

DSRP as Universal Ontology

The Structural Foundation of All Systems

Derek Cabrera^{a,b,@}

a: Cabrera Lab

b: Cornell University

@:dac66@cornell.edu

ABSTRACT: Across the sciences, each discipline develops its own domain ontology—its structural assumptions about what exists, from particles and fields to molecules, cells, minds, and social agents. Yet beneath this disciplinary diversity lies a deeper unity. This paper presents an empirically grounded structural ontology showing that the universe organizes itself through four Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs): Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives (DSRP). Using the Unified Calculus of Organization, we show that these operators are not independent categories but projections of one generative polarity expressed through eight elemental roles and three universal dynamics (4–8–3). These structures appear empirically in quantum state boundaries, molecular bonding symmetries, cellular architectures, ecological networks, social systems, and human cognition. They constitute the structural grammar of reality. Two lines of scientific evidence support this claim. First, existence evidence demonstrates that the DSRP invariants—polarity, part–whole recursion, relational interaction, and perspectival orientation—are instantiated in nature independent of human observers. Second, effect evidence shows that human cognition uses the same invariants but with measurable structural bias. When these biases are corrected, individuals exhibit large and replicable gains in systems thinking, metacognition, causal reasoning, and model accuracy. In an age dominated by large language models, this structural ontology becomes more than a philosophical insight—it becomes a practical necessity. Current LLM-based AI systems lack internal ontology: they do not represent boundaries, part–whole structure, causal or conceptual relationships, or perspectives. As a result, they hallucinate, contradict themselves, collapse distinctions, fabricate causal chains, and drift semantically over time. Without structure, there is no coherence. By formalizing the generative grammar of reality and cognition, the ontology advanced here provides the missing structural foundation that both humans and AI systems require to think, model, and understand reliably. It clarifies why humans reason the way they do, why AI systems fail the way they do, and why a shared structural framework—one that makes thinking visible, measurable, and governable—is essential for science, education, and human–AI intelligence. DSRP is not a theory of systems; it is the structural ontology that makes systems possible—and the generative grammar future human and artificial intelligence will require.

KEYWORDS: Structural Ontology | DSRP Theory | Unified Calculus | Simple Interaction Rules | Model–World Alignment | Systems Thinking | Structural Cognition | Artificial Intelligence Alignment

Cite this paper: Cabrera, D. (2025). DSRP as universal ontology: The structural foundation of all systems. *Journal of Systems Thinking*, 25(1), 1–46. <https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6sfas6>

1. Introduction

We’ve been thinking the wrong way about *ontology* and *epistemology*—we think they are different instead of two facets of the same patterns. We make the same mistake often—it comes from our bias toward the bivalent logic—this or that, either/or logic instead of both/and. We made the same mistake with *time* and *space*—treating them as separate until Einstein showed they were one structural field wearing two different masks. We make the same mistake with *theory* and *practice*—Lewin said, “nothing is more practical than a good theory” signaling that the most practical thing in the world is a good theory, or a theory that adequately describes nature’s practice. We bifurcate the same phenomenon seen through different lenses—as if we are looking at one cow from two perspectives, yet we continually see two cows.

Ontology is how nature organizes information in practice — nature’s practice. *Ontology is what* the universe is doing. *Epistemology* is how mind organizes information as it takes a theory-of-mind of nature. *Epistemology* is what the mind *thinks* nature is doing. In the same way that *mind* is part of *nature*, *epistemology* is part of *ontology*. Nature (including mind) ontologically organizes information in a patterned way [1–4]. It is essential to emphasize that the operators used throughout this paper—Distinction, System, Relationship, and Perspective—are *not* defined by their ordinary-language meanings. They are not conceptual categories, metaphors, or intuitive labels. Each operator is defined (Equality dynamic) strictly and formally by its elemental duals (i/o, p/w, a/r, v/p) and the special generative relationship ($r_{\mathbb{P}}$) that co-defines those duals. The operator *is* the polarity; its meaning arises entirely from the coimplication of its two elements. Thus DSRP should not be interpreted through dictionary definitions but through its elemental structure. The terminology is descriptive, but the operators are formal, axiomatic, and structural. Each of the four Patterns ($\mathbb{P}$) is thus defined as follows:

