

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Complexity Theory in Biology and Technology: Broken Symmetries and Emergence

[Paolo Di Sia](#) * and [George F. R. Ellis](#)

Posted Date: 16 August 2023

doi: 10.20944/preprints202308.1126.v1

Keywords: Complexity theory, Emergence, Biology, Technology, Agency, Symmetries



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Complexity Theory in Biology and Technology: Broken Symmetries and Emergence

George F. R. Ellis ^{1,2,†}  and Paolo Di Sia ^{3,4,†} 

¹ Mathematics Department, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7700, Cape Town, South Africa; george.ellis@uct.ac.za

² The New Institute, 18 Warburgstrasse, Hamburg, Germany; george.ellis@thenew.institute

³ Technical Applied Sciences, University of Verona, Via Bengasi 4, 37134 Verona, Italy; paolo.disia@univr.it

⁴ University of Padova, Padova, Italy; paolo.disia@unipd.it

* Correspondence: paolo.disia@univr.it

† PDS mainly wrote sections 1 and 5 whereas GFRE mainly wrote sections 2,3, and 4.

Abstract: This paper discusses *complexity theory*, that is, the many theories that have been proposed for emergence of complexity from the underlying physics. Our aim is to identify which aspects have turned out to be the more fundamental ones as regards the emergence of biology, engineering, and digital computing, as opposed to those that are in fact more peripheral in these contexts. In the cases we consider, complexity arises via adaptive modular hierarchical structures that are open systems involving broken symmetries. Each emergent level is causally effective because of the meshing together of upwards and downwards causation that takes place consistently with the underlying physics. Various physical constraints limit the outcomes that can be achieved. The underlying issue concerns the origin of consciousness and agency given the basis of life in physics, which is structured starting from symmetries and variational principles with no trace of agency. A possible solution is to admit that consciousness is an irreducible emergent property of matter.

Keywords: complexity theory; emergence; biology; technology; agency; symmetries

1. On Complexity in Contemporary Science

Over the years, many proposals have been made as to what the core of complexity is [94,118,193], although there is considerable skepticism about some of the claims made [154]. There has also been a somewhat distinct literature on the nature of emergence, which is of a more philosophical nature [20,37,96,116,136]. We are primarily concerned here with the former rather than the latter, although they are not independent

The term complexity is increasingly frequent, not only in scientific language, but also in socio-economic, medical and even political terms. The origin of that usage can be identified in the increasingly widespread belief that the world has reached a level of interrelationship between its various components that makes it less and less predictable and controllable. In recent decades, the world of science has shifted a significant part of its attention and resources towards the study of complex systems, i.e. systems characterized by the substantial difficulty in treating them on the basis of simple cause-effect relationships, with complexity emerging from the interrelation between subsystems endowed with some simple or articulated internal structure. A particular structure generally considered complex is the human brain, which manifests this nature from many points of view, from biophysical ones such as action potential spike chains to those concerning cognition and perception, the formation of thought, and agency.

One line of thought holds that the essential nature of complex systems can be captured by a single basic set of concepts and associated dynamics models, unifying them within the same conceptual architecture. By highlighting common features of substantially different problems, as early as the end of the 1970s people were reflecting on how to deal in a unified way with problems deriving from physics, chemistry, biology, computer science, psychology, linguistics, sociology, and economics. Particularly studied are complex adaptive systems [13,93], which include living beings.

The laws regulating collective behavior can differ greatly from those that regulate the behavior of individual elements, dealing with the spontaneous emergence of variety and organization, starting from a large numbers of elementary components of a few kinds that interact easily with each other [159]. There seems to be consensus in defining complex systems as those whose behavior cannot be directly determined by the analysis of their constituent elements, and the scale of observation influences the degree of complexity that can be encountered. The complex emerges when the whole is not simply reducible to the sum of the parts [171]. The need to tackle problems such as meteorology, the properties of non-linear or disordered systems, and the organization of living matter, has increasingly shifted the attention of science towards the study of this type of system [51]. Few concepts appeared in recent decades have proved so penetrating as that of complexity, to the point of asking whether complexity provides a new scientific paradigm, in the Kuhnian sense of the term, reflected in the award of the Nobel Prize to Giorgio Parisi [16].

Important scientific results have been obtained such as the field of computational complexity, the theory of spin glasses, the dynamics of chaotic systems and neuronal networks. This anti-reductionist trend culminated in an epistemological movement, including the complexity theory of Morin [131] and Prigogine [157]. Any macroscopic description involves a loss of information, relating to knowing the multitude of details of the microscopic level; thanks to this loss of information, systems that are very different systems from each other in detail have the same global behavior. This is the phenomenon of multiple realizability [21,83]. In the transition from micro to macro, the loss of information causes countless microscopically different systems to have the same macroscopic behavior. This raises the issue of determining a clear boundary between irrelevant details and essential information [24,34,101], as for example in the debate on “junk DNA” in genetics.

However there is a problem. Not all that has been labelled as “Complexity Science” has in fact been of major significance in the emergence of the truly complex systems we see around us: specifically, life, technology, digital computers, and social systems. *Wikipedia* states it thus in its entry on [Complexity Economics](#):

In a series of publications, Scientific American journalist John Horgan ridiculed the movement as being the fourth C among the “failed fads” of “complexity, chaos, catastrophe, and cybernetics”. In 1997, Horgan wrote that the approach had “created some potent metaphors: the butterfly effect, fractals, artificial life, the edge of chaos, self-organized criticality. But they have not told us anything about the world that is both concrete and truly surprising, either in a negative or in a positive sense.”

In the following we will consider the wide range of approaches that have been taken to understanding complexity, and then comment on what role we see them as playing when we compare them with each other. There are three domains we will consider:

- biology;
- technology;
- complexity science,

aiming to show clearly how the latter relates to the first two, which we will show have many common features. We will not deal with psychology and sociology or social structures and institutions in the present paper, even though they are certainly highly complex and share many common features with what we present; they bring in too many extra issues (see [69] for a discussion).

The paper considers, The puzzle of complexity: The variety of approaches (§2); The role each approach plays when viewed today (§3); Cognitive limits of materialism and irreducibility of life and consciousness (§4); and Conclusion (§5). We will give links to *Wikipedia* articles where useful, as they are often convenient accessible summaries of complex material.

2. The Puzzle of Complexity: The Variety of Approaches

We consider here in turn, biology (§2.1); technology (§2.2); and complexity science (§2.3). We shall see that the same basic principles underlie the first two domains, and are rather different than those emphasized in the third.

2.1. Biology

As regards biology, the understanding of its complexity developed over centuries, starting already with Hippocrates and Aristotle, and proceeding to understanding of physiology, developmental biology, and evolution.

2.1.1. Hierarchy

Biology is of a hierarchical nature, based at the bottom in the same material stuff as all other matter we see around us. Thus the hierarchy is upwards and downwards causation takes place as indicated [61,66]. The key influences from above L13 are incoming solar radiation, which in combination with a dark night acting as a heat sink sky enables the **biosphere** to function in **energy terms**, and the gravitational fields of the Sun and Moon, causing tides. All this is based in the possibilities physics allows at each emergent level [38].

2.1.2. Physiology

The first real studies of complexity were studies of **physiology**. Circulation of blood by the heart was already discussed by many including Hippocrates (c.460-370 BC), but was first put on a solid footing by William Harvey in 1628.

Physiological systems One by one all the **physiological systems** of human beings were understood: 1. the respiratory system, 2. digestive system /excretory system, 3. circulatory system /cardiovascular/vascular system, 4. urinary system/renal/urinary tract, 5. integumentary system, 6. skeletal system, 7. muscular system, 8. endocrine system, 9. lymphatic system, 10. nervous system, and 11. reproductive system, working together in harmony to provide our physical being. Each of the physiological systems is in turn of a hierarchical nature related to its function, as in the hierarchical nature of the heart [138].

Cells A crucial discovery by Hooke in 1665 was the way all life is based in microscopic **cells**, with their complex substructures (cytoplasm, nucleus, ribosomes, mitochondria, etc) being elucidated in following years. This is the first level at which all the functions of life occur. There are 13 different **cell types** in the human body.

Molecular biology In 1953, James Watson and Francis Crick published the double helical structure of DNA. The first protein structures to be solved were myoglobin by John Kendrew in 1958 and hemoglobin by Max Perutz in 1963. This led to the understandings of supramolecular chemistry [111,112] regarding how supramolecular conformational change underlies molecular biology. In particular the molecular structure of the nucleic acids RNA and DNA [185] and of many proteins [152] have been determined, and hence the molecular biology of the cell elucidated [2].

Vast numbers Life emerges out of vast numbers of atoms and molecules and cells:

- The number of cells in the human body is 10^{13} ,
- The number of proteins in a cell is 4×10^7 ,
- The number of proteins in a human body is 4×10^{20} ,
- The number of atoms in a typical cell is 10^{14} ,
- The number of atoms in a human being is 10^{27} .

None of this is obvious, because both atoms and cells are so small (which is why it took so long for both the cellular structure of life and atomic structure of matter to be proved).

Stochasticity and Molecular Machines Molecules in air at normal room temperature are moving at between 300 to 400 metres per second. A biomolecule collides 10^{13} times a second with water

molecules. Biology has evolved to use the opportunities at the bottom [75] to thrive on molecular stochasticity, so [molecular machines](#) reliably extract order from this chaos [92,148]. Examples are how motor proteins (myosin, kinesin, dynein) are responsible for muscle contraction and move cargo inside cells, DNA polymerases replicate DNA, RNA polymerases produce mRNA, the spliceosome removes introns, and the ribosome synthesises proteins.

