

Three Myths in Complexity Science – and How to Resolve Them

Casper van Elteren

From bird flocking to neural dynamics, complex systems generate fascinating structures and correlations. Often, seemingly simple dynamics lead to intricate emergent properties. Despite their visceral appeal, defining complex systems lacks universal agreement. In this paper, I will debunk three prevalent myths in complex systems and propose resolutions. This work contributes by offering a contemporary interpretation of complex systems, presenting essential definitions that benefit complexity scientists.

Complex systems are often exemplified through classic instances, such as ants collaborating to forage for food, starlings forming mesmerizing murmurations at dusk, or the dynamic flows of traffic (fig. 1).

The field of complexity science shows its traces through scientific history, but it was coined as a distinct discipline in 1984 with the establishment of the Santa Fe Institute [14]. This institute played a pivotal role in consolidating various threads of scientific approaches from cybernetics, systems theory, chaos theory and non linear systems and weaving it into a new field of complexity science.




Figure 1: Complex systems exist at multiple scales, ranging from the microscopic interactions of elementary particles (experiment oil droplets in a double slit experiment emulating a “pilot wave”, top left) to the intricate inner workings of cells (slime mold, top right), the dynamics of human societies, and the vast interdependencies within ecosystems (anthill, bottom left) and climate (wind flows, bottom right). This illustration highlights how these systems, despite their diverse scales, share common characteristics such as interconnectivity, emergent behavior, and adaptability, illustrating the universality and complexity of interactions across different levels of organization.

The early days of the field of complexity science, concerned itself with so-called “wicked problems” – problems that defy reductionistic analysis and emphasize

the importance the web of relations underpinning complex problems [27]. The field aimed to be in-between different approaches, integrating upon existing work to produce novel approaches to understand so-called complex systems.

The term complex system was used to differentiate it from the term system. A system is defined as a tuple $S = (P, R)$ comprising a collection P of interconnected parts, related through a mapping $R(P)$. The parts themselves can represent various levels of description relevant to understanding, potentially leading to a nested hierarchy of systems. Alternatively, the elements might capture the fundamental, atomistic level of description necessary to comprehend natural phenomena.

The word “complex” comes from the Latin word *complexus*, meaning “embraced” or “encompassed”. This, in turn, is derived from “com-” (meaning “together”) and *plectere* (meaning “to weave” or “to braid”). Taken together a complex system etymological means a collection of interwoven parts.

The term “complex” carries two primary interpretations. Firstly, it denotes something that is difficult to understand. For example, a complex problem is more challenging to comprehend or solve than a simple one. Secondly, it implies the interconnectedness of many parts. This second interpretation highlights that the interactions of these parts are often difficult to capture with simple rules. In other words, the behavior of the whole system does not emerge from straightforward rules governing individual components.

Both interpretations permeate the science of complexity, which is defined by the interrelatedness of parts and the inherent difficulty in predicting the behaviors that emerge from their interactions [23].

Thus, the term *complex systems* is commonly used to describe systems consisting of parts that produce behavior or properties greater than the sum of their parts. Understanding or predicting the behavior of a complex system requires analyzing how the interaction structure (*its form*) relates to its behavior (*its function*) [16, 1]. These interactions can involve simple pairwise connections or higher-order relationships, which may be weighted or temporally dependent, adding layers of complexity.

The key point is that the interrelatedness of a system produces phenomena distinct from the properties of its individual parts studied in isolation. Complex systems are closely tied to the concept of emergence, where new behaviors and properties arise from the interactions within the system. The relationship between components cannot be reduced to mere linear relations, as linearity would imply superposition, which could be understood by analyzing parts separately. Instead, the study of complex systems requires a holistic ap-

proach to grasp the emergent behavior arising from the intricate web of interactions.

While intuitive examples like ants foraging, starlings murmuring, and traffic flowing may evoke a sense of understanding, the concept of complex systems remains debated and lacks a universally accepted definition [9, 12, 17]. This intuitive sense of understanding is relative, relying on the observer's ability to comprehend the system (as illustrated in fig. 2). Nevertheless, the concept of complex systems remains contentious, with no consensus on a definition [19, 9, 12, 17, 31].