- (1) Things are differentiated through boundary distinctions [5]. *Distinctions* (D) occur because of two related elements: *identity* (i) and *other* (o); the coimplicative, special relationship between them is *existence* and *negation*. In order for any *Distinction* to exist, an *identity* and *other* must mutually *exist* (is) and *negate* (is not) each other.

$$D : \quad i \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{exists}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{negates}} \end{array} o$$

Pattern ($\mathbb{P}$): Distinction (D)

Elements ($e_{\pm}$): identity (i) / other (o)

Special relationship ($r_{\mathbb{D}}$): exists $\rightleftharpoons$ negates

- (2) Things group together into *Systems* (S) which occur because of two related elements: *part* (p) and *whole* (w);[6] the coimplicative, special relationship between them is *belongs* and *contains*. In order for any type of *System* to exist, a *part* must *belong* to a *whole*, and the *whole* must *contain* that *part*.

$$S : \quad p \begin{array}{c} \xleftrightarrow{\text{belongs}} \\ \xleftrightarrow{\text{contains}} \end{array} w$$

Pattern ($\mathbb{P}$): *System (S)*

Elements ($e^\pm$): *part (p) / whole (w)*

Special relationship (r_s): *belongs $\rightleftharpoons$ contains*

- (3) *Relationships (R)* form between things [7]. These relationships are themselves material things. Relationships (R) occur because of two related elements: *action (a)* and *reaction (r)*; the coimplicative, special relationship between them is *effects* and *affects*. In order for any kind of *Relationship* to exist, an *action effects* a *reaction*, and that *reaction affects* that *action*.

$$R : \quad a \begin{array}{c} \xleftrightarrow{\text{effects}} \\ \xleftrightarrow{\text{affects}} \end{array} r$$

Pattern ($\mathbb{P}$): *Relationship (R)*

Elements ($e^\pm$): *action (a) / reaction (r)*

Special relationship (r_R): *affects $\rightleftharpoons$ effects*

- (4) All things have a unique framing of their surroundings. *Perspectives (P)* occur when two related elements interact: *view (v)* and *point ($\dot{p}$)*; the coimplicative, special relationship between them is *observes* and *observed*. In order for any kind of *Perspective* to exist, a *point observes* a *view*, and that *view must be observed* from that *point* [8].

$$P : \quad v \begin{array}{c} \xleftrightarrow{\text{observes}} \\ \xleftrightarrow{\text{observed}} \end{array} \dot{p}$$

Pattern ($\mathbb{P}$): *Perspective (P)*

Elements ($e^\pm$): *view (v) / point ($\dot{p}$)*

Special relationship (r_P): *observes $\rightleftharpoons$ observed*

Mind also organizes information in these same four patterns. But there is a meaningful difference between how *nature* and *mind-ontology* and *epistemology-* organize despite their vast isomorphism. This difference is made clear by the *cognitive Pareto bias*. In short, nature and mind do not differ in *how they organize information*, but in *how biased they are when they organize it*. The cognitive Pareto bias *descends* as follows [9]:

$$D \gg S \gg R \gg P \text{ and } Di \gg Do, Sp \gg Sw, Rgen \gg Ra/Rr, Pv \gg Pp$$

Mind *overweights* some operators, *underweights* others, and *convinces* us that our partial view *is* the reality. In other words, the mind runs on the same DSRP rule-structures nature uses; it just notices them unevenly.

That's why the little symbols aren't abstractions or "just theory" or cognitive metaphors. They're the basic rules nature uses to organize matter, energy, information, and meaning. Lewin was underselling it. DSRP isn't "just a theory" or a "theory of mind"—it is the operational grammar of the universe in action. Nature's practice.

Let me provide just one example: A living cell is one of the clearest windows into that grammar. [10] But to appreciate how deeply structural this example is, we must go beyond metaphor and into the biochemical machinery:

Distinctions (D). A cell exists only because it continuously enforces the *i/o boundary*: the membrane must maintain steep differences in ion concentration, pH, and redox potential. Sodium–potassium antiporters, proton gradients across the inner membrane, and ATP synthase complexes work relentlessly to keep *i* (the cytosolic chemical state) separate from *o* (the external environment). Even a small breach in this distinction—loss of ionic asymmetry, collapse of membrane potential—leads to immediate functional death. This is not symbolic; it is the ontological necessity of $D = i \leftrightarrow o$.