Three key principles occur, all involving contextual logical branching:

1. Form and function in biology are related by a multi-scale [119] [hierarchical structure](#), forming an integrated whole [89,164] with structure/function relations occurring at all emergent scales [31,139], involving variables relevant to that level [5].
2. [Metabolism](#) involves a). enzyme-catalyzed reactions converting energy in food to forms suitable for cellular processes, b). conversion of matter in food to building blocks for biomolecules, and c). the elimination of metabolic wastes [73]. These reactions are crucial in allowing growth and reproduction, maintenance of structure, and environmental responses, and take place in the form of metabolic networks [100].
3. [Homeostasis](#) in biology was discovered in 1865 by Claude Bernard [39] and then rediscovered in an engineering context by Norbert Wiener in 1961 [188] as a concept he named [Cybernetics](#). The common core of both processes is feedback control loops that counteract deviations from a chosen goal state by corrective action, thus acting top-down to control micro-states so that desired macro states emerge (as in a thermostat) and so enabling contextual dynamical branching (e.g. a heater element is on or off). It is a principle of very wide application in biology, with the set points determined by evolution, and engineering and society, with chosen setpoints.

2.1.3. Reproduction and Developmental Processes

Existence of individual organisms occurs via developmental processes based at the cellular level in [cell division](#) followed by [cell differentiation](#).

Cell division is part of a [cell cycle](#) during which the cell grows and replicates its chromosomes before dividing. It should be noted that this process itself is not coded in DNA but rather is built into the inherited cell structure, duplicated when cells divide and developmental systems are reproduced [144]. The process includes duplication of the gene itself in a complex process mediated by various RNAs, and followed by a careful proof reading and [correction process](#) whereby DNA replication errors are reduced by many orders of magnitude [156]. Also gene organelles divide by highly complex processes, as e.g. in the case of [mitochondria](#).

Cell differentiation The same genetic information is encoded in the DNA in the [chromosomes](#) in every cell. Genes are segments of DNA that can be read to produce proteins, with regulatory sequences controlling transcription of the gene. Which genes are read is determined by binding factors that turn genes on so that they are transcribed into messenger RNA (mRNA) molecules, which in turn are translated into proteins [185]. The issue is which specific genes are read in which cells in which position in the developing embryo at what time [98,129]. This is controlled by gene regulatory networks on the basis of positional information that controls cell fate decision [79,81,166,191]. The resultant proteins then determine what kind of cell emerges at each position [32,33] and so determines embryo and hence adult organism structure.

2.1.4. Darwin and Adaptive Selection

So where does the DNA come from that shapes biological outcomes? As is well known, by processes of variation and selection as proposed by Charles Darwin in 1868 [44], now commonly agreed to on as a key feature of biology [55] explaining apparent design by natural processes [74]: organisms are thereby adapted to their environment [30].

Of course, when Darwin developed the theory, it was a theory of macroscopic variation (Levels L9 and upwards in Table 1), for the concept of a gene was not even known at that point. It has since been recast as a theory of [genetic evolution](#), and many writings represent it as only being such. This

ignores the undoubted role of physiology in the process of evolutionary selection [140] (e.g. as in the case of Darwin’s finches), thereby undermining the central achievement of evolutionary theory [76].

In fact evolutionary adaptation takes place simultaneously at all the emergent levels L4 to L12 in Table 1 in an integrated way [66], as has to be the case, because of the way the levels interact with each other (see e.g. [183] for the interaction of physiology, proteins, and genes). Neither organisms nor genes are levels uniquely determining evolutionary outcomes. In particular, selection takes place of developmental systems [149], so there is a strong “Evo-Devo” interaction between evolutionary and developmental processes [32,33]

From a broader viewpoint, evolution is an example of the power of *Complex Adaptive Systems* [93], a theme we return to later.

Table 1. The Hierarchy of structure for biology on Earth. Levels L0 to L4 are strictly physical, and their nature is unaffected by biology. Level L5 is the first distinctly biological level, and level L6 the first level where all the processes of life occur. Higher levels are the Earth (the planet as a whole), Sun (essential to life) and Solar System, Galaxy, and so on. The bottom level L0 is unknown (it could be strings, but they are not well defined). The up arrows indicate upward emergence from a specific configuration; the down arrows, downward determination of specific outcomes in particular contexts.

L13		Biosphere	
L12	↑	Ecosystems	↓
L11	↑	Populations	↓
L10	↑	Organisms	↓
L9	↑	Physiological Systems	↓
L8	↑	Tissues	↓
L7	↑	Cells	↓
L6	↑	Cytoplasm, organelles	↓
L5	↑	Macromolecules	↓
L4	↑	Molecules	↓
L3	↑	Atoms	↓
L2	↑	Protons Neutrons Electrons	↓
L1	↑	Quarks Leptons Bosons Higgs	↓
L0		Unknown physics (if it exists)	

2.1.5. Networks

Given these vast numbers, interactions often take the form of networks, where simple interactions are combined to give complex outcomes. Their nature is characterised by graph theory, and one can study the statistics of networks, such as existence of hubs and the degree to which they are scale-free, etc [1,17]. One can also determine what network motifs occur [4], with specific functions. Biological networks are of two types:

- **Interaction networks** with specific functions, particularly metabolic networks [100] [161], gene regulatory networks [105], and cell signalling networks [19]. These occur inside compartments bounded by membranes that keep the interactants from drifting away, so spatial location is a key aspect of their functioning [122]. They reliably produce macro level functions out of the huge number of interactions of specific components at the micro level. One can model their function by Boolean interaction networks, thus distinguishing biological from random networks [184].
- **Nervous systems** are structural networks [35] which are themselves hierarchically organised [124]. They consist of neurons (cells made of dendrites, a nucleus, and axons) connected by synapses to other neurons, together forming a physical neural network [104]. Action potential spike chains travelling down axons to other neurons convey information and allow adaptive resonant networks to occur. The hierarchical structure of the brain [124] allows hierarchical dynamics to occur [160].

Note that it is not sufficient to give statistics of the roughly 10^{14} synaptic connections of the roughly 10^{11} neurons in a human brain to characterise it. It is the specific details of these connections that embodies our unique memories and abilities that make each of us the human individuals that we are.

2.1.6. Perception, Learning and Prediction, Agency

The extraordinary thing that occurs is the emergence of qualia and mental processes out of physical entities, namely action potential spike chains propagating in the physical brain. Indeed there are a variety of emergent properties arising:

- **Learning** Plasticity at macro and micro scales enables learning on the basis of experience [103]. The brain is altered by our experiences and understandings, and able to recall (or at least reconstruct) associated memories.
- **Perception** is enabled by predictive processing of incoming data [36], enabled by cortico-thalamic circuits and experienced as qualia.
- **Planning** Internal models of the world based on past experience and present data allows prediction of outcomes, and so values-based choices between action options [69] and consequent actions.
- **Randomness** Stochastic dynamics is a principle of brain function [48]. Indeed stochasticity at the micro-level underlies the capacity for higher level processes to select optimal lower level outcomes on the basis of higher level needs [141,142], allowing higher levels to break free of the iron determinism of physics *per se*.
- **Agency and Free Will** This amounts to the emergence of agency [45,87,88], and indeed effective free will emerges [69,147].

2.1.7. The Emergent Whole

What emerges in biology are open systems [151] that are consequently dissipative systems [158] for thermodynamic reasons, which form an integrated whole [80] where each part works together to enable the whole to function. All the characteristics of life emerge, including function at every level [139], and agency.

Measures We do not attempt to give a measure of their complexity, out of all the measures proposed [162], as the numbers of particles and molecules and cells and neural connections involved are too large. One needs some measure characterising the extraordinary properties remarked on in §2.1.6. Perhaps those are the dimensions that should be used as a basis for such a measure.

2.2. Technology

Another area where true complexity exists is technology, which also has a modular hierarchical nature [7,169] for reasons explain in [172] [26] (see §3.1.3). Each technology is based in some phenomenon captured and put to use ([7]:51,53). There is a fundamental similarity between some technologies: mechanical, hydraulic, and electrical circuits have completely analogous dynamics as expressed in their equations of motion [29], [106].

2.2.1. Basics

Taking electronic systems as an example, **electronic circuits** are made of **active and passive components** that are combined to give complex outcomes.

- Wires channel the electron flows that comprise currents; batteries or generators drive the current; lights or heaters or motors act as output devices of the circuit; and switches enable control by turning the current on or off.
- Capacitors C, coils L, resistors R, and diodes are the basic elements allowing **electric circuits** to perform functions such as being an amplifier, radio receiver, or oscillator
- Contextual logical branching is enabled by two-way switches, sensors, and input signals, controlling relays, vacuum tubes, or transistors linked to create logic gates.

2.2.2. Digital Computers and Computation

The core phenomenon underlying current technologies is computation, as technology of all kinds is largely controlled by algorithms realised in computer programs.

Digital computer systems have orthogonal hierarchies enabling their functioning: a physical hierarchy [172] supporting a hierarchical logical structure ([61]:§2) encoded in computer programs processed by a hierarchy of virtual machines [172]. Black boxing takes place [11] as a part of the abstraction that is key to modular structuring [26].