Figure 2: Complex systems can be compared to the legend of the blind men and the elephant, where each man perceives only a part of the elephant, leading to incomplete and varied understandings. This cartoon illustrates that understanding complex systems requires integrating different perspectives to form a complete picture.^a

^aBlind men and the elephant cartoon by G. Renee Guzlas, artist.

Definitions of complex systems typically involve properties ill-defined properties, such as the requirement for “many” elements for complexity to arise, the need for memory or the emergence of robust order [25]. Such inquiries immediately raise questions, casting doubt on the validity of the field. The goal of this work is not to get entangled in semantics or attributing complexity to the observations of an external observer (fig. 2). Rather, the idea is to give a modern interpretation of what how complex system are understood.

To provide clarity for the field of complexity science, I aim to resolve three myths that permeate the field:

Myth 1

The whole is more than the sum of its parts.

Myth 2

The behavior of complex systems cannot be understood through reductionistic approaches.

Myth 3

Complexity requires the interaction of many constituents.

To discuss these myths, I will first examine how parts relate to the whole within the context of complexity science. I will argue that the common belief that complexity science defies reductionism and produces something “more” leads to logical inconsistencies and a reliance on magical ingredients to explain macroscopic structures. This belief is often conflated with the concept of emergence. By providing concise, operational definitions of emergent properties and emergent behavior, I will clarify this misconception. With these definitions, we will understand that complex systems do not offer ontological novelty in the strong sense but rather impose restrictions on degrees of freedom, producing outcomes that are different from the sum of their parts.

How Do the Parts Relate to the Whole?

What makes a system complex is not just the number of parts it has, but rather the web of interactions between those parts. It's the way these individual components interact with each other that gives rise to behaviors that fascinate many. With the enormous success of classical mechanics, the reductionistic way of thinking led many to believe for centuries that reducing the thing-to-be-understood (*explanandum*) to a part description was sufficient. By decomposing behavior in terms of the sum of the interactions, we could grow closer to understanding *how* the *explanandum* arises.

According to some complexity scientists, complex systems inhabit a special niche that challenges this reductionistic way of thinking. As G. H. Lewes articulated in 1879:

Every resultant is either a sum or a difference of the co-operant forces; their sum, when their directions are the same – their difference, when their directions are contrary. Further, every resultant is clearly traceable in its components, because these are homogeneous and commensurable. It is otherwise with emergents, when, instead of adding measurable motion to measurable motion, or things of one kind to other individuals of their kind, there is a co-operation of things of unlike kinds. The emergent is unlike its components insofar as these are incommensurable, and it cannot be reduced to their sum or their difference.

Lewes. *Problems of Life and Mind* in 1879, p. 368.

According to Lewes, interrelated parts can create something beyond mere aggregation. For example, surface tension of water is not due to the mere aggregation of water molecules. Rather, wetness arises from the hydrogen bonds between the slightly polarized water molecules that create the property of water tension. Likewise, it is not the grand ensemble of neuron activity that produces consciousness, but the interconnected coordination of billions of neurons.

This sense of wonder and enchantment is not unique to Lewes's quote, but is a common reaction when people first encounter complex systems. It *feels* as if these intricate networks of interactions are performing some kind of “magical” trick, where disparate components come together to create something entirely new and unexpected. It further complicates the question of how parts relate to the whole, as it seems to challenge reductionist approaches (box 1 Explanations in Complex Systems: Reductionism, and Holism).

The property by which a whole (system) exhibits behavior that is different from the properties of the parts is also known as emergence, to which we turn next.

Box 1 Explanations in Complex Systems: Reductionism, and Holism

Complexity scientists face the daunting task of understanding and modeling complex systems. Two primary approaches emerge: reductionism and holism. Reductionism involves breaking down these systems into their constituent parts, analyzing each piece separately to explain a high-dimensional phenomenon in terms of a lower-dimensional object that is equally well-described.

In contrast, holistic thinking considers the system as a whole, focusing on its emergent properties rather than individual components. While both approaches aim to understand the natural world, they differ fundamentally in the level of compression that can be achieved. Reductionism seeks to compress complex phenomena into lower-dimensional objects, whereas holism suggests that this compression may not always be possible, requiring consideration of the entire system as a focal point.