Systems (S). The cell’s viability requires that thousands of molecular parts—ribosomes, polymerases, tRNAs, cytoskeletal elements—*belong to* and be *contained by* the whole in precise ratios. Ribosome biogenesis, for example, follows scaling laws: too few ribosomes and the system cannot grow; too many and they consume all available cytoplasmic volume, stalling metabolism. The whole (*w*) places strict volumetric, kinetic, and thermodynamic limits on each part (*p*). If any subsystem outpaces the whole, the system ceases to be a system. This is pure $S = p \leftrightarrow w$.

Relationships (R). Every catalytic cycle is an $a \leftrightarrow r$ structure: enzyme–substrate binding, allosteric regulation, phosphorylation cascades, electron-transfer chains. These are directional, energetic, and material relationships. Changing one reaction rate necessarily affects its partners; each metabolic edge is simultaneously an action (effect) and a reaction (affect). The cell is not made of “things”—it is made of relationships.

Perspectives (P). Cells sense gradients, respond relative to internal states, and update their behavior based on “how the world appears” from their point. Two cells in the same external environment behave differently when their internal states differ. Chemotaxis pathways, quorum sensing, and gene-regulatory networks are perspectival operators: $v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$ enacted biochemically.

D, S, R, and P aren’t “in” the cell; *they are the cell*. The cell is DSRP made flesh.

The mind is no different. The “self–other” boundary, the internal coherence of beliefs, the relational flows that stabilize identity, the perspectives we adopt—they’re the same operators running in a cognitive substrate. The difference is not the rules; it’s the bias cascade that hides some of them from awareness.

And that is the radical simplicity: the complexity of cells, minds, societies, and AI all grow out of four interaction rules—DSRP-483—organizing information into the most intricate structures in the universe. Nature uses them. Mind uses them. AI will use them. The rules aren’t something we invented; they’re something we finally noticed.

And this is only one example. Across all scales—quantum physics, molecular biology, ecology, psychology, sociology—the same universal structures emerge, expressed in the local dialect of each discipline. DSRP provides not just a theory, but a *universal grammar* for the organization of all systems.

Table 1. DSRP Ontologically Across Scale. Across scales, each field describes the same universal structural operators—only the vocabulary changes.

Scale / Domain	Material Universe	Structural Insight
Quantum Scale	Particles are probabilistic identity clouds (D), entangled in irreducible systems (S), bound through nonlocal relationships (R), and behave differently relative to measurement or environmental context (P). Qubits and atoms exhibit perspectival behavior through decoherence and sensing — Perspective is a physical, structural element of nature, not just a cognitive abstraction.	Identity arises only through relational collapse from a perspective, within an entangled system — the whole is more than the simple sum of its parts and there are many more types of parts (relations, perspectives, identities) than we account for. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Atomic & Molecular Chemistry	Atoms form systems (S) through orbital overlap (R); stable distinctions (D) form molecules; their behavior varies depending on energetic or spatial configuration (P) — perspective determines bonding angle, orbital hybridization, and reactivity.	Systems of distinction form through relational bonding; orbital structure and chemical behavior are influenced by the spatial and energetic perspective of the atoms — perspective determines how atoms "see" and interact with each other. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Biological Systems	Molecules replicate and organize into living systems (S); respond adaptively to energy gradients and environmental pressures (P); molecular structures rely on specific active-site distinctions (D) and binding relationships (R) to function (e.g., enzymes, signaling).	Living systems exhibit distinctions at the molecular and cellular level, form structured wholes, engage in complex internal and external relationships, and adapt based on internal and external perspectives — biological function is perspectival, relational, and structural. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Cognitive / Conceptual Thought	Concepts are probabilistic clouds (D) structured by schemas (S), interact via associative meaning (R), and shaped by context (P)	Thought emerges as a structural system of distinctions organized in mental schemas and restructured by context. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Psychological Identity	Systemic personal identities (S) form from stable concept bags (D); traits are relational (R) and emerge from perspectives (P)	Psychological selfhood is a dynamic, systemic identity composed of conceptual distinctions and relations. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Ecological & Social Systems	Organisms interact in ecosystems (S), forming adaptive relationships (R) and identity niches (D) shaped by resources and interaction (P)	Ecologies are structured systems of relational distinctions; survival and function depend on perspectival fitness. D, S, R, P structure apparent.
Cultural Evolution & Epistemology	Ideas evolve in cultural ecosystems (S), reproduce and adapt via memetic interaction (R), gain distinction (D) in conceptual space, shift based on discourse perspective (P)	Cultural knowledge evolves through structural patterning — DSRP acts as a universal grammar across disciplines. D, S, R, P structure apparent.