Integrated circuits [12] allow Very Large Scale Integration (VLSI) so that billions of transistors are included on a single chip. Thus as in the case of biology discussed above, the number of components is vast: these are networks of great complexity. This allows structuring of **microprocessors** which process information in a computational cycle with a clock generating pulses which synchronize the operations of its components.

Computation Outcomes are determined by the program loaded and data processed, whether that was provided at the start, or is input in an ongoing way from external data sources such as sensors. The core feature is Turing's insight [177] that digital representation is possible of any information whatever, including the program for manipulating the data.

2.2.3. Digital Computers and Effective Agency

Abstract causation Because algorithms are abstract concepts, as are virtual machines, abstract causation is taking place when a digital computer runs a program realising an algorithm. This is discussed illuminatingly by Dasgupta [43], who comments that both physical and abstract causation take place during a computational process, with liminal causation (neither purely physical nor purely abstract) linking the two.

Effective Agency The resulting systems are capable of effective agency in the sense of choosing appropriate outcomes on the basis of ongoing incoming data, and acting so as to achieve these outcomes. A key example here is aircraft autopilots, including **automatic landing systems** that receive data on a second by second basis from radio and radar systems and can on that basis control the aircraft to a safe landing even in dense fog, without intervention by the pilots.

2.2.4. Randomness and Openness

Randomness In contrast with the biological case, where randomness at the micro level is rife and is exploited by microbiological processes, in this case such randomness is minimal: processes are more or less entirely deterministic, with exceptions caused by cosmic rays, electromagnetic noise, or power-supply fluctuations. Thus when it is operating on given initial data, it is basically a deterministic system, with outcomes uniquely determined by the program loaded and data then processed.

The internet However this is not how it works in practice. Because effectively all digital computers are now connected to the internet, they are themselves open systems continually receiving information from that wider context and in turn sending messages and information to it. Thus in the end as in the case of biology, you can't predict future outcomes from a full knowledge of the state of the computer itself at any one time: it is affected by unpredictable incoming data (much of which is hidden from the user).

2.2.5. The Emergent Whole

Again what emerges is a complex whole where upwards and downwards causation occurs in both the physical and logical hierarchies ([61]:§.2, [67]) enabled by **compilers** or **interpreters** and allowing virtual machines to function at each emergent abstract level. Effective agency emerges, to the extent that current debates about Artificial Intelligence ("AI") are seriously considering if it is able to be a serious threat to humanity. In any event Chatbots such as **ChatGPT** can carry out tasks such as writing

and debugging computer programs, translate and summarize texts, and so on. Thus it approaches human capabilities.

2.3. Complexity Science

We now turn to various facets of “complexity science” [118] [94] that have been identified as such since the 1950s. Many fascinating aspects of how complex outcomes can emerge from the underlying physics have been uncovered. The Wikipedia article on [Complex Systems](#) states,

“Complex systems are systems whose behavior is intrinsically difficult to model due to the dependencies, competitions, relationships, or other types of interactions between their parts or between a given system and its environment. Systems that are “complex” have distinct properties that arise from these relationships, such as nonlinearity, emergence, spontaneous order, adaptation, and feedback loops, among others. Because such systems appear in a wide variety of fields, the commonalities among them have become the topic of their independent area of research. In many cases, it is useful to represent such a system as a network where the nodes represent the components and links to their interactions.”

We now look in turn at seven major themes considered in this literature.

2.3.1. Information Theory and Algorithmic Complexity

[Information Theory](#) (Claude Shannon, 1948 [167]) studies the measurement of amount of information stored and transmitted, and characterises important limits on such usage. This has led to [Algorithmic Complexity Theory](#) [118] as attempts to measure complexity. However none of this has anything to do with the meaning of that information. Thus it does not directly relate to the way that the *content* of information is crucial in both biology [72,143] and in technology via its use in computer systems [7,43].

2.3.2. Reaction-Diffusion Equations

The [reaction diffusion equation](#) and related partial differential equations can lead to surprisingly complex patterns arising from simple initial data. This was pointed out by Alan Turing in 1952 [178], and plays a significant role in pattern formation during the initial stages of developmental processes in biology, as he pointed out, for example in determining zebra stripes, giraffe mottling, and butterfly wing patterns.

2.3.3. General Systems Theory and Complex Adaptive Systems

[General systems theory](#) was developed by Kenneth Boulding (1956) [27], Stafford Beer (1966) [18], and Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968) [181] as an attempt at a general theory of how complex systems work. It proved by and large to be too generic to lead to specific outcomes, although it touched on many important ideas. Its most important outcome are arguably firstly, recognising the importance of cybernetics [9,188] in biology and engineering, and generalising it to Jay Forrester’s [systems dynamics](#), which is a form of predictive feedback control. Secondly, introducing the general idea of [Complex Adaptive Systems](#), which is a key concept in complexity theory.

2.3.4. Catastrophe Theory

[Catastrophe theory](#), proposed by Renee Thom in 1977 [173,192], is the first of the forms of complexity classified by Manson [118] as “Deterministic complexity”. It shows how bifurcations in behaviour of physical or social systems can occur only in a small number of geometrically characterised ways (fold, cusp, swallowtail, and butterfly catastrophes in the case of one active variable), deterministically resulting in sudden transitions from an unstable state to a more stable state. It is important in topics such as gravitational lensing, but use in the case of truly complex systems such as human self-pity and the stock market has been criticised. In these contexts it is descriptive rather than predictive.

2.3.5. Chaotic Dynamical Systems, Strange Attractors, Self-Organised criticality

This is the second of the forms of complexity classified by Manson [118] as “Deterministic complexity”. Constraints can turn generic dynamical behaviour into that characterised as dynamical systems [108]. In particular situations, this can result in existence of *chaotic dynamical systems* [34, 49] where arbitrarily small differences in initial conditions can lead to very different outcomes in a deterministic but unpredictable way - the “Butterfly effect” created by strange attractors, with bifurcation cascades taking place. An extraordinary emergent effect is the nature of *fractals*, such as the Mandelbrot set.

An interesting discovery is that in some cases, self-organization and order emerge at the *edge of chaos*, thus *self-organised criticality* takes place [113], with the system in effect tuning itself as it evolves towards criticality. Self-organized criticality is a property of dynamical systems that have a critical point as an attractor. These studies often refer to behaviour of cellular automata.

2.3.6. Scaling of Complexity

Studies by Ludwig Von Bertalanffy [180] and Geoffrey West [186,187] show how emergent properties in many contexts are associated with a variety of scaling laws that restrict what is possible. This is an important aspect of emergent complexity.

2.3.7. Weakly Coupled and Self-Organizing Systems

A key point is that biological and technological systems are strongly coupled, e.g. a cell, a heart, or a computer CPU are tightly linked together with billions of elements conjoined in a highly structured way. However many complexity studies refer to weakly coupled systems where perhaps only neighbouring elements interact, as in cellular automata, or more distant elements interact, as in murmurations of birds or slime moulds, but not in a tightly controlled way. A key question is to what extent downwards causation then takes place from the whole to the parts. Here is a set of such cases.

1. Cellular automata, developed particularly by Wolfram (1984,2002) [189,190], have been much studied. As mentioned above, in the context of cellular automata. In some cases self-organization and order emerge at the edge of chaos, or self-organised criticality takes place. John Conway’s “Game of Life” (see [Gardner \(1970\)](#)) is probably the most famous cellular automaton.
2. Spin glasses [22], which show cooperative behavior in terms of the freezing of spin directions when below a ‘freezing temperature’.
3. Flocking of birds [14] leading to *murmurations* where each bird keeps track of seven neighbouring birds is a bottom-up dynamic similar to the Game of Life.
4. Slime moulds however coordinate their activities by communicating with each other through traveling waves of the molecule cAMP [163] which enables them to have some properties similar to those of animal neural systems. Arguably there is downward coordination taking place in this case.

3. The Role Each Approach Plays When Viewed Today

We consider here the core of complex emergence in biology and technology, including digital computer systems (§3.1), the periphery (§3.2), and foundations (§3.3).

3.1. The Core

We propose that the following are the core features allowing complexity involving coordination of billions of components so as to attain emergent function, as in the case of life and digital computer systems, to emerge

3.1.1. The Centre

- Non-linearity. The dynamics involved, and their emergent outcomes, are manifestly non-linear. While the basic elements making up a complex system may indeed have linear dynamics, they are assembled in highly non-linear ways [65], for example involving interacting hierarchical feedback control circuits and interaction networks.
- Organisation. These elements are systematically organised so as to achieve desired emergent outcomes [168] [133]. This occurs either via the processes of natural selection in the case of biology [30,76], or by processes of design and manufacture, as in the case of digital computers [43,169], aircraft, and so on.
- Open systems. These are all open systems with well defined boundaries [151], so unpredictable incoming influences influence their dynamics [179]. They can however be structured so as to attained desired goals despite this fact.
- Dissipative structures and metabolism. In terms of their interaction with the environment, they can be characterised as dissipative structures [158], extracting their order at a thermodynamic cost to the environment via metabolic processes that extract material and energy from the environment, transform them to usable form, utilise them for functional purposes, and dispose of waste products and heat.
- Use of information to shape outcomes. All life inherits information, collects it by various sensory systems, analyses it and stores it, and uses it to determine desirable outcomes [143] [72]. Modern technology is centrally based in information collection, storage, and analysis via digital computers so as to make optimal choices [7] [43].