However, rather than being mutually exclusive, these approaches can be seen as complementary strategies lying on a continuum (fig. 3). When a complex system can be understood through a singular, e.g. one dimensional, description, it is fully reduced to a part. As interactions become more significant, however, detail is required for explanation. In the limit, considering the whole system becomes necessary, leading to holism.




Figure 3: The tension between reductionism and holism can be resolved by considering both approaches in terms of the level of compression. The mechanics of a watch can be completely reduced to the summation of the workings of the parts (image credit: Andrea Muratore). As the complexity increases, more complex patterns such a flocking could be reduced to simple rules combined with nearest neighbor interactions. Murmurations, for example, can be understood through three simple rules: separation, alignment, and cohesion. Separation ensures individuals avoid crowding their neighbors, alignment means they steer towards the average heading of nearby flockmates, and cohesion keeps them close to the center of the group. At maximum incompressibility, we are left with a system in which the whole is necessary such as parity checks or XOR gates.

Emergence in Complex Systems - Delineating Etymology, Property, and Behavior

Emergence is best understood as the idea that the whole system exhibits properties or behaviors that are not directly attributable to its individual parts [2, 5, 8]. In other words, the system transcends the sum of its components, creating something novel or something that is difficult to predict from the parts alone. Through often simple interactions among its parts, novel and sometimes unexpected behaviors emerge at the system level.

Despite the intuitive appeal of emergence, it remains a concept that is often viewed as troublesome, especially within philosophical discourse [15, 18, 24].

The concept of emergence has its roots in ancient philosophy, notably dating back to Aristotle [7]. However, it wasn't until the late 19th and early 20th centuries that the term “emergence” became widely used to describe the relationship between constituent parts and the whole. The term itself derives from the Latin verb *emergere*, meaning “to rise out” or “to come forth,” which is formed from the prefix *ex-* meaning “out,” and the verb *mergere*, meaning “to dip” or “to sink.” Originally, emergence referred to the act of rising out or coming forth from a submerged or hidden state. In modern usage, emergence generally denotes the pro-

cess of becoming visible or apparent, such as a body emerging from water.

Aristotle's philosophy provides an early framework for understanding emergence, particularly through his concept of hylomorphism, which posits that everything is a compound of matter (*hyle*) and form (*morphe*). He believed that the form of an object is not just its shape but its essence or what it is meant to be. The form gives matter its structure and purpose, suggesting an emergent relationship where the whole is more than just a collection of its parts. For example, a house is not a mere collection of sticks; they are cut and constructed with great diligence to carry the weight of a roof, provide doors to walk through, and so on.

Emergence, however, comes in different forms, notably weak and strong emergence. Some might argue that these systems show weak emergence, where the emergent properties can still be traced back to the interactions of the individual components [32, 29, 28]. However, for systems that exhibit strong emergence, there would indeed not be such a mapping back from the whole to the parts. To date, no such system has ever been seen in nature. Consciousness is often considered to show strong emergence [22], however, this view is questioned by some and is not settled [6]. Still, the notion of different forms of emergence is useful to get closer to an understanding of what is meant by emergence.

Building on Aristotle's foundational ideas, Henri Poincaré's contributions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries brought renewed attention to the concept of emergence, emphasizing its relevance in modern scientific thought [13]. Poincaré asserts that:

*The whole is not merely the sum of its parts,
but it is something more than this.*

Poincaré. *Science and Hypothesis* in 1905.

His work highlighted the importance of looking beyond reductionist approaches, which attempt to understand complex systems solely by dissecting their individual components. Instead, he advocated for a holistic view, recognizing that interactions between parts can lead to novel and unexpected outcomes. This idea has been profoundly influential in various scientific disciplines, such as systems theory and complexity science, where researchers explore how simple rules and interactions give rise to complex and emergent behaviors. In essence, Poincaré's insights bridge ancient philosophical ideas with contemporary scientific understanding, reinforcing the notion that emergent properties of a system contribute to its identity and function in ways that transcend the mere aggregation of its parts. His work continues to inspire and inform modern theories of complexity and systems, demonstrating the enduring relevance of the concept of emergence in understanding the natural world.

