ecology): This concept describes a situation where individuals acting in their own self-interest deplete a shared, limited resource, even when it is clear that doing so is not in anyone's long-term interest. Understanding this dynamic is fundamental to designing systems for managing shared resources like clean air, water, or fisheries.

5 The Engineer’s Dilemma: Navigating Moral Complexity

This expanded education leads to a difficult but essential question: "I work at company Y, and my project is at odds with sustainability. What do I do?" A purely technical education provides no tools to answer this. The result can be negative psychological states: paralysis (the inability to act), nihilism (the belief that nothing matters), or depression. These are real mental health challenges facing students and professionals who feel trapped between their values and their employment.

The antidote to this despair lies not in engineering textbooks but in the humanities. The world's great philosophical, spiritual, and religious traditions are rich resources for building the moral resilience needed to navigate such complex ethical dilemmas.

- Shakespeare and the Classics prepare you for reality. They present characters navigating flawed systems, making difficult choices with imperfect information, and living with the consequences. They teach empathy and moral reasoning in a way that case studies cannot.
- The Bhagavad Gita, a foundational Hindu text, offers one powerful example. Its wisdom is delivered not in a tranquil monastery but on a battlefield, as the warrior Arjuna despairs before a catastrophic war. It serves as a guide to finding purpose and acting with ethical clarity (dharma) in the midst of conflict and chaos. It is one of many touchstones—from Stoic philosophy to Buddhist ethics—that equip individuals to act with purpose in the face of profound adversity, teaching that one cannot wait for a perfect system to act rightly; one must find a way to do so within the world as it is.

These traditions do not offer easy answers, but they build the fortitude required to navigate the ethical battlefields of the modern world.

6 Recommendations

How can we integrate these ideas into already packed engineering curricula? The goal is not to make every engineer an expert in economics or philosophy, but to provide crucial exposure that cultivates an inventor’s mindset. Acknowledging the common pushback that "the curriculum is full," we propose the following tactical reforms.

6.1 Project-Based Learning with Autonomy

Go beyond tightly scoped capstone projects. Give students intellectual space and credit to pursue their own ideas, even if those ideas lie outside a supervisor’s direct expertise. Interdisciplinary maker spaces and student-led design teams can provide outlets for this creative freedom, with faculty acting as enablers rather than gatekeepers.

6.2 Legitimizing Failure as Data

Explicitly incorporate iterative design challenges where failure is expected. Grade on the rigor of the process and the learning demonstrated in reflection reports, not just the final outcome. Share stories like the Gossamer Condor to normalize the idea that failure is a feature, not a bug, in innovation. This aligns with industry practices like agile development and design thinking (Brown, 2008), as well as established educational movements like CDIO approach (Crawley et al., 2007) and builds resilience.

6.3 Tactical Integration

Instead of adding full courses, use high-impact, low-overhead tactics.

- Two-Day Seminars: Host intensive workshops on "The Greatest Hits of Economics for Sustainable Engineering" or "Anthropological Thinking for Global Projects," led by passionate experts from those fields. The goal is exposure to key mental models.
- Readings and Dialogues: Assign readings from other disciplines and structure discussions around them. Use "teach to learn" assignments, where students are tasked with explaining a concept like Jevons Paradox to their peers, deepening their own understanding.

6.4 Fostering Interdepartmental Bonds

These activities create a great opportunity to build relationships between engineering and other university departments. Such collaborations break down institutional silos and model the interdisciplinary teamwork students will need in their careers.

7 Conclusion

Our argument is a call to reclaim the full essence of engineering in education. It is not science’s lesser cousin but a human endeavor of creation, experimentation, and problem-solving in context. The urgency of global challenges requires engineers who are not afraid to stray from the syllabus, who test daring ideas, and who can integrate knowledge from everywhere to make solutions work. They must be comfortable with ambiguity, resilient in failure, and adept at learning from other disciplines. In short, they must be inventors and leaders.

