

Toward a Systemic Continuum

Dismantling the "Natural vs. Artificial" Dichotomy via Systemic Balance and a Phenomenological Lens

How a cultural construct, ingrained for millennia in our common sense, operates as an anthropocentric bias that limits our vision—and what its overcoming implies for Systems Theory in the search for a unifying paradigm.

Ignacio Lucas de León Pontet

Preprint / Working Paper — February 15, 2025

Correspondence: nachofacultad@outlook.com

Abstract

Since Ludwig von Bertalanffy's seminal work, *Systems Theory* has aimed to provide a unifying lens for phenomena spanning biology, technology, and society. Yet the field often remains fragmented due to a pervasive assumption that "natural" and "artificial" systems occupy separate ontological realms. Drawing from classical theorists (von Bertalanffy, Wiener, Maturana & Varela), sociotechnical critics (Latour, Haraway), foundational philosophical texts (Aristotle, Descartes), and more recent complexity research (Holland, Batty, Mitchell, Kauffman, Capra, Tegmark), this paper articulates the **Continuum Paradigm**: a perspective that positions all forms of organization—organic or technological—on a single evolutionary spectrum of self-organization and emergence.

This new version strengthens the argument by introducing two conceptual pillars:

1. **Systemic Balance** – A unifying principle that emphasizes the dynamic interplay of all agents (including humans) as ingredients within a global network, rather than managers of "external" systems.
2. **Phenomenological Systems** – A lens for exploring how human consciousness and lived experience themselves manifest within—and contribute to—the very processes of emergence that characterize this continuum.

We discuss concrete empirical indicators (case studies of coral reefs vs. cities, neural nets vs. biological brains), propose a roadmap for experimental validation, and examine ethical/policy implications. Ultimately, we show that the boundary between "natural" and "artificial" is less a fundamental divide than a conceptual bias—one that, once lifted, reveals a more integrated and powerful approach to resilience, cognition, and sustainability.

Table of Contents

1. **Introduction**
 - 1.1. Context and Fragmentation in Systems Theory
 - 1.2. The Core Thesis: Dismantling the “Natural vs. Artificial” Dichotomy
 - 1.3. A Paradigm Shift in the Kuhnian Sense
 - 1.4. Relevance to Contemporary Debates
2. **Theoretical Underpinnings & Position in the Literature**
 - 2.1. Classical Foundations and Early Critiques
 - 2.2. Modern Complex Systems Research
 - 2.3. Why the Continuum Paradigm?
3. **The Continuum Paradigm**
 - 3.1. Fundamental Assertions
 - 3.2. Contrasting Traditional Views
4. **Introducing “Systemic Balance”: The Human as an Ingredient**
 - 4.1. Defining Systemic Balance
 - 4.2. Human Participation vs. External Management
 - 4.3. Beyond Anthropocentrism: Linking Systemic Balance and Continuum Theory
5. **Phenomenological Systems: Toward a Deeper Existential Lens**
 - 5.1. Why a Phenomenological Approach?
 - 5.2. Bridging Subjective Experience and Systemic Dynamics
 - 5.3. DNA as “Natural Technology”: A Parallel to Digital Systems
6. **Empirical Deep Dive: Urban Resilience vs. Coral Reef Self-Organization**
 - 6.1. Rationale
 - 6.2. Proposed Metrics and Methods
7. **Further Example: Computational Neural Nets vs. Biological Brains**
8. **Roadmap for Experimental Validation**
9. **Addressing Potential Objections**
 - 9.1. “Isn’t the Continuum Concept Too Abstract?”
 - 9.2. “Regulatory Frameworks Need Practical Distinctions”
 - 9.3. “Different Time Scales and Energetics”
 - 9.4. “Extended Mind and Posthumanist Arguments Remain Controversial”
10. **Ethical and Policy Implications**
 - 10.1. AI Governance and Socio-Ecological Management
 - 10.2. Sustainability and “Extended Ecosystems”
 - 10.3. Philosophical and Posthuman Perspectives
11. **Grand Conclusion and Future Horizons**
 - 11.1. Synthesis and Vision
 - 11.2. Toward a Revolutionary Shift
 - 11.3. A Call for Interdisciplinary Action

References

1. Introduction

1.1 Context and Fragmentation in Systems Theory

General Systems Theory (GST) envisioned a unified lens capable of bridging biology, technology, and society (von Bertalanffy, 1968). Yet from Aristotle's *physis* vs. *techne* (Aristotle, 1999) to Descartes' mind/body split (1641), Western thought has perpetuated an enduring assumption that "natural" and "artificial" occupy separate ontological domains.