Novelty of What?

The problem with Poincaré's addition of the word "more" is that we are left with a problem: what is more to the system? In the context of Poincaré's work, we can deduce that the "more" refers to the patterns and system behaviors that emerge through non-linear dynamics, producing difficult-to-predict properties based on initial conditions. Prior to Poincaré, the success of reductionism led many to believe that given enough measurement prowess, we could—in principle—deduce the future trajectories of many systems by applying the laws of physics.

In the concept of emergence, however, it is important to note that Aristotle never intended to invoke a sense of "more." In fact, his texts always refer to the property that the whole is *different* from the parts (see the quote at the beginning of this book). To state something is more, we need to explicate what this novelty is and how it arises.

The problem with novelty in the context of emergence lies in its ambiguous nature. Defining what constitutes "novelty" can be challenging, as it implies that the emergent properties are not merely a sum or rearrangement of the existing parts, but something fundamentally new [10]. This raises questions about the origins and mechanisms of these new properties. For instance, how does a complex system give rise to behaviors or characteristics that were not present in the individual components? That is, is it impossible to understand the surface tension of water in terms of the electromagnetic forces within the individual water molecule? For the known observable systems, this simply is not the case.

Moreover, compared to the degrees of freedom that individual components possess, complex systems are actually limited systems [33, 30]. This might seem counterintuitive, but mutual constraints within a system generate correlations and dependencies that prevent the system from exploring its full degrees of freedom. For example, in a biological organism, individual cells are constrained by the need to function coherently within the larger system of the body. These constraints limit the range of possible behaviors and interactions, leading to a more organized and structured system.

Novelty, in this sense, is not necessarily a gain of function but rather a lack of it (box 2 But surely novelty exists?). The emergent properties arise from the limitations and constraints imposed on the components, which restrict their behavior in specific ways. This restricted behavior results in new patterns and properties that we perceive as emergent. Thus, the novelty seen in complex systems is a consequence of the interplay between parts and the constraints they impose on each other, rather than an outright creation of new functions or capabilities.

Box 2 But surely novelty exists?

A complex system describes the interactions among individual parts, resulting in emergent behaviors. This implies that each part exhibits elementary behaviors that are altered through interaction. These parts can then be organized into complex systems C' , where systems within systems exist. The properties observed at the original level of individual parts can subsequently emerge from the interdependent constraints among subsystems, thereby exerting a causal influence throughout the system *all the way down*.




Figure 4: Novelty can be understood of system C by creating an augmented system C' , effectively creating a nested hierarchy. The properties of each “element” is produced through mutual constraints of the lower levels. Within the simpler system C , however, novelty is best understood as the diminishing degrees of freedom of the parts created through local correlations.

The complex system depicted in fig. 4 consists of interconnected subsystems, where edges represent connections between distinct components. Each subsystem contributes to the emergence of properties through mutual constraints, collectively forming a cohesive whole.

How to Understand Emergence? From Property to Behavior

Complex systems exhibit emergent behavior, but what does that mean? To understand emergent behavior, we must first identify when a complex of elements possesses an emergent property. This requires a fundamental understanding of how to approach complex systems.

There are (at least) three distinct ways to understand complex systems [3, 4]. First, we can view them

as mere collections of individual elements, where the whole is simply the sum of its parts. For example, a complex made up of three poodles is understood as a complex of poodles [11]. Second, we can categorize them based on the characteristics of their constituent elements. For instance, a complex consisting of one poodle, one Dalmatian, and one Alsatian is understood as a complex of dogs because it includes elements from the species “dogs”. However, these approaches neglect the crucial aspect of relationships between elements.

A more comprehensive understanding of complex systems emerges when we consider the relationships between the elements. For example, a complex made up of a palomino stallion, his mare, and their pony is understood as a family of palomino horses. In this case, it is necessary to know the relationships between the stallion, mare, and pony to define the complex as a family of palomino horses. This relational understanding recognizes that a system’s properties arise not just from individual elements but from the dynamic interactions between them. This perspective is essential for analyzing complex systems, as it acknowledges that the system’s behavior and emergent properties emerge from the interactions between its components.