3.1.2. Symmetry, Broken Symmetry, Topology

From a physics viewpoint, what underlies emergence, in addition to coarse graining, is one of three features:

- Symmetry, such as gauge groups [97] that characterise the basic physics itself, and in many cases symmetries characterising emergent structures [28], for example crystal symmetries leading to [Bloch's Theorem](#) and related emergent properties.
- Broken symmetries. More complex emergence is based in broken symmetries, as pointed out by Anderson [5]. This is key *inter alia* to biological emergence through the immense complexity of macromolecular shape [111,112], and to technological emergence through the structure of transistors [67].
- Topological effects [120,174], which by nature are non-local: you cannot determine topology from local quantities without determining how they fit together at emergent scales. This occurs particularly in the case of topological insulators, feedback control loops, and physical and interaction networks.

3.1.3. Modular Hierarchical Structures, Multiple Realisability

Biological and technological, systems are modular hierarchical structures for very good reasons explained by Herbert Simon [169]. The basic principle is to break up a complex task into simple operations, design modules to carry out the simple operations, and then combine the outcomes to produce the desired result. This involves abstraction, labelling, information hiding and multiple realisability, as explained clearly by Booch *et al* [26]

- The modules are more tightly bound relative to the inter-module interactions, and generically have more rapid dynamical processes than those between modules.
- The modular structure comes into being by developmental processes (biology) or manufacturing (technology), and possibly by self-organisation in the right context where all the components in a contained space have the necessary nature.
- Upwards effects in the emergent structure take place by contextual coarse-graining or black boxing, depending on context.

- Downwards effects occur via interlevel time-dependent constraints on the one hand, and by higher levels creating, modifying, or deleting lower level elements on the other.
- Through these effects, new properties occur at every emergent level that were not present at lower levels. They are characterised by effective theories at each level [64,139] in terms of emergent variables appropriate to that level [5].
- Multiple realisability takes place whereby higher level functions or adaptations can be realised by many different configurations at lower levels [21,82,110]. This means that effective laws characterising functions at higher levels, such as homeostasis or natural selection in biology or a computation in a digital computer, cannot be described in any simple way at relevant lower levels (genes, molecules, electrons) because at that level they are characterised by billions of possible alternatives.

3.1.4. Function, Adaptation

The key difference between physics *per se* and both biology and technology is that the latter centrally embody function and purpose at every emergent level in the hierarchy (Table 1) above the physical levels L0-L4 [67,71,90,128].

In order that they can successfully do so, they must

- Continually adapt to the environment in which they operate so that they can meet the challenges it represents, thus they must be *Complex Adaptive Systems* [13,93,193].
- This occurs through evolutionary processes whereby characteristics of a class of entities are determined by adaptive processes, as in the case of Darwinian evolution in biology [44,76] and in technological evolution [7]. In each case, branching dynamics takes place via selection of best outcomes from a set of alternatives
- This adaptation takes place consistently at every emergent level simultaneously; it has to do so in order that system functionality is maintained all the time.
- It also occurs through developmental processes [80,191], whereby individual entities come into being and then continually adapt to the environment on an ongoing basis.

3.1.5. Stability via Feedback Control

They must be stable under the kinds of perturbations they are likely to meet on an ongoing basis, and so must be *homeostatic systems* [89,127] (in the case of biology, the setpoints being determined through evolutionary processes) or *cybernetic systems* [9,188] (where the setpoints are either set by design, or are adjustable on an ongoing basis). Branching dynamics occurs via contextual use of information [72,143].

3.1.6. Causal Closure, Stochasticity

Because of the meshing together of upwards and downwards causation, causal closure involves the whole set of interacting levels [63,130]; any smaller set of levels will contain dynamic variables whose evolution is undefined. Because of this, every level of the emergent hierarchy (Table 1) adapts to context simultaneously during both evolutionary and developmental processes.

It is crucial that the vast numbers of components involved in a cell at the micro level are moving at high velocities and colliding millions of times a second, so molecular stochasticity is a key feature of biological dynamics at those levels [92,137]. Because of this, stochasticity provides freedom whereby lower levels can be adapted to higher level needs, thereby enabling the possibility of agency [141, 142]. Lower level outcomes can be selected as needed from the myriad of options that occur every microsecond.

3.1.7. Interaction Networks

Networks are a key feature whereby simple interactions can combine to produce complex results. In biology they include,

- Metabolic networks [100,161,183],
- Gene regulatory networks [105,183]
- Their interactions with each other [85]
- Neural networks [95] [35]

These have come to be what they are through natural selection. In the case of technology, they include

- VLSI circuit boards with billions of components
- Artificial Neural Networks of many kinds, including networks underlying Artificial Intelligence and programs such as ChatGPT-4.
- The global Internet

the first two having arisen via very careful processes of design, and the third by a rather haphazard developmental process.

3.1.8. Emergent Agency

Agency occurs in all higher forms of life, characterised as any living thing with eyes, ears, feet, or wings (it may well occur in other simpler organisms, but we claim that in these cases it is indisputable: these are all organs associated with agency, so they are evidence it exists in these cases). According to Philip Ball [15],

“ The whole point about agency is that it can be versatile, adaptive and improvisational. Agency evolves precisely because living organisms are liable to encounter challenges that evolution itself is too slow to adapt to.”

That is why it has evolved [99,175]. Ball continues,

“What most distinguishes agents is that they have reasons for actions, which in turn elicit value judgements: a primitive notion of meaning” [15]

It involves predictive processing of possible outcomes via contextual use of information, enabling obtaining desired out comes as contexts change. Agency also occurs also in high level technological systems, such as automatic pilots in aircraft, self-driving cars, and automated factories, which make contextual choices as to what to do next.

Characteristics of agency are stated by Potter and Mitchell [155] as shown in Table 2, where we have for convenience renumbered these items.

Table 2. The elements of agency: a comparison of [155] and this paper.

	Potter and Mitchell [155]	This paper
1	Thermodynamic autonomy	Metabolism
2	Persistence	Homeostasis
3	Holistic integration,	Hierarchy
4	Multiple realisability	Multiple realisability
5	Low-level indeterminacy	Low-level indeterminacy
6	Historicity	Memory
7	Endogenous activity	Endogenous activity
8	Agent-level normativity	Value judgements

These are essentially the characteristics we have emphasized above for both living systems and technology. There is a close correspondence between them, highlighting the properties needed for agency to emerge.

Number 7 is what makes it agency, the others are what are required for it to occur. There are different levels of endogenous activity in that cybernetic systems will attain set goals **G** reliably, but a

higher level of goal-seeking occurs if the goals G in a cybernetic system are themselves selected in an adaptive way according to some selection criteria C_1 , and a yet higher level if the selection criteria C_1 themselves are selected according to even higher selection criteria C_2 [58].

Number 8 emphasizes that agency is always connected with function associated with some purpose (see [67] for the case of digital computers). Low-level indeterminacy, emphasized above in §3.1.5 in the case of biology, occurs also in all technological systems because of the *Shot Noise* that arises because of the discrete nature of the charges carried by electrons or holes. Reliable outcomes emerge in the technological case because of thresholds associated with coarse graining.

3.2. The Periphery

It will be clear from the above that some topics listed under “Complexity Theory” (§2.3) do not occur in the core of biological and technological emergence as characterised in §3.1, apart from *cybernetics* and *complex adaptive systems*, which are characterised as important in both cases. That does not mean that the others are not important under certain circumstances, characterising very interesting complex behaviour that can indeed occur, but rather that they are not part of the core set of features that underlie existence of biological and technological complexity. Rather sometimes they are additional features adding to and modulating that core theory in significant ways.

3.2.1. Reaction-Diffusion Equations

The Reaction-Diffusion equations studied by Turing [178] and others play an important role during early embryonic development, when diffusion of active agents sets up basic patterns such as occur in zebra strips and butterfly wings [121]. Thus they crucially provide the initial context for developmental processes to take place. However they do not characterise how that development itself takes place.

3.2.2. Catastrophe Theory, Basins of Attraction, and Critical Transitions

The geometrically characterised kinds of transformations of properties described by Catastrophe Theory [173,192] are not nowadays widely used in biology or technology. A different characterisations of when dynamical outcomes in these contexts change from one kind of behaviour to another is when dynamical systems change from one basin of attraction to another [6]. Such critical transitions are associated with symmetry breaking [115]. A key case where this occurs is in the changes between possible outcomes that occur in Waddington’s epigenetic landscapes [3]. Amongst the most important events where this occurs are the major evolutionary transitions in biology [170] and technology [7].

3.2.3. Chaotic Dynamical Systems, Strange Attractors, and Fractals

Chaotic dynamical systems are not of significance for emergent complexity in biology and technology *per se*, but rather because they can affect the context within which these operate. Indeed in in biology and technology, with a possible exception of some brain dynamics [132], these systems are structured precisely so that chaotic dynamical systems (in the technical sense) and strange attractors do not arise. Thus the *edge of chaos* [113] does not lead to emergence in these contexts. It is a metaphor rather than a tight relation: it reflects the fact that if the dynamics is too deterministically based in initial data alone, agency is not possible, whereas if stochastic dynamics at the molecular level is considered, there is openness for agency to occur [141,142]. But stochastic dynamics is quite different than a chaotic dynamic system.