1.1 Foundational Support: Formal Calculus And Empirical Base

The structural ontology proposed in this paper rests on two independent pillars:

- (1) a formal generative calculus, and
- (2) a large, multi-decade empirical research program documenting both the existence of DSRP structures in reality and their measurable effects in cognition.

(1) Formal Foundations: The Unified Calculus

The mathematical and structural foundations of this ontology are developed in the *Unified Calculus of Organization, Structure, Emergence, and Meaning* [2]. That work formalizes the four generative structural patterns—Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives—as recursive, co-implicative dualities operating under six universal structural mechanics: *duality, mutual containment, recursive fractality, observer–observed entanglement, relativity, and cognitive structuring*. The calculus defines the minimal structural unit ($\mathbb{U}$), formalizes the collapse of the node–edge dichotomy, and provides the axioms underlying structure formation in both cognition and nature.

This ontology extends that formalism from structural mechanics to the ontological question of *what exists*—arguing that the grammar of structure is itself the substrate of reality.

(2) Empirical Foundations: Existence, Epistemology, Dynamics, Effects, and Measurement

The scientific evidence supporting this structural ontology is summarized in the *Top Research Findings in Systems Thinking* report. Across more than 90 empirical studies spanning physics, biology, cognition, education, organizational behavior, and large-scale cognitive-mapping datasets, the research program establishes the following:

Ontological Evidence: DSRP Structures Exist in Nature

Empirical reviews across >200 studies show that the elemental duals ($i:o, p:w, a:r, \dot{p}:v$) and their pattern-level expressions (D, S, R, P) recur across:

- quantum phenomena (identity collapse, entanglement, measurement perspective),
- molecular and cellular structure (membranes, part–whole organization, metabolic relationships, environmental perspective),
- ecological and social systems (boundaries, roles, interactions, niche perspectives).

These patterns are observed properties of natural systems, not imposed categories.

Epistemological Evidence: The Same Structures Organize Cognition

Dozens of cognitive experiments (Fish Tank studies, DSRP instruction experiments, perspective tasks) show that:

- human mental models are structured by D/S/R/P,
- metacognition increases when people explicitly practice these patterns,
- cognitive skill can be intentionally increased by training these structures,
- DSRP patterns form a single latent general systems-thinking factor.

This establishes that the mind organizes information using the same structures the world exhibits.

Dynamic Evidence: Equality, Coimplication, and Simultaneity

Across 34 experimental studies, D, S, R, and P indicators exhibit extremely high co-occurrence ($r \approx .80-.90$). Activating one pattern *predicts and requires* the activation of the others. Empirically and formally, the patterns operate as a simultaneous structural field, not as discrete steps or categories. This supports the argument that structure emerges through entangled dualities, not sequential operations.

Effect Evidence: Structural Training Produces Large Cognitive Gains

Intervention research shows:

- Significant increases in cognitive complexity (Cohen's $d \approx 1.2-1.6$)
- Up to 550% improvement in problem-solving and systems-thinking performance
- Emergence of *System 3 Thinking*—fast, accurate structural cognition
- Corrective impact on known cognitive biases (identity fixation, part-whole neglect, causal oversimplification, perspective myopia)

These effects demonstrate that structural cognition is trainable, measurable, and transferable.