While early critiques (e.g., Wiener's cybernetics, 1948) recognized feedback loops in both animals and machines, the conceptual wedge persisted. Sociotechnical studies (Latour, 1993) advanced the idea that humans and their artifacts form interwoven networks, yet mainstream discourse still labels some systems "natural" and others "manufactured."

1.2 The Core Thesis: Dismantling "Natural vs. Artificial"

Building on Latour (1993), Haraway (1985), Kauffman (1993), and others, this paper argues that the natural/artificial distinction is largely an anthropocentric cultural artifact. We propose the **Continuum Paradigm**, contending that all forms of self-organizing systems (ecosystems, AI networks, human cultures) exist along an evolutionary spectrum where substrate is secondary to emergent dynamics.

1.3 A Paradigm Shift in the Kuhnian Sense

Thomas Kuhn (1962) noted that scientific revolutions often hinge on dismantling "bedrock" assumptions. By renouncing the "natural vs. artificial" binary, we open new paths in resilience theory, AI governance, sustainability, and beyond. Such a shift parallels previous unifications (e.g., Copernican astronomy, Darwinian evolution) by removing an arbitrary boundary that had previously shaped how we investigate reality.

1.4 Relevance to Contemporary Debates

- **AI Governance & Extended Mind:** If intelligence is not strictly biological, AI emerges as a continuation of self-organization (Clark & Chalmers, 1998; Tegmark, 2017).
- **Posthuman & New Materialism:** Aligns with Haraway's (1985) "Cyborg Manifesto," dissolving the categories that once separated biological from technological.
- **Sustainability & Policy:** Viewing cities, infrastructures, and emergent technologies as "ecosystems" helps unify the logic of ecological management and technology governance (Biermann, 2014; Meadows, 2008).

2. Theoretical Underpinnings & Position in the Literature

2.1 Classical Foundations and Early Critiques

1. **von Bertalanffy (1968)**: Provided a holistic framework but retained an emphasis on “living systems.”
2. **Wiener (1948)**: Revealed the universality of feedback, though still recognized “mechanical” vs. “organic.”
3. **Maturana & Varela (1980)**: Introduced *autopoiesis*, emphasizing self-production in living cells—raising questions about synthetic or AI-driven self-maintenance.
4. **Descartes (1641)**: The mind-body split, ironically, underwrites the conceptual gap that lumps technology with “the external world” as separate from “nature.”

2.2 Modern Complex Systems Research

- **Complex Adaptive Systems**: Work at the Santa Fe Institute (Holland, 1998; Mitchell, 2009) shows how multi-agent dynamics apply to domains from ant colonies to stock markets.
- **Resilience Theory**: Holling (1973) and Gunderson & Holling (2002) provide a conceptual bridge between ecological and socio-technical resilience, yet still speak of two domains.
- **Meadows’ Systems Thinking**: Emphasizes broad, practical modeling strategies across social and ecological contexts (Meadows, 2008).

2.3 Why the Continuum Paradigm?

Unlike biomimicry (Benyus, 2002) or sociotechnical transitions, the Continuum Paradigm explicitly dissolves the line between “nature” and “techne.” It posits that emergent complexity follows universal principles of self-organization (Capra, 1996; Kauffman, 1993), making any substrate-level distinctions heuristic at best.

3. The Continuum Paradigm

3.1 Fundamental Assertions

1. **Universal Evolutionary Flow**: Reefs, server farms, human cultures—all exhibit self-organizing behaviors subject to similar dynamical principles (Holland, 1998; Kauffman, 1993).
2. **Substrate-Agnostic Dynamics**: Complexity arises from feedback, synergy, and phase transitions, not from any “intrinsically natural” or “intrinsically artificial” essence (Mitchell, 2009).
3. **Intelligence Aumentada**: Advanced AI constitutes another expression of cognitive self-organization (Clark & Chalmers, 1998; Tegmark, 2017), aligning with neural processes more than the “artificial” label suggests.

3.2 Contrasting Traditional Views

- **Biomimicry**: Tends to see “nature” as a reference, with humans replicating natural designs (Benyus, 2002).
 - **Sociotechnical**: Often frames technology as an extension of humanity, yet tacitly treats the “natural world” as external.
 - **Continuum Lens**: Rejects the conceptual wedge altogether, emphasizing a single continuum of emergent processes—whether carbon-based or silicon-based.
-

4. Introducing “Systemic Balance”: The Human as an Ingredient

4.1 Defining Systemic Balance

Systemic Balance refers to the dynamic interplay of all agents—including humans—within a global network of interactions. Rather than seeking a stable homeostasis, it highlights ongoing adaptive “balancing acts,” where various subsystems co-evolve. Unlike static equilibrium, *balance sistémico* allows for constant flux and partial disequilibrium as engines of innovation and resilience.