However chaotic dynamics in the technical sense arises in systems that are the context for biology and engineering, and specifically as regards *weather*, where the unpredictability of the Real Butterfly Effect occurs [153]. This causes unpredictability in biology as people and animals respond to unpredictable rain and wind, as well as in some technological contexts, such as aircraft automatic landing systems.

As to fractals, biology is not self similar at different scales, that is the whole point of the hierarchy shown in Table 1 where structure is quite different at different scales. However self-similarity occurs to a limited degree in a few contexts in biology, such as the lungs; but even then this involves self-similarity for only a few recurrences, not the endless repetition of self-similarity involved in fractals such as the [Mandelbrot set](#).

3.2.4. Limiting Relations: Speeds, Size, Scaling, Geometry

Various physical effects limit what emergent outcomes are possible in modular hierarchical structures, and hence in complex systems. Examples are diffusion rates for ions and molecules at synapses. There are also limits on transmission of information as characterised by Shannon's [Information Theory](#) [167], however it is not clear that they play a significant role in the brain, for example in limiting propagation of information by [action potential spike chains](#). However this is important in technology via coding theory.

These physical limits result in the scaling relations for complexity studied by Von Bertalanffy [180] West [186,187]. However those relations assume the context provided by the core features discussed in §3.1. Another example of such limitations is that the geometry of the brain puts constraints on human brain function [150].

3.2.5. Weakly Coupled Systems: Mainly Bottom Up Emergence

As mentioned above, both murmurations of birds [14] and [slime moulds](#) [163] are cited as examples of biological emergence with interesting properties. While this is indeed true, if compared with tightly coupled systems occurring in physiology such as the cell, the heart, and the brain, they omit key features of downward causation that result from this tight coupling whereby higher levels constrain and shape lower level function in order to enable higher level functions to occur. A key issue here is to what extent in these cases the emergent context modifies the behaviour of agents, rather than just providing a context where circular causation takes place between the emergent entities and the components. In the case of slime molds, it appears that this does take place, enabling learning behaviour. Both cases are useful in seeing how complex such largely bottom-up systems can become, and how apparently cooperative phenomena can emerge in these contexts.

Non-biological cases of weakly coupled emergence are [spinglasses](#) and [cellular automata](#) [189,190], including [The Game of Life](#). Again they exhibit very interesting emergent behaviour, but they omit the kind of tight modular hierarchical structuring that enables function of complex technological systems such as digital computers (with their ability to process arbitrary data in accord with arbitrary algorithms that are also specified via data) and aircraft to function. Cellular automata are not a feature of real-world technology.

Related to this is [agent based modelling](#) in general and in [biology](#) and economics [8] in particular, which includes the possibility of multi-scale modelling. We will not pursue this topic here, except to repeat the comment that from our viewpoint, the key issue is to what degree the larger context can influence the nature and dynamics of the lower level agents.

3.2.6. Measures of Complexity

We have not considered measures of complexity, which are often related to various entropy measures, in turn related to Information Theory. These are discussed in [42]. Integrated Information Theory [176] is the most sophisticated measure of this kind, particularly because it is carefully structured to relate to modular hierarchical dynamics, but the issue is whether in practice it works because of the huge number of connections in the brain or a digital computer.

Ross Ashby studied the foundations of self-organizing systems in an important article [10] which in effect looks at this also but in a different way by asking, What is meant by the word "organisation"? One needs something like a measure of the number of functional capacities and emergent entity has at different levels, to get at what emergent complexity in biology and technology is about.

4. Cognitive Limits of Materialism and the Irreducibility of Life and Consciousness

In the first pioneering scientists, such as Francis Bacon, Galileo Galilei, Rene Descartes, Blaise Pascal and Isaac Newton, we identify an original opening to a broader and more unitary vision of the global knowledge of reality than existed before.

Considering the understandings of modern physics, science has become aware of the distance existing between foundational physical theories and the reality they investigate, and the ordinary world around us, noting oddities, wonders, counter intuitive experiences far from the macroscopic experiences of daily life at the quantum level. On the other hand physics, despite all its progress and potential, does not seem to be able to date to explain with rigorous accuracy some of the most humanly relevant natural phenomena such as life and consciousness.

Reductionist naturalism believes it is possible to explain the entire universe, including ourselves, by reducing it to fundamental physical laws, explaining life and mind in terms of physico-chemical evolution. Hence biology, and the emergence of life in the cosmos, would be reduced to the laws of physics and chemistry, as would psychology, resulting from the emergence of mind and consciousness, both attributable to biological evolution. In this way it is represented the fundamental framework in which the program of reductionist science is placed, which despite still having many knots to untie, is considered to be the only scientifically valid and viable road. Any all-encompassing theory of reality which is derived starting from a few fundamental physical-mathematical laws collides however with the impossibility of answering the question of why such laws are given, a question that seems insurmountable, and has to be satisfied with the (non) answer that that is just how things are.

We seek a line of research that contrasts with

- Cartesian dualism (which would not allow any unitary synthesis between matter and spirit),
- Reductionist materialism (which would claim to reduce the mind to material principles),
- Explicit theism, which would introduce a transcendent agent to explain life and consciousness from outside nature,
- Subjectivist idealism, which would lead everything back to the spirit by considering matter as pure appearance.
- Panpsychism, with an attempt to develop a scientific theory of awareness already present at the quantum level, connected to an emergent psycho-physical hypothesis where the mental is closely connected to physical complexity; this could explain the development required for natural selection, although the mystery of this emergence would remain.

We do not advocate any of these approaches. We rather support non-reductive physicalism as do Gillette (2002) [82], List and Menzies (2009) [114], O'Connor and Churchill (2010) [146], Bishop (2012) [23], and Menzies (2015) [123].

The physical laws of the universe, being not totally deterministic and depending on boundary and initial conditions, leave various openings for the possible outcomes of processes in the future and, among these, there would be some more probable for the formation of complex organisms than others. Final or teleological causality has been excluded from modern sciences and is considered an imaginary cause due to ignorance of the real causes, i.e. the efficient ones. However, this physical and causal reductionism fails to give full reason to what happens in the world of life [57]. Biological sciences appear more and more clearly as irreducible to physical science as hitherto understood

Quantum physics is based on abstract mathematical information; in describing material reality, it risks identifying matter with this abstract information [70]. Each systemic theory/idealization describing reality does not coincide with reality itself, but describes various aspects of reality, not fully capturing it. This is a fundamental epistemological thesis, valid for any scientific, philosophical, or theological theory.

Furthermore, physical science studies matter from an external perspective, wanting to observe the objects present in reality from a neutral position; therefore it only describes the external nature of objects, the phenomenon observed from outside and is manifested externally, but never accesses

the internal reality. If we want to avoid dualisms in describing physical reality, our inner conscience, sensations of various kinds, and other inner experiences must be taken into account. It would be therefore necessary to develop a physical theory that also explains the presence of consciousness in the natural world. Among the investigated proposals we have:

- *Materialism*: there is only matter, understood as what is studied by current physics; this leads to a conflicting position between science and religion.
- *Dualism*: there is matter on one side, studied by physics, and consciousness on the other; it is a pro-independence position between science and religion.
- *Holism*: the whole is greater than the sum of its parts [80], therefore the unity of an entity cannot be explained by studying the parts composing it, according to the reductionist approach. In the unity of the entity, a novelty irreducible to its constituents appears [53,78]

Holism in physics, in particular in relation to quantum physics, has highlighted interesting and debated questions, such as the non-separability as a consequence of the holism of physical properties [91], the mental experiment of “delayed choice” about the spatial and temporal holism of the quantum world [46], the indivisible whole of quantum objects [25]. As mentioned above, we support non-reductive physicalism, as well as holism. The way this works out in terms of the hierarchy of emergence in Table 1 is,

- Physical emergence holds from levels **L1** to **L3**;
- Chemical emergence occurs at level **L4**;
- Biological emergence from level **L5** up, with the first level with all the functions of life being **L7**
- something completely new occurs at level **L10**, namely agency; in the case of humans: consciousness, self-consciousness, and the ability for meta-reflection and so morality and responsibility.

The classic separation between *res cogitans* and *res extensa* and the consequent fixation on the *res extensa* is not sufficient to understand physical reality, at most to explain it, with the previously indicated limits. This is well known in the philosophical field with Dilthey’s distinction [50,117] between natural and spiritual sciences, according to which the former explain reality, while the latter try to understand it [52,52]. We do not enter here into the metaphysical issues to do with why the Universe exists and why it has the nature it does, which underlies these questions [60,62].

Finally, a useful comment from Edward Feser: “*Since conscious experience provides the observational evidence on which physics rests, physics presupposes the reality of conscious experience. Hence, if conscious experience is left out of physics’ mathematical representation of nature, then the epistemology of physics once again entails that there must be more to reality than is captured by that mathematical representation.*” Equally physics presupposes the existence of sufficient free will to plan and carry out experiments. Without this, no physics is possible.

5. Conclusion

This paper has compared the various aspects of “Complexity Theory” as commonly discussed with the way emergence of complexity takes place in biological and technological systems. Aspects of complexity theory that are of key importance in those contexts are that on the one hand they are complex adaptive systems, and on the other they are homeostatic or cybernetic systems. However “complexity theory” as usually stated misses out the key element of existence of modular hierarchical structuring with the emergence of effective theories at each level. Other aspects of complexity theory as usually understood play significant roles in shaping how these structures emerge or function in particular contexts, as discussed in §3.2; however weakly coupled systems play a minimal role, and in particular cellular automata do not play a significant role in such emergence.