Measurement Evidence: Thinking Quotient (TQ)

Psychometric research ($N = 1,580$; $\alpha \approx .87$; $\omega \approx .88$) validates TQ as the first reliable measure of systems-thinking skill, with subscales for:

- Distinctions (D)
- Systems (S)
- Relationships (R)
- Perspectives (P)
- Mixing (M)

Factor analysis confirms a dominant general systems-thinking factor, aligning measurement with the structural ontology.

Structural Laws: The Cognitive Law, Pareto Law, and LRL

Three empirically validated laws underpin the theory:

- 1. **Cognitive Law:** $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{I} \cdot \mathbb{O}$ — Understanding depends multiplicatively on information and its organization.
- 2. **Reality Law (reciprocal):** $\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{I} \cdot \mathbb{O}$ — Reality itself exhibits the same organization–information structure.
- 3. **Love–Reality Loop (LRL):** $\mathbb{M}/\mathbb{R} \rightarrow 1$ — Learning is recursive structural alignment between mental models and reality.
- 4. **Cognitive Pareto Law:** Analysis of 1.2 billion cognitive actions shows that ~20% of structural operations account for ~80% of organized understanding. This law identifies the **Six Pareto Moves** as the recurrent structural configurations responsible for most cognitive performance.

These laws supply a *quantitative, predictive foundation* for cognitive alignment with reality.

Comparative Evidence: Empirical Dominance Over Other Frameworks

A systematic review of 400 top-cited systems thinking papers shows:

- Seven of eight major ST frameworks exhibit *very weak* empirical support.
- Citation popularity is negatively correlated with empirical quality ($r \approx -.26$).
- DSRP contributes **52.54% of all empirical evidence in the field** while holding <1% of citations.
- DSRP-483 is the only framework with strong existence, epistemological, and effect validation.

This establishes DSRP as *the only empirically grounded universal structural model* in systems science. Together, the formal calculus and the empirical research program provide a scientifically grounded foundation for the ontology developed in this paper. The structural patterns described here are not theoretical inventions—they are *formally defined, empirically observed, cognitively universal, and measurably effective*. They constitute a testable, reproducible, cross-domain grammar of structure connecting mind and nature.

Table 2. Existence Evidence for DSRP Structures Across Domains. This table summarizes representative empirical and theoretical cases in which natural systems exhibit the four Simple Interaction Rules—Distinctions (D), Systems (S), Relationships (R), and Perspectives (P)—and their shared structural mechanics (duality, mutual containment, recursive fractality, observer–observed entanglement, relativity, and cognitive structuring). The purpose is illustrative rather than exhaustive; detailed discussion appears in Sections 5.1–5.6.

Domain / Scale	Exemplar System or Phenomenon	DSRP Operators Instantiated	Structural Mechanics Highlighted	Representative Sources
Quantum and Relativistic Physics	Quantum state identity and projection operators; entanglement; observer frame	D: state identity vs complement; S: multipartite systems and field excitations; R: entanglement as non-factorizable	Duality of states; mutual containment in basis structure; recursive part–whole in fields; observer–observed	[11–14]

	effects in relativity	correlation; P: measurement bases and inertial frames	entanglement; frame-relative quantities	
Atomic and Molecular Chemistry	Orbital structure; bonding; periodic table; stereochemistry	D: elemental identity via Z and configuration; S: orbitals → electrons → atoms → molecules; R: covalent, ionic, hydrogen, van der Waals interactions; P: spatial orientation, chirality, conformational geometry	Duality of occupied/unoccupied orbitals; mutual containment of atoms within molecules; fractal p/w scaling; perspectival dependence of reactivity on geometry	[15–17]
Cellular and Organismal Biology	Membrane boundaries; gradients; metabolic relationships; signaling networks; chemotaxis	D: inside/outside, self/non-self; S: molecules → organelles → cells → tissues; R: catalytic cycles, signaling cascades, feedback loops; P: receptor-based orientation and gradient sensing	Boundary duality; mutual containment across biological hierarchies; recursive fractal organization; LPFs; contextual relativity	[18–20]
Ecological and Social Systems	Food webs; trophic networks; roles; institutions; group identities	D: species, roles, boundaries; S: populations → communities → ecosystems; individuals → teams → organizations; R: competition, predation, cooperation, trade; P: organismal and institutional viewpoints	Mutual containment of parts/wholes; recursive scaling; LPFs; relativity of behavior to informational environment	[21–23]
Cognitive and Conceptual Systems	Category formation; schemas; causal models; cognitive frames	D: conceptual identity/other; S: schemas as part-whole structures; R: causal/associative/inferential links; P: frames, viewpoints, attentional orientation	Duality of concept vs contrast; mutual containment of concepts within models; recursive conceptual hierarchies; observer-observed entanglement; cognitive structuring as $M = I \cdot O$	[24–27]