4.2 Human Participation vs. External Management

A common bias in systems theory has been the implicit assumption that humans stand *outside* a system, managing or administrating it. By contrast, **Systemic Balance** sees the human as a “catalyst-ingredient.” For example, a city emerges from the interplay of human decisions, cultural trends, resource constraints, and environmental factors—no single ingredient can be labeled *the cause*.

- **Analogy:** In baking, sugar is crucial to the structure and taste of a cake, but sugar alone does not “create” the cake. Likewise, humans (or their technologies) are necessary catalysts in certain emergent processes, but they remain part of the overall recipe rather than external architects.

4.3 Beyond Anthropocentrism: Linking Systemic Balance and Continuum Theory

By embedding humanity within a single continuum of self-organizing dynamics, we move from anthropocentric management to active participation. This reframing:

- Eliminates the notion of “artifacts” as fundamentally “outside nature.”
 - Encourages governance models where human activities, technologies, and ecological processes are seen as co-evolving participants, potentially clarifying controversies in AI or ecological policy.
-

5. Phenomenological Systems: Toward a Deeper Existential Lens

5.1 Why a Phenomenological Approach?

Classical phenomenology (Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Heidegger) explored how reality is constituted in conscious experience. The **phenomenological systems** approach extends this idea, suggesting that *our very sense of ‘self’ or ‘observer’ emerges from—and within—the same systemic continuum*.

- **Human Lived Experience:** Not separate from global processes, but a dynamic node in the matrix of interactions.
- **Mystical Resonance:** While not strictly “mystical,” describing human consciousness as an emergent property of a cosmic web of interactions can evoke a sense of wonder, reminiscent of older spiritual or cosmological intuitions.

5.2 Bridging Subjective Experience and Systemic Dynamics

The recognition that humans are “ingredients” in larger feedback loops means that consciousness itself might be analyzed as a phenomenon of “systemic balance” in neural, cultural, and technological networks. This merges existential reflections with rigorous systems modeling, adding an experiential dimension often absent in conventional system theories.

5.3 DNA as “Natural Technology”: A Parallel to Digital Systems

A further illustration of the Continuum Paradigm is to consider **DNA** as a form of “technology”—albeit one that emerged without human intervention. If we accept that **DNA** functions as a system for storing, transmitting, and executing information (much like a computer’s code), then the notion of a strict natural/artificial boundary becomes increasingly untenable:

- **Information Storage and Processing:** DNA encodes genetic sequences that guide protein synthesis, akin to how digital systems store and process software instructions.
- **Evolution and Adaptation:** Mutations in DNA provide variability that natural selection can act upon, while machine learning systems also “mutate” or optimize model parameters through iterative updates.
- **Self-Organizing Emergence:** DNA arose through billions of years of evolutionary processes without any single designer—similar, at a conceptual level, to how neural networks develop internal representations through algorithmic training.

By framing DNA as “natural technology,” we highlight that labeling something “artificial” or “human-made” is more about perspective than ontological fact. DNA, a molecule central to life, already performs many of the roles we typically associate with engineered technology—underscoring that the principles of complex information processing transcend the labels “natural” vs. “artificial.”

6. Empirical Deep Dive: Urban Resilience vs. Coral Reef Self-Organization

6.1 Rationale

Cities (commonly labeled “artificial”) and coral reefs (commonly labeled “natural”) are typically studied with different vocabularies. Demonstrating that identical resilience metrics apply to both domains underscores the premise that “natural vs. artificial” is a misleading dichotomy.

6.2 Proposed Metrics and Methods

Metric	Urban Context	Coral Reef Context	Why It Matters
Modularity	Neighborhood clustering, transport subnetworks (Batty, 2013)	Community structure among coral species & symbiotic algae patches	High modularity indicates resilient “compartments” after disturbance

Redundancy	Backup pathways for utilities (Meadows, 2008)	Functional redundancy in key fish species grazing on algae (Holling, 1973)	Ensures system can cope with partial node/species loss
Time-to-Recovery	Restoration speed of critical infrastructure post-disaster	Speed of reef cover regrowth post-bleaching event (Hughes et al., 2010)	Core resilience indicator (Gunderson & Holling, 2002)
Network Connectivity	Road, rail, and digital links bridging urban districts	Larval dispersal routes connecting reef patches across a region	Facilitates resource/information flow, shaping adaptation

- **Urban:** Combine multi-layer network data (transport, power, IT) with post-event analyses (flood or hurricane).
- **Reef:** Field surveys (ecological parameters, bleaching recovery rates) + satellite/remote sensing (e.g., *Global Environmental Change* references).
- **Modeling:** Use agent-based simulations or system dynamics (Forrester, 1961) with identical structural logic across both domains.