However the key feature of “complexity theory” in weakly coupled cases such as the flight of starlings, extended through to more tightly coupled cases such as spin glasses, is explained best in Philip Ball’s review of the new book by Giorgio Parisi:

“Parisi explains why reporters who were scratching their heads about how to explain spin glasses were missing the point of his research. His work isn’t about this system or that – a specific metal alloy, or the flocks of starlings in Rome that Parisi studied as a complex system in the 2000s. It’s about the universality of phenomena, whereby systems of many interacting components that look utterly different – be they flocks of starlings, groups of particles or the magnetic atoms in spin glasses – can be described using the same mathematics.

The fact that you can do so isn’t because there is a loose analogy between these systems but because they are all, at root, the same (collective) thing.”

The same applies to the tightly coupled biological and technological systems we consider here: they share the same core structural and dynamical principles (§3.1).

In all cases, broken symmetries are there freeing the emergent dynamics from the underlying physics symmetries, as pointed out so long ago by Phil Anderson [5].

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Acknowledgments: PDS is very grateful to GFRE for the prestigious opportunity to collaborate in writing this article together.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Albert, R., and Barabási, A. L. (2002). “Statistical mechanics of complex networks.” *Reviews of modern physics* **74**:47.
2. Alberts, B., Johnson, A., Lewis, J., Morgan, D., Raff, M., and Roberts, K. (2018). *Molecular biology of the cell* (Garland Science).
3. Allen, M. (2015). “Compelled by the diagram: thinking through CH Waddington’s epigenetic landscape”. *Contemporaneity* **4**:119.
4. Alon, U. (2019). *An introduction to systems biology: design principles of biological circuits*. (CR Press).
5. Anderson, P W (1972) “More is different: broken symmetry and the nature of the hierarchical structure of science” *Science* **177**:393-396.
6. Arrowsmith, D. K., Place, C. M., and Place, C. H. (1990). *An introduction to dynamical systems*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
7. Arthur, W. B. (2009) *The Nature of Technology: What it is and How it evolves* (New York: Free Press)
8. Arthur, W. B. (2021). “Foundations of complexity economics”. *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**:136-145.
9. Ashby, W R (1957) *An introduction to cybernetics* (London: Chapman and Hall).
10. Ashby, W. R. (2017) “Principles of the self-organizing system”. In *Systems Research for Behavioral Science Systems Research* (Routledge),. 108-118.
11. Ashby, W. R. (2013) *Design for a brain: The origin of adaptive behaviour*. (Springer Science and Business Media).
12. Ayers, J. E. (2018). *Digital integrated circuits: analysis and design*. (CRC Press).
13. Badcock, P. B., Ramstead, M. J., Sheikhabaee, Z., and Constant, A. (2022). “Applying the Free Energy Principle to Complex Adaptive Systems” *Entropy* **24**: 689.
14. Bajec, I. L., and Heppner, F. H. (2009). *Organized flight in birds*. *Animal Behaviour* **78**(4):777-789.
15. Ball, P. (2023) *Organisms as agents of evolution* (John Templeton Foundation)
<https://www.templeton.org/news/organisms-as-agents-of-evolution-new-research-review>
16. Ball, P. (2023) *Giorgio Parisi: the Nobel-prize winner whose complex interests stretch from spin glasses to starlings* *Physics World Newsletter* 02 Aug 2023
17. Barabasi, A. L., and Oltvai, Z. N. (2004). *Network biology: understanding the cell’s functional organization*. *Nature reviews genetics*, **5**:101-113.
18. Beer, S. (1966). *Decision and Control* (London: Wiley).
19. Berridge, M J (2007) *Cell signalling biology* (London: Portland Press).
Available online: URL <http://www.cellsignallingbiology.co.uk/csb/>
20. Bickhard, M H. (2000) “Emergence.” In Andersen et al (Eds), , *Downward Causation* (University of Aarhus Press), pp:322-348.

- <https://www.lehigh.edu/~mhb0/Emergence27Jul97.pdf>
21. Bickle, J (2020) "Multiple Realizability", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2020/entries/multiple-realizability/>
 22. Binder, K., and Young, A. P. (1986). [Spin glasses: Experimental facts, theoretical concepts, and open questions.](#) *Reviews of Modern physics* **58**:801.
 23. Bishop, R. C. (2012). "Excluding the causal exclusion argument against non-reductive physicalism". *Journal of Consciousness Studies* **19**:57-74.
 24. Boffetta, G, Cencini, M, Falcioni, and M, Vulpiani, A (2002) "Predictability: a way to characterize complexity" *Physics Reports* **356**(6):367-474.
 25. Bohm, D, and Hiley, B J (1995) *The Undivided Universe: An Ontological Interpretation of Quantum Theory* (Oxfordshire: Routledge).
 26. Booch, G (1990) *Object oriented design with applications* (Benjamin-Cummings Publishing Co)
 27. Boulding, K. E. (1956). "[General systems theory—the skeleton of science](#)". *Management science* **2**:197-208.
 28. Brading, K., and Castellani, E. (Eds.). (2003). *Symmetries in physics: philosophical reflections*. (Cambridge University Press)
 29. Brown, F. T. (2006). *Engineering system dynamics: a unified graph-centered approach* (CRC press)
 30. Campbell, D T (1974) "Downward causation in hierarchically organised biological systems". In *Studies in the Philosophy of Biology: Reduction and Related Problems*, eds F J Ayala and T Dobzhansky (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press), 179-186.
 31. Campbell, N. A. and Reece, J. B. (2005) *Biology* (San Francisco: Benjamin Cummings).
 32. Carroll, S B (2005). *Endless forms most beautiful: The new science of evo devo and the making of the animal kingdom* (WW Norton and Company).
 33. Carroll, S B (2008) "Evo-devo and an expanding evolutionary synthesis: a genetic theory of morphological evolution" *Cell* **134**:25–36.
 34. Cencini, M, Ceconi, and F, Vulpiani, A (2009) *Chaos: From Simple Models to Complex Systems* (Singapore: World Scientific).
 35. Churchland, P. S., and Sejnowski, T. J. (1994). *The computational brain* (MIT Press).
 36. Clark, A (2013) "Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science" *Behavioral and brain sciences* **36**:181-204.
 37. Clayton, P., and Davies, P. (Eds.). (2006) *The re-emergence of emergence* (Oxford University Press, Oxford).
 38. Cockell, C.S. (2017) "The laws of life" *Physics Today* **70**, 42 <https://doi.org/10.1063/PT.3.3493>
 39. Cooper, S. J. (2008). "[From Claude Bernard to Walter Cannon. Emergence of the concept of homeostasis](#)". *Appetite* **51**:419-427.
 40. Cornish-Bowden, A, Cardenas, M L, Letelier, J C, Soto-Andrade, J, and Abarzúa, F G (2004) "Understanding the parts in terms of the whole" *Biology of the Cell* **96**:713-717.
 41. Cramer, F (1994) "Emil Fischer's Lock-and-Key Hypothesis after 100 years - Towards a Supracellular Chemistry" *Perspectives in supramolecular chemistry: The lock-and-key principle*, pp.1-23.
 42. Crutchfield, J., and Wiesner, K. (2010). "Simplicity and complexity" *Physics world* **23**(02):36.
 43. Dasgupta, S. (2016) *Computer Science: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press).
 44. Darwin, C, and Wallace, A R (1958) *Evolution by natural selection* (memorial volume) (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 45. David, N. (2012). "New frontiers in the neuroscience of the sense of agency" *Frontiers in human neuroscience* **6**:161.
 46. Davies, P, and Gribbin, J (2007) *The Matter Myth: Dramatic Discoveries that Challenge Our Understanding of Physical Reality* (New York City: Simon and Schuster).
 47. Deacon, T. W., and García-Valdecasas, M. (2023). "[A thermodynamic basis for teleological causality](#)." *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A* **381**: 20220282.
 48. Deco, G., Rolls, E. T., and Romo, R. (2009). "Stochastic dynamics as a principle of brain function". *Progress in neurobiology* **88**:1-16.
 49. Di Bernardo et al (2008) "Bifurcations in nonsmooth dynamical systems." *SIAM review* **50**:629-701.
 50. Dilthey, W (1988) *Introduction to the Human Sciences - An Attempt to Lay a Foundation for the Study of Society and History* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press).