Table 3. Effect Evidence for DSRP-Based Structural Cognition. This table summarizes key empirical studies demonstrating that explicitly training DSRP operators and their associated moves produces measurable improvements in systems thinking, metacognition, and model–world alignment. Effect magnitudes correspond to values reported in the cited work and synthesized in Section 6.

Study or Research Program	Sample / Context	Primary DSRP Focus	Main Outcome Measures	Representative Effects	Sources
D, S, R, P Empirical Series	Multiple studies across K–16, higher education, organizational settings	Explicit instruction in Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, Perspectives	Structural indicators in cognitive maps; cognitive complexity; transfer to novel domains	High co-occurrence of D/S/R/P ($r \approx .80-.90$); simultaneity empirically supported	[3,5–8,28–32]
“Fish Tank” studies	University + professional learners	Deliberate metacognitive use of DSRP in modeling systems	Pre–post cognitive complexity; systems-thinking performance; metacognition	Significant improvements in complexity and accuracy vs. controls	[28]
Pareto Structure of Thought & Six Pareto Moves	Large-scale cognitive-action datasets	Structural bias profile and corrective Move design	Distribution of i, o, p, w, a, r, v, p; reasoning error patterns	Discovery of bias cascade ($D \gg S \gg R \gg P$; $Di \gg Do$ etc.); small set of Moves explains majority of performance	[3,9,30]
Thinking Quotient (TQ) Psychometric Program	N = 1,580 across broad populations	Measurement of D/S/R/P/Mixing as latent structural skills	Reliability indices; factor structure; domain reliability	$\alpha \approx .87$, $\omega \approx .88$; strong general systems-thinking factor	[3,33]
Structural Training in Policy & Professional Education	Graduate policy programs and professional cohorts	Application of DSRP + Pareto Moves to complex problem solving	Systems-thinking outputs; complex performance tasks; transfer tests	Gains up to ~550% over content-only controls; broad domain transfer	[9,29]

2. The Need for a Scientific Ontology

Ontology has traditionally been treated as a branch of metaphysics—an arena for conceptual speculation, categorical schemes, and philosophical taxonomies. What has been missing is a *scientific ontology*: a minimal, empirically grounded account of the structural operations by which nature organizes

information. As argued in the introduction, ontology in the scientific sense is not a linguistic exercise or a catalog of entities. Ontology is nature’s practice: the generative rules through which the universe differentiates, combines, interacts, and orients its own structure.

Most historical ontologies—classical, analytic, phenomenological, process, or systems-theoretic—fail to meet the requirements of a scientific ontology. They are rarely axiomatized, almost never empirically validated, and often conflate *content* (what things are) with *structure* (how things come to be). Their explanatory units—categories, substances, essences, levels, modes, holons, forms, actual occasions—are introduced rather than discovered; asserted rather than derived. They depend on human conceptual schemes rather than measurable operators instantiated in matter, energy, information, and cognition.

This produces a fundamental mismatch. A scientific ontology should describe *the structural operations the universe uses*, yet most ontologies describe *the classificatory habits of human minds*. Because they cannot be tested, falsified, quantified, or used to explain cross-scale regularities, they multiply into incompatible metaphysical systems that fail to converge precisely because they lack grounding in nature’s structural mechanics.