Additionally, studies on **urban metabolism** (Kennedy, Cuddihy, & Engel-Yan, 2007) or **reef connectivity** (Olds et al., 2012) showcase how mainstream ecological and infrastructural research further supports the idea that diverse systems—traditionally labeled “natural” or “artificial”—can be analyzed using parallel metrics and methodologies. By integrating these approaches, it becomes clearer how both cities and coral reefs exhibit analogous structural and functional features, thus reinforcing the Continuum Paradigm.

7. Further Example: Computational Neural Nets vs. Biological Brains

- **Biological Brains:** Use fMRI or in vivo imaging to study synaptic plasticity under learning tasks (Huang et al., 2013).
- **Deep Neural Networks:** Monitor weight updates and network topology shifts during training (LeCun, Bengio, & Hinton, 2015).
- **Comparative Analysis:** Convergence in learning curves or connectivity adaptations suggests an underlying principle of emergent intelligence that does not depend on a “natural vs. artificial” dichotomy.

8. Roadmap for Experimental Validation

Following Meadows’ (2008) emphasis on **clear, testable steps**, we propose a structured research path:

Hypothesis	Metric / Variable	Method	Domains	Indicator of Confirmation
H1: "Urban & reef resilience metrics correlate if measured consistently."	Time-to-recovery, redundancy, network connectivity	Multi-layer network modeling Agent-based simulation	Cities vs. coral ecosystems	Similar correlations & effect sizes across domains
H2: "Neural net learning curves mirror biological synaptic changes."	Connectivity density, error reduction curve	Compare training logs in AI (LeCun et al., 2015) fMRI data	AI vs. mammalian brains	Overlapping logistic/curve shapes & topological evolutions
H3: "Governance frameworks for advanced AI & ecosystems display parallel complexities."	Stakeholder diversity, feedback loops in policy interventions	Case study analysis (Cowls & Floridi, 2018; Bryson, 2020)	AI policy vs. ecological management	Evidence of emergent patterns in policy adaptation/regulatory loops

9. Addressing Potential Objections

9.1 "Isn't the Continuum Concept Too Abstract?"

Response: Far from merely speculative, the paper offers metrics, comparative studies, and a clear roadmap for empirical tests. As Kuhn (1962) reminds us, new paradigms are often accused of excessive abstraction before their unifying value becomes evident.

9.2 "Regulatory Frameworks Need Practical Distinctions"

Response: Legal and policy distinctions (e.g., "protected natural habitat" vs. "zoned urban land") will persist for pragmatic reasons. The Continuum Paradigm suggests these are **heuristics**, not fundamental separations—potentially making them more adaptable to unexpected cross-domain phenomena (like AI that influences real-world ecosystems).

9.3 "Different Time Scales and Energetics"

Response: Coral reefs evolve over centuries, while server farms might be replaced every five years. These differences are quantitative, not qualitative—both remain feedback-driven adaptive systems subject to resource availability and emergent constraints (Holland, 1998).

9.4 "Extended Mind and Posthumanist Arguments Remain Controversial"

Response: Indeed, the lines between brain, body, and environment (Clark & Chalmers, 1998) continue to spark debate, as do posthuman perspectives (Haraway, 1985; Braidotti, 2013). The Continuum

Paradigm does not “settle” these debates but offers a unifying conceptual field in which they become less about separate categories (natural vs. man-made) and more about degrees of self-organized complexity.

10. Ethical and Policy Implications

10.1 AI Governance and Socio-Ecological Management

Viewing advanced AI as an evolving participant in a broader systemic balance invites policy frameworks that integrate ecological and technological governance (Bryson, 2020; Cows & Floridi, 2018). Regulatory bodies might adopt ecological concepts (like species diversity) to ensure healthy “machine ecosystems,” where no single technology or platform dominates to a detrimental extent.

10.2 Sustainability and “Extended Ecosystems”

Cities, technologies, and ecosystems become parts of a meta-ecosystem requiring integrated management (Biermann, 2014). By **systemic balance**, we recognize that the actions and policies we implement for “nature” must align with actions taken for “infrastructure” and “technological platforms”—all co-evolving nodes in the same dynamic web.