By restructuring education around both the Mind and the Soul of engineering, we prepare students for this reality. We equip them with the historical understanding that invention drives theory (the Mind) and the ethical and systemic awareness to wield that power responsibly (the Soul). We may not produce a "Gossamer Condor" in every class, but we will produce graduates with an innovation mindset and the confidence to venture into the unknown.

Buckminster Fuller famously said, "There are no passengers on Spaceship Earth, only crew." Our task is to train that crew. Invention often comes before theory; it is time our educational practices reflected that truth. Let’s teach our engineering students to build the flying machine and trust that the principles—and their own deeper learning—will follow. In doing so, we empower them to be true catalysts, armed with experience, curiosity, and a consilient worldview to engineer a more sustainable, equitable future.

References

Academy of Achievement. 1991. *Paul MacCready Interview*. https://achievement.org/achiever/paul-b-maccready-ph-d/ - interview.

Basalla, G. 1988. *The Evolution of Technology*. Cambridge University Press.

Beyer, K.W.. 2012. *Grace Hopper and the invention of the information age.* MIT Press.

Brown, T. 2008. Design Thinking. *Harvard Business Review*, **86(6)**, 84–92.

Brown, T., Mann, B., Ryder, N., Subbiah, M., Kaplan, J., Dhariwal, P., Neelakantan, A., Shyam, P., Sastry, G., Askell, A., Agarwal, S., Herbert-Voss, A., Krueger, G., Henighan, T., Child, R., Ramesh, A., Ziegler, D., Wu, J., Winter, C., Hesse, C., Chen, M., Sigler, E., Litwin, M., Gray, S., Chess, B., Clark, J., Berner, C., McCandlish, S., Radford, A., Sutskever, I., & Amodei, D. 2020. *Language Models are Few-Shot Learners*. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems. https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2020/hash/1457c0d6bfcb4967418bfb8ac142f64a-Abstract.html

Cardwell, D. S. L. 1971. *From Watt to Clausius: The Rise of Thermodynamics in the Early Industrial Age*. Cambridge University Press.

Crawley, E. F., Malmqvist, J., Östlund, S., & Brodeur, D. R. 2007. *Rethinking Engineering Education: The CDIO Approach*. Springer.

Fast Company's Co.Design. 2011. *Wanna Solve Impossible Problems? Find Ways to Fail Quicker*. https://web.archive.org/web/20110331053617/http://www.fastcodesign.com/1663488/wanna-solve-impossible-problems-find-ways-to-fail-quicker.

Gershenfeld, N. (2005). Fab: The Coming Revolution on Your Desktop—from Personal Computers to Personal Fabrication. Basic Books.

Kaplan, J., McCandlish, S., Henighan, T., Brown, T., Chess, B., Child, R., Gray, S., Radford, A., Wu, J., Amodei, D., & Sutskever, I. 2020. *Scaling Laws for Neural Language Models*. https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.08361

Petroski, H. 1985. *To Engineer Is Human: The Role of Failure in Successful Design*. St. Martin's Press.

Smith, A. M. 2010. *From Sight to Insight: The Passage from Ancient to Modern Optics*. Cambridge University Press.

Radford, A., Wu, J., Child, R., Luan, D., Amodei, D., & Sutskever, I. 2019. *Language Models are Unsupervised Multitask Learners.* OpenAI Blog. https://openai.com/index/better-language-models/

Signal v. Noise. 2011. *How nature and naivete helped Paul MacCready build a human powered airplane in only six months* . https://signalvnoise.com/posts/2861-how-nature-and-naivet-helped-paul-maccready-build-a-human-powered-airplane-in-only-six-months.

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. 2017. *Attention Is All You Need.* Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 5998–6008. https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html

Vincenti, W. G. 1990. *What Engineers Know and How They Know It: Analytical Studies from Aeronautical History*. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Wilson, E. O. 1998. *Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge*. Alfred A. Knopf.