51. Di Sia, P (2013) "Looking at the Schrödinger equation for nanotechnology" *International Journal of Engineering Science and Innovative Technology (IJESIT)* 2:410-418.
52. Di Sia, P (2020) "On philosophy of mind, quantum physics and metaphysics of the uni-multiverse" *Philosophical News* 18:161-174.
53. Di Sia, P (2021) "On Advances of Contemporary Physics about Totality" *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Modern Education (IJMRME)* 7:8-12
54. Di Sia, P (2022) "The Primordial Dynamic Space (Introduction 1)"
Preprint DOI: 10.31219/osf.io/qd4fb.
55. Dobzhansky, T. (2013) "Nothing in biology makes sense except in the light of evolution". *The American Biology Teacher* 75:87-91.
56. Drossel, B (2023) "The passage of time and top-down causation" *Proceedings of the MG16 Meeting on General Relativity Online*; 5–10 July 2021 2023:
57. Ellis, G. F. (2005). "Physics, complexity and causality". *Nature*, 435:743-743.
58. Ellis, G. F. (2012). "Top-down causation and emergence: some comments on mechanisms". *Interface Focus*, 2:126-140.
59. Ellis, G (2012) "On the limits of quantum theory: Contextuality and the quantum-classical cut" *Annals of Physics* 327: 1890-1932.
60. Ellis, G. F. R. (2014). "On the philosophy of cosmology". *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics*, 46:5-23.
61. Ellis, G (2016) *How can physics underlie the mind? Top-down causation in the human context* (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.)
62. Ellis, G (2017). "The domain of cosmology and the testing of cosmological theories." In *The philosophy of cosmology*: Chamcham, K., et al (Eds.) (Cambridge University Press), 3-39.
63. Ellis, G (2020) "The Causal Closure of Physics in Real World Contexts" *Foundations of Physics* 50:1057-1097.
64. Ellis, G (2020) "Emergence in Solid State Physics and Biology" *Foundations of Physics* 50:1098– 1139.
65. Ellis, G. (2023). "Quantum physics and biology: the local wavefunction approach".
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.06516>
66. Ellis, G. (2023). "Efficient, Formal, Material, and Final Causes in Biology and Engineering". To appear in *Entropy*
67. Ellis, G., and Drossel, B. (2019). "How downwards causation occurs in digital computers." *Foundations of Physics* 49:1253-1277.
68. Ellis, G. and Kopel, J. (2019) "The dynamical emergence of biology from physics: branching causation via biomolecules" *Frontiers in Physiology* 9:1966.
69. Ellis, G., and Noble, D. (2023). "Economics, Society, and the Pre-eminent Role of Values".
70. Faggini, F. (2021) *Silicon: From the Invention of the Microprocessor to the New Science of Consciousness* (Cardiff: Waterside Productions).
71. Farnsworth, K. D., Albantakis, L., and Caruso, T. (2017) "Unifying concepts of biological function from molecules to ecosystems" *Oikos* 126:1367–1376.
72. Farnsworth, K. D., Nelson, J., and Gershenson, C. (2013) "Living is information processing: from molecules to global systems" *Acta biotheoretica* 61:203-222.
73. Fell, D., and Cornish-Bowden, A. (1997). *Understanding the control of metabolism* (London: Portland Press).
74. Frank, S. A., and Fox, G. A. (2020). "The inductive theory of natural selection." *The theory of evolution*, 171-193.
75. Feynman, R. (1960). "There's Plenty of Room at the Bottom" *Engineering and Science* 5: 22–36.
76. Gardner, A. (2009) "Adaptation as organism design" *Biology Letters* 5:861-864.
77. Gardner, M (1970). "The fantastic combinations of John Conway's new solitaire game 'life' ". *Mathematical Games. Scientific American* 223:120–123.
78. Gatherer, D (2010) "So what do we really mean when we say that systems biology is holistic?" *BMC Systems Biology* 4:22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-0509-4-22>.]
79. Gilbert, S. F., Opitz, J. M., and Raff, R. A. (1996). "Resynthesizing evolutionary and developmental biology." *Developmental biology* 173:357-372.

80. Gilbert, S. F., and Sarkar, S. (2000). "Embracing complexity: organicism for the 21st century".. *Developmental dynamics: an official publication of the American Association of Anatomists*, **219**:1-9.
81. Gilbert, S. F. (2001). "Ecological developmental biology: developmental biology meets the real world." *Developmental biology* **233**:1-12.
82. Gillett, C. (2002). Strong Emergence as a Defense of Non-Reductive Physicalism. *Principia: an international journal of epistemology*, 6(1), 89-120.
83. Gillett, C. (2002). "The metaphysics of realization, multiple realizability, and the special sciences". *The Journal of Philosophy* **100**: 591-603.
84. Gillett, C (2017) "Scientific emergentism and its move beyond (direct) downward causation". In *Philosophical and scientific perspectives on downward causation* (Routledge), pp.242-262.
85. Goelzer, A, et al (2008). "Reconstruction and analysis of the genetic and metabolic regulatory networks of the central metabolism of *Bacillus subtilis*." *BMC systems biology* **2**: 1-18.
86. Guay, A., and Sartenauer, O. (2018). "Emergent quasiparticles. Or how to get a rich physics from a sober metaphysics." *Individuation, process and scientific practices*, 214-234.
87. Haggard, P. (2008). "Human volition: towards a neuroscience of will". *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **9**:934-946.
88. Haggard, P. (2017). "Sense of agency in the human brain" *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **18**:196-207.
89. Hall, J E., and Hall, M E. (2020) *Guyton and Hall textbook of medical physiology* (Elsevier Health Sciences).
90. Hartwell, L, Hopfield, J, Leibler, S, and Murray, A (1999) "From molecular to modular cell biology" *Nature* **402**:C47-C52.
91. Healey, R (2009)"Holism in Quantum Mechanics" In: Greenberger, D, Hentschel, K, Weinert, F (eds) *Compendium of Quantum Physics* (Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer)
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-70626-7_91
92. Hoffmann, P (2012) *Life's ratchet: how molecular machines extract order from chaos* (New York: Basic Books).
93. Holland, J. H. (1992). *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems: an introductory analysis with applications to biology, control, and artificial intelligence* (MIT Press).
94. Homer-Dixon, T. (2011) "Complexity science." *Oxford Leadership Journal* **2**:1-15.
95. Hopfield, J. J. (1982). "Neural networks and physical systems with emergent collective computational abilities." *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* **79**:2554-2558.
96. Humphreys, P. (2016) *Emergence: A Philosophical Account*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
97. Jackiw, R. W. (1987). Berry's phase: topological ideas from atomic, molecular and optical physics (Report No. MIT-CTP-1475).
98. Jacob, F, and Monod, J (1961) "Genetic regulatory mechanisms in the synthesis of proteins" *Journal of Molecular Biology* **3**:318-356.
99. Jaeger, J. (2021). "The fourth perspective: evolution and organismal agency" <https://sf.io/2g7fh/down>].
100. Jeong, H., Tombor, B., Albert, R., Oltvai, Z. N., and Barabási, A. L. (2000). "The large-scale organization of metabolic networks". *Nature* **407**:651-654.
101. Jepps, O. G., and Rondoni, L (2006) "Thermodynamics and complexity of simple transport phenomena" *Journal of Physics A* **39**:1311.
102. Juarrero, A (2002) *Dynamics in Action: Intentional Behavior as a Complex System* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press).
103. Kandel, E R (2001) "The molecular biology of memory storage: a dialogue between genes and synapses" *Science*:**294**:1030-1038.
104. Kandel, E. R, et al (2000) *Principles of neural science* (New York: McGraw-Hill)
105. Karlebach, G., and Shamir, R. (2008) "Modelling and analysis of gene regulatory networks". *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* **9**:770-780.
106. Karnopp, D. C., Margolis, D. L., and Rosenberg, R. C. (2012). *System dynamics: modeling, simulation, and control of mechatronic systems*. (John Wiley and Sons).
107. Karplus, M (2014) "Development of multiscale models for complex chemical systems: from H+ H2 to biomolecules" (Nobel lecture) *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **53**:9992-10005.
108. Katok, A., and Hasselblatt, B. (1995). *Introduction to the modern theory of dynamical systems* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
109. Kauffman, S A (2019) *A World Beyond Physics: The Emergence of Evolution and Life*