10.3 Philosophical and Posthuman Perspectives

If the mind is not confined to the brain, and “life” extends into synthetic processes, then ethical and existential frameworks must evolve beyond the anthropocentric (Braidotti, 2013). Rather than asking how humans manage the world, we ask how we participate in co-evolving processes ethically, aware that “human vs. environment” or “human vs. machine” boundaries are porous.

11. Grand Conclusion and Future Horizons

11.1 Synthesis and Vision

By showing how coral reefs and cities—brains and neural nets—can be studied with analogous metrics, this revised version of the **Continuum Paradigm** amplifies the argument that the natural/artificial divide is neither empirically nor theoretically necessary. The added lenses of **Systemic Balance** and **Phenomenological Systems** further underscore the active, participatory role of humanity within a vast web of emergence.

11.2 Toward a Revolutionary Shift

- **Empirical Path:** The methodological roadmap (Sections 6, 7, 8) calls on interdisciplinary teams to replicate these comparisons, from environmental scientists to AI engineers.
- **Philosophical & Ethical Depth:** Linking extended mind theories, posthumanism, and advanced AI governance extends the conversation beyond conventional boundaries, echoing Kuhn’s notion of paradigm-defining anomalies.

11.3 A Call for Interdisciplinary Action

In summary, the **Continuum Paradigm**—reinforced by **Systemic Balance** and a phenomenological appreciation of the human ingredient—offers a unifying framework with potential to reshape how we conceive of resilience, cognition, ethics, and governance. We invite scholars, policymakers, technologists, and ecologists to pursue cross-domain collaborations that test, refine, and implement this perspective.

“Humans, corals, code, and neurons do not inhabit separate worlds; they dance in a single evolving tapestry where all are co-ingredients in the cosmic recipe of self-organization.”

References

- Aristotle. (1999). *Metaphysics: Books B and K 1-2*. Oxford University Press.
- Batty, M. (2013). *The New Science of Cities*. MIT Press.
- Bendmann, A. (1970). Review of von Bertalanffy: *General System Theory*. *Systems Research*, 17(3), 210–212.
- Benyus, J. M. (2002). *Biomimicry: Innovation Inspired by Nature*. Perennial.
- Biermann, F. (2014). *Earth System Governance: World Politics in the Anthropocene*. MIT Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2013). *The Posthuman*. Polity Press.
- Bryson, J. J. (2020). The artificial intelligence of the ethics of AI: An introductory overview for law and regulation. In *The Oxford Handbook of Ethics of AI* (pp. 37–54). Oxford University Press.
- Capra, F. (1996). *The Web of Life: A New Synthesis of Mind and Matter*. Anchor Books.
- Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis*, 58(1), 7–19.
- Cows, J., & Floridi, L. (2018). Prolegomena to a white paper on an ethical framework for a good AI society. *ITU Journal: ICT Discoveries*, 1(1), 1–6.
- Descartes, R. (1641). *Meditations on First Philosophy*.
- Forrester, J. W. (1961). *Industrial Dynamics*. MIT Press.
- Gunderson, L. H., & Holling, C. S. (2002). *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems*. Island Press.
- Haraway, D. (1985). *A Cyborg Manifesto*. In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. Routledge.
- Holland, J. (1998). *Emergence: From Chaos to Order*. Oxford University Press.
- Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 4, 1–23.
- Huang, Y., et al. (2013). Neuroplasticity in adult mammalian brain. *Neuroscience Bulletin*, 29(4), 549–557.
- Hughes, T. P., et al. (2010). Rising to the challenge of sustaining coral reef resilience. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 25(11), 633–642.
- Kauffman, S. (1993). *The Origins of Order: Self-Organization and Selection in Evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- Kennedy, C., Cuddihy, J., & Engel-Yan, J. (2007). The changing metabolism of cities. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 11(2), 43–59.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (1993). *We Have Never Been Modern*. Harvard University Press.
- LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521(7553), 436–444.
- Maturana, H., & Varela, F. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. D. Reidel.
- Meadows, D. H. (2008). *Thinking in Systems: A Primer*. Chelsea Green.
- Mitchell, M. (2009). *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. Oxford University Press.
- Olds, A. D., et al. (2012). Habitat connectivity improves reserve performance. *Conservation Letters*, 5(1), 56–63.
- Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. *Science*, 325(5939), 419–422.
- Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being Human in the Age of Artificial Intelligence*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. George Braziller.
- Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. MIT Press.