The level of explanation needed to understand complex systems varies significantly based on context and the individual’s expertise [21]. Take, for example, the phenomenon of opinion polarization. At a basic level, we recognize it as the creation of divides. However, deeper analysis prompts us to ask how exactly this polarization occurs. This requires delving into specific mechanisms that drive polarization, such as societal structures or historical contexts.

To truly grasp the behavior and emergent properties of complex systems, a comprehensive explanation is essential—one that considers the dynamic interactions between elements, as discussed earlier. The sufficiency of the explanation regarding these mechanisms depends on the specific questions asked and the goals of understanding. Recognizing the need for different levels of explanation allows us to tailor our responses effectively, providing a more accurate and comprehensive understanding of complex systems.

From this, we can define what an emergent property is and how it relates to behavior in complex systems.

Definition 1: Emergent property

A characteristic of a system that exists by virtue of the interrelation of the parts. Addition or removal of the parts or interrelation will change the property (or make it disappear).

Definition 2: Emergent behavior

Emergent behavior is an emergent property expressed as a function of time. Specifically, emergent behavior is the temporal (and potentially transient) behavior that arises from the interactions of a complex system's components.

Armed with these definitions, we can now turn to the use of complex systems in the field of complexity science.

Emergence in Modern Complexity Science

In complexity science, emergence is intrinsically tied to the interactions produced by a system or a complex of elements. It refers to systemic regularities, such as behavior or structure, that arise from the interactions of individual elements. This modern perspective echoes Aristotle's idea that emergent properties arise from the complex organization and interaction of parts within a whole. We conclude by revisiting the myths discussed at the beginning.

Myth 1: The whole is more than the sum of its parts. The whole is not merely more than the sum of its parts; it is different. The apparent novelty of emergent systems is an illusion; in reality, they exist due to a reduction in degrees of freedom, creating correlations among elements.

Myth 2: Emergent Systems Evade Reductionist Analysis. Furthermore, complex systems demonstrating (weak) emergence do not evade reductionist analysis. Complexity scientists provide explanations by relating system behavior to the interactions of its parts, thus revealing the mechanisms by which the emergent properties arise. This understanding allows for intervention-based approaches to examine how changes in parts affect the whole system.

Myth 3: Emergent Systems Requires Many Entities. Emergent systems can arise in any system with interactions, eliminating the need for a large number of interacting entities often suggested in the literature. Emergent properties and behaviors can exist through non-linear interactions between as few as two entities.

In modern complex systems science, the study of emergent properties has profound implications for various fields, from biology and ecology to sociology and economics. For instance, the emergence of consciousness from neural interactions in the brain, the formation of ecosystems through species interactions, and market dynamics arising from individual economic agents' behaviors all illustrate how complex systems science seeks to understand and predict emergent phenomena. Researchers utilize computational models, network theory, and data analytics to investigate these systems, aiming to uncover the underlying principles that govern emergent behavior.

We have therefore reached a modern understanding of complex systems, where a system is considered complex if it exhibits an emergent property, and its dynamics result in emergent behavior.

In conclusion, I have sought to identify and critique persistent flaws in complexity science. Despite the vastness of the literature and the evolution of perspectives over time, I hope my contributions shed new light on this field. Given the scope of these discussions, it was impossible to cover all the discourse on complex systems that has occurred over the past centuries. Some may notice obvious omissions, such as computational complexity, statistical mechanics, self-organizing criticality, and others. By focusing on certain myths, I aim to advance our understanding of complex systems by examining a common root issue: language may shift the focus away from what is truly important to understanding something separate. While the use of language and semantics is important, it should not obstruct progress. Consensus should only arise out of necessity¹.

Looking ahead, there is much to be done to further refine the borders of complexity science. The sketch provided here implies that a system may exhibit multiple forms of emergence through properties and different behaviors. Furthermore, how the results and parts result in these properties is not explicated other than pointing to the interactions and stating that these interactions should be more than linear mixing.

I owe a great intellectual debt to the pioneers who have shaped the study of complexity. The framework presented here sets the stage for future exploration of how interactions between components affect the behavior and form of complex systems.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express gratitude to W. Rouwhorst and J.D.A de Bouter for providing feedback and comments on the earlier drafts of this work.