110. Koskinen, R (2019) "Multiple realisability as a design heuristic in biology and engineering" *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* **9**:15
111. Lehn, J. M. (2004) "Supramolecular chemistry: from molecular information towards self-organization and complex matter" *Reports on progress in physics* **67**: 249.
112. Lehn, J. M. (2007) "From supramolecular chemistry towards constitutional dynamic chemistry and adaptive chemistry" *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **36**:151-160.
113. Lewin, R. (1999). *Complexity: Life at the edge of chaos*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
114. List, C., and Menzies, P. (2009). "Nonreductive physicalism and the limits of the exclusion principle". *The Journal of Philosophy* **106**:475-502.
115. Longo, G., and Montévil, M., (2014). "From physics to biology by extending criticality and symmetry breakings." *Perspectives on Organisms: Biological Time, Symmetries and Singularities*, 161-185.
116. Macdonald, C., and Macdonald, G. (Eds.), (2010). *Emergence in mind*. (OUP, Oxford).
117. Makkreel, R (2021) "Wilhelm Dilthey" *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* E N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/dilthey/>.
118. Manson, S. M. (2001). "Simplifying complexity: a review of complexity theory". *Geoforum* **32**:405-414.
119. Martins, M L, Ferreira, S C, and Vilela, M J (2010) "Multiscale models for biological systems". *Current opinion in colloid and Interface Science* **15**:18-23.
120. McLeish, T., Pexton, M., and Lancaster, T. (2019). "Emergence and topological order in classical and quantum systems." *Studies Hist and Phil of Science Part B: Studies in Hist and Philos Modern Physics*, **66**:155-169.
121. Meinhardt, H. (2012). "Turing's theory of morphogenesis of 1952 and the subsequent discovery of the crucial role of local self-enhancement and long-range inhibition." *Interface Focus* **2**:407-4S.
122. Menon, G., and Krishnan, J. (2021). [Spatial localisation meets biomolecular networks](#) *Nature Communications* **12**: 5357.
123. Menzies, P. (2015). "The causal closure argument is no threat to non-reductive physicalism" *Humana. Mente Journal of Philosophical Studies*, **8**:21-46.
124. Meunier, D., Lambiotte, R., and Bullmore, E. T. (2010). "Modular and hierarchically modular organization of brain networks" *Frontiers in neuroscience* **4**:200.
125. Menzies, P, and List, C (2010) "The Causal Autonomy of the Special Sciences". In *Emergence in Mind* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) (<https://philpapers.org/rec/MENTCA>).
126. Milsum, J. H., and F. A. Roberge (1973) "Physiological regulation and control." In *Foundations of Mathematical biology: Vol 3, Supramolecular systems* (Ed R N Rosen), pp.1-96.
127. Modell, H, Cliff, W, Michael, J, McFarland, J, Wenderoth, M P, and Wright, A (2015) "A physiologist's view of homeostasis" *Advances in physiology education* **39**: 259-266.
128. Monod, J (1971) *Chance and Necessity: An Essay on the Natural Philosophy of Modern Biology* (New York: Vintage Books).
129. Monod, J, Changeux, J P, and Jacob, F (1963) "Allosteric proteins and cellular control systems" *Journal of molecular biology* **6**:306-329.
130. Montévil, M and Mossio, M (2015) "Biological organisation as closure of constraints" *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **372**:179-191.
131. Morin, E. (2008) *On Complexity (Advances in Systems Theory, Complexity, and the Human Sciences)* (New York: Hampton Press).
132. Mosheiff, N., Ermentrout, B., and Huang, C. (2023). "Chaotic dynamics in spatially distributed neuronal networks generate population-wide shared variability". *PLOS Computational Biology* **19**:e1010843.
133. Mossio, M., Montévil, M., and Longo, G. (2016). "Theoretical principles for biology: Organization." *Progress in Biophysics and Molecular Biology* **122**:24-35.
134. Mossio, M, Bich, L, and Moreno, A (2013) "Emergence, closure and inter-level causation in biological systems" *Erkenntnis* **78**:153-178.
135. Mossio, M, Saborido, C, and Moreno, A (2009) "An organizational account of biological functions" *Br. J. Philos. Sci.* **60**:813-841.
136. Murphy, N., Ellis, G., and O'Connor, T. (Eds.). (2009). *Downward causation and the neurobiology of free will* (Springer Science and Business Media).
137. Needleman, D, and Shelley, M (2019) "The stormy fluid dynamics of the living cell" *Physics Today* **72**: 32
138. Noble, D (2002) "Modeling the heart – from genes to cells to the whole organ" *Science* **295**: 1678-1682

139. Noble, D (2012) "A theory of biological relativity: no privileged level of causation" *Interface focus* **2**:55-64.
140. Noble, D., Jablonka, E, Joyner, M. J., Müller, G. B., and Omholt, S. W. (2014). "Evolution evolves: physiology returns to centre stage." *The Journal of physiology* **592**:2237.
141. Noble, R. and Noble, D. (2018) "Harnessing stochasticity: how do organisms make choices?" *Chaos* **28**, 106309
142. Noble, R. and Noble, D. (2020) "Can Reasons and Values Influence Action: How Might Intentional Agency Work Physiologically?" *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 1-19.
143. Nurse, P (2008) "Life, logic and information" *Nature* **454**:424-426.
144. Nurse, P., Masui, Y., and Hartwell, L. (1998). "[Understanding the cell cycle.](#)" *Nature medicine*: **4**:1103-1106.
145. O'Connor, T. (2021) "Emergent Properties", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/properties-emergent/>
146. O'Connor, T., and Churchill, J. R. (2010). "Nonreductive physicalism or emergent dualism? The argument from mental causation." *The waning of materialism*, 261-279.
147. O'Connor, T. and Franklin, C. (2021) "Free Will", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, E N. Zalta (ed.), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/freewill/>
148. Oster, G (2002) "Brownian ratchets: Darwin's motors." *Nature* **417**:25-25.
149. Oyama, S, Griffiths, P E, and Gray, R D (2001) *Cycles of Contingency: Developmental Systems and Evolution* (Cambridge Mass: MIT Press).
150. Pang, J. C., *et al* (2023). "[Geometric constraints on human brain function](#)". *Nature*, **618**:566-574.
151. Peacocke, A. R. (1989). *An introduction to the physical chemistry of biological organization*. (Oxford: Oxford University Press.)
152. Petsko, G A, and Ringe, D (2004) *Protein structure and function* (New Science Press).
153. Palmer, T. N., Döring, A., and Seregin, G. (2014) "The real butterfly effect" *Nonlinearity* **27**: R123: 472.
154. Phelan, S. E. (2001). "What is complexity science, really?". *Emergence, A Journal of Complexity Issues in Organizations and Management* **3**:120-136.
155. Potter, H. D., and Mitchell, K. J. (2022). "[Naturalising agent causation](#)". *Entropy* **24**:472.
156. Pray, L. (2008) [DNA Replication and Causes of Mutation](#). *Nature Education* **1**:214
157. Prigogine, I. (1987). "[Exploring complexity](#)". *European journal of operational research* **30**:97-103.
158. Prigogine, I., and Nicolis, G. (1971). "Biological order, structure and instabilities". *Quarterly reviews of biophysics* **4**:107-148.
159. Prigogine, I, and Stengers, I (2018) *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* (London, New York: Verso).
160. Raut, R. V., Snyder, A. Z., and Raichle, M. E. (2020). "Hierarchical dynamics as a macroscopic organizing principle of the human brain". *Proceedings Nat Acad Sciences* **117**:20890-20897.
161. Ravasz, E. *et al.* (2002) "Hierarchical organization of modularity in metabolic networks." *Science* **297**:1551-1555.
162. Rebout, N., Lone, J. C., De Marco, A., Cozzolino, R., Lemasson, A., and Thierry, B. (2021). "[Measuring complexity in organisms and organizations](#)". *Royal Society Open Science* **8**:200895.
163. Reid, C. R., and Latty, T. (2016). "Collective behaviour and swarm intelligence in slime moulds". *FEMS microbiology reviews* **40**:798-806.
164. Rhoades, R. and Pflanzner, R. (1989) *Human physiology* (Fort Worth: Saunders College Publishing)
165. Rolls, E T and Deco, G (2010) *The Noisy Brain: Stochastic Dynamics as a Principle of Brain Function* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
166. Sáez, M., Briscoe, J., and Rand, D. A. (2022). Dynamical landscapes of cell fate decisions. *Interface focus* **12**:20220002
167. Shannon, C. E. (1948). "A mathematical theory of communication". *The Bell system technical journal*, 27(3), 379-423.
168. Simon, H A (1962) "The Architecture of Complexity" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* **106**:467-482
169. Simon, H A (2019) *The Sciences of the Artificial* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press).
170. Smith, J M, and Szathmary, E (1997) *The major transitions in evolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
171. Sornette, D (1999) "Complexity, catastrophe and physics" *Physics World* **12**:57.
172. Tanenbaum, A S (2006) *Structured Computer Organisation* (Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs).

173. Thom, R. (1977). "Structural stability, catastrophe theory, and applied mathematics". *SIAM review* **19**:189-201
174. Thouless, D. (1998). *Topological quantum numbers in nonrelativistic physics* (World Scientific).
175. Tomasello, M. (2022). *The Evolution of Agency: Behavioral Organization from Lizards to Humans*. (Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press).
176. Tononi, G., Boly, M., Massimini, M., and Koch, C. (2016). [Integrated information theory: from consciousness to its physical substrate](#). *Nature Reviews Neuroscience* **17**:450-461.
177. Turing, A. M. (1936). "On computable numbers, with an application to the Entscheidungsproblem". *J. of Math* **58**:230-265.
178. Turing, A. M. (1952). "The chemical basis of morphogenesis". *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond.* **B 237**:37-72.
179. Von Bertalanffy, L. (1950) "The theory of open systems in physics and biology". *Science* **111**:23-29.
180. Von Bertalanffy, L. (1957). "Quantitative laws in metabolism and growth". *The quarterly review of biology* **32**:217-231.
181. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications* (New York: George Braziller).
182. von Neumann, J., and Morgenstern, O. (1944) *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
183. Wagner, A (2014) *Arrival of the fittest: solving evolution's greatest puzzle* (London: Penguin).
184. Walker, S. I., Kim, H., and Davies, P. C. (2016). ["The informational architecture of the cell"](#). *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*: **374**:20150057.
185. Watson, J D, *et al* (2013) *Molecular Biology of the Gene* (Pearson).
186. West, G. B., Brown, J. H., and Enquist, B. J. (1997). "A general model for the origin of allometric scaling laws in biology". *Science* **276**:122-126.
187. West, G. B., and Brown, J. H. (2004). "Life's universal scaling laws". *Physics today*, **57**:36-43.
188. Wiener, N (1961) *Cybernetics or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, Second Edition).
189. Wolfram, S. (1984). "Cellular automata as models of complexity". *Nature* **311**: 419-424.
190. Wolfram, S. (2002). *A new kind of science* (Champaign IL: Wolfram Media, Inc.)
191. Wolpert, L *et al* (2002) *Principles of development* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
192. Zeeman, E. C. (1976). ["Catastrophe theory"](#). *Scientific American* **234**:65-83.
193. Zimmerman, B., Lindberg, C., and Plsek, P. (1998). ["A complexity science primer: What is complexity science and why should I learn about it"](#). Adapted From: Edgeware: Lessons From Complexity Science for Health Care Leaders, Dallas, TX: VHA Inc.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.