References

- [1] P.W. Anderson. "More Is Different". In: *California medicine* 76.1 (1972), pp. 30–33. ISSN: 00081264. JSTOR: 1734697. URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1734697>.
- [2] Mark Bedau and Paul Humphreys, eds. *Emergence: Contemporary Readings in Philosophy and Science*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2008. 464 pp. ISBN: 978-0-262-02621-5 978-0-262-52475-9.

¹A similar discussion can be found in the discourse about defining what Japanese art is in *Killing Commendatore*, chapter 9 by Haruki Murakami (2017), and the definition of a game in *Philosophical Investigations* by Ludwig Wittgenstein (1953).

- [3] Ludwig von Bertalanffy. “An Outline of General System Theory.” In: *Emergence: Complexity and Organization* 10.2 (Apr. 1, 2008), pp. 103–124. ISSN: 15213250. URL: <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&issn=15213250&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA181407900&sid=googleScholar&linkaccess=abs> (visited on 01/23/2024).
- [4] Ludwig von Bertalanffy. *General System Theory : Foundations, Development, Applications*. New York : G. Braziller, 1969. 314 pp. URL: <http://archive.org/details/generalsystemthe0000bert> (visited on 06/14/2024).
- [5] J. Butterfield. “Emergence, Reduction and Supervenience: A Varied Landscape”. In: *Foundations of Physics* 41.6 (June 2011), pp. 920–959. ISSN: 0015-9018, 1572-9516. DOI: 10.1007/s10701-011-9549-0.
- [6] DJ Chalmers. “Facing up to the Problem of Consciousness”. In: *Journal of consciousness studies* 3 (1995), pp. 200–219. URL: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/imp/jcs/1995/00000002/00000003/653> (visited on 01/30/2013).
- [7] S. Marc Cohen and C. D. C. Reeve. “Aristotle’s Metaphysics”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta. Winter 2021. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2021. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/aristotle-metaphysics/> (visited on 06/07/2024).
- [8] J. de Haan. “How Emergence Arises”. In: *Ecological Complexity* 3.4 (Dec. 2006), pp. 293–301. ISSN: 1476945X. DOI: 10.1016/j.ecocom.2007.02.003.
- [9] Ernesto Estrada. “What Is a Complex System, After All?” In: *Foundations of Science* (May 30, 2023). ISSN: 1572-8471. DOI: 10.1007/s10699-023-09917-w.
- [10] Raghu Garud et al. “Introduction : How Does Novelty Emerge?” In: ed. by Raghu Garud et al. Vol. 5. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Mar. 5, 2015, pp. 1–24. ISBN: 978-0-19-872831-3. URL: <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/52401/> (visited on 03/31/2024).
- [11] I Georgiou. “The Idea of Emergent Property”. In: *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 54.3 (Mar. 1, 2003), pp. 239–247. ISSN: 0160-5682. DOI: 10.1057/palgrave.jors.2601520.
- [12] Gertrude Hirsch Hadorn et al. “The Emergence of Transdisciplinarity as a Form of Research”. In: *Handbook of Transdisciplinary Research*. Ed. by Gertrude Hirsch Hadorn et al. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands, 2008, pp. 19–39. ISBN: 978-1-4020-6698-6 978-1-4020-6699-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6699-3_2.
- [13] Gerhard Heinzmann and David Stump. “Henri Poincaré”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman. Summer 2024. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2024. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2024/entries/poincare/> (visited on 06/07/2024).
- [14] *History | Santa Fe Institute*. URL: <https://www.santafe.edu/about/history> (visited on 07/01/2024).
- [15] Menno Hulswit. “How Causal Is Downward Causation?” In: *Journal for General Philosophy of Science* 36.2 (2005), pp. 261–287. ISSN: 09254560. DOI: 10.1007/s10838-006-7153-3.
- [16] Philippe Huneman. “Determinism, Predictability and Open-Ended Evolution: Lessons from Computational Emergence”. In: *Synthese* 185.2 (2012), pp. 195–214. ISSN: 00397857. DOI: 10.1007/s11229-010-9721-7.
- [17] Yeliz Karaca. “Chapter 2 - Theory of Complexity, Origin and Complex Systems”. In: *Multi-Chaos, Fractal and Multi-Fractional Artificial Intelligence of Different Complex Systems*. Ed. by Yeliz Karaca et al. Academic Press, Jan. 1, 2022, pp. 9–20. ISBN: 978-0-323-90032-4. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-323-90032-4.00003-1.
- [18] Jaegwon Kim. “Emergence: Core Ideas and Issues”. In: *Synthese* 151.3 (Aug. 2006), pp. 547–559. ISSN: 0039-7857, 1573-0964. DOI: 10.1007/s11229-006-9025-0.
- [19] James Ladyman, James Lambert, and Karoline Wiesner. “What Is a Complex System?” In: *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* 3.1 (Jan. 19, 2013), pp. 33–67. ISSN: 1879-4912. DOI: 10.1007/s13194-012-0056-8.
- [20] George Henry Lewes. *Problems of Life and Mind : First Series : The Foundation of a Creed*. Boston : Houghton, Mifflin, 1879. 508 pp. URL: <http://archive.org/details/problemsoflifemi1937lewe> (visited on 06/07/2024).
- [21] David John Marr. *Vision*. Cambridge: The MIT press, 1982. ISBN: 978-0-262-51462-0.
- [22] Brian McLaughlin and Karen Bennett. “Supervenience”. In: *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta and Uri Nodelman. Winter 2023. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, 2023. URL: <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2023/entries/supervenience/> (visited on 06/07/2024).

- [23] G. Nicolis and Cathy Nicolis. *Foundations of Complex Systems: Emergence, Information and Prediction*. 2nd ed. Singapore ; Hackensack, N.J. ; London: World Scientific, 2012. 367 pp. ISBN: 978-981-4366-60-1.
- [24] John F. Padgett and Walter W. Powell. “The Problem of Emergence”. In: *The Problem of Emergence*. Princeton University Press, Oct. 14, 2012, pp. 1–30. ISBN: 978-1-4008-4555-2. DOI: 10.1515/9781400845552-005.
- [25] Steven E. Phelan. “What Is Complexity Science, Really?” In: *Emergence* 3.1 (Apr. 2001), pp. 120–136. ISSN: 1521-3250, 1532-7000. DOI: 10.1207/S15327000EM0301_08.
- [26] Henri Poincaré. *Science and Hypothesis*. London W. Scott, 1905. 298 pp. URL: <http://archive.org/details/scienceandhypoth00poinuoft> (visited on 06/07/2024).
- [27] Horst Rittel and Melvin Webber. “Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning”. In: (1973).
- [28] Fernando E. Rosas et al. *Software in the Natural World: A Computational Approach to Hierarchical Emergence*. June 5, 2024. arXiv: 2402.09090 [nlin]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2402.09090> (visited on 06/19/2024). Pre-published.
- [29] Adam T. Rupe and James P. Crutchfield. *On Principles of Emergent Organization*. Nov. 22, 2023. arXiv: 2311.13749 [cond-mat, physics:nlin, physics:physics]. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2311.13749> (visited on 06/19/2024). Pre-published.
- [30] Evan Thompson. “Life and Mind: From Autopoiesis to Neurophenomenology. A Tribute to Francisco Varela 1”. In: *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3.4 (2004), pp. 381–398. ISSN: 15687759. DOI: 10.1023/B:PHEN.0000048936.73339.dd.
- [31] Stefan Thurner. *43 Visions For Complexity*. World Scientific, Nov. 11, 2016. 93 pp. ISBN: 978-981-320-686-1. Google Books: 1cekDQAAQBAJ.
- [32] *Varieties of Emergence*. URL: <https://www.consc.net/papers/granada.html> (visited on 06/07/2024).
- [33] Géza Ódor. “Universality Classes in Nonequilibrium Lattice Systems”. In: *Reviews of Modern Physics* 76.3 (Aug. 17, 2004), pp. 663–724. ISSN: 0034-6861, 1539-0756. DOI: 10.1103/RevModPhys.76.663.