If ontology is to be scientific, it must satisfy several requirements:

- *Parsimony*: a minimal set of structural primitives.
- *Universality*: applicability across physical, biological, cognitive, and social scales.
- *Axiomatization*: explicit generative rules and constraints.
- *Empirical existence*: evidence that the operators are instantiated in nature.
- *Empirical effect*: evidence that the same operators govern cognition.
- *Falsifiability*: clear conditions under which the ontology could be shown false.
- *Generativity*: capacity to produce complexity from simple interaction rules.

As the introduction illustrated using the cell as an ontological exhibit, DSRP satisfies these criteria because it is derived from the structural operations nature demonstrably uses: distinctions, systems, relationships, and perspectives—each defined by coimplicative elemental duals and governed by shared universal mechanics. DSRP is not a conceptual vocabulary. It is an empirical description of the organizational field through which natural and cognitive systems arise.

To situate DSRP relative to existing traditions, it is useful to compare leading ontologies—classical, contemporary, and systems-theoretic—against these scientific criteria. The purpose of this comparison is not criticism for its own sake, but to illustrate the difference between *content ontologies*, which enumerate conceptual entities, and a *structural ontology*, which identifies the generative operations shared by mind and nature.

Table 4. Comparison of Major Ontological Traditions Against Scientific Ontology Criteria

Most ontologies propose conceptual or categorical content. Only DSRP provides minimal structural operators, axioms, empirical grounding, universality across scales, falsifiability, and generativity. The table highlights the distinction between descriptive metaphysical models and a scientific ontology derived from nature’s organization.

Ontology	Core Claim	Structural Units	Axioms?	Empirical Evidence?	Falsifiable ?	Applies to Mind + Nature?	Generative ?	Comparison to DSRP
Aristotle's Categories	Being sorted into 10 categories	Categories	✗	✗	✗	✗	✗	Content ontology; no structure; unfalsifiable; pre-scientific
Kant's Categories	Mind imposes 12 categories	Categories of understanding	✗	✗	✗	Mostly mind- only	✗	Epistemic architecture, not ontological structure
Husserl's Phenomenology	Essence-intentionality	Intentional objects	✗	✗	✗	Mind-only	✗	Descriptive, not structural; no operators
Whitehead's Process Ontology	Reality is processual	Actual occasions, prehensions	✗	✗	✗	Mostly nature	✗	Rich metaphor, no primitives, no calculus
Quine's Ontology	"To be is to be the value of a bound variable"	Sets	✗	✗	✓ (in logic)	Nature	✗	Linguistic; ignores perspective, relations, systems
Bunge's Formal Ontology	World composed of systems	Systems, levels, categories	✗	✗	Limited	Mostly nature	✗	Good intuition, but descriptive and non-minimal
Ontic Structural Realism (OSR)	Structure is fundamental	Undefined "structures"	✗	✗	✓ (in principle)	Nature	✗	Almost DSRP, but lacks primitives and calculus
Mereology	Parts and wholes	p/w	Partial	✗	✓	Nature	✗	Captures S only; no D, R, P; incomplete
Process Metaphysics	Becoming over being	Processes	✗	✗	✗	Nature	✗	Ignores D, P, identity collapse, etc.
DSRP Ontology	Nature + mind organize information using 4 operators	i/o, p/w, a/r, v/p	✓ minimal and complete	✓ existence + effect	✓	✓ universal	✓ generative	Only scientific, minimal, axiomatized structural ontology

In the language of complexity science, a scientific ontology must identify the Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs) that govern how informational agents behave in any complex adaptive system (CAS). As shown in Section 3, DSRP provides exactly these SIRs.

2.1 DSRP Compared with Existing Ontological Frameworks

The comparison in Table 4 clarifies that most historical and contemporary ontologies are best understood as content ontologies: they specify what kinds of things there are, typically in the form of categories, substances, levels, or processes. By contrast, the ontology advanced here is a structural ontology: it specifies the minimal operators by which any “things” can come to be organized. This distinction is central. A scientific ontology must identify the Simple Interaction Rules that generate structure, not merely the vocabulary we use to describe its products.

Classical schemes such as Aristotle’s and Kant’s categories are paradigmatic content ontologies. They sort being into conceptual types or conditions of possible experience, but they do not provide generative rules, are not axiomatized, and cannot be tested or falsified in empirical domains. Their units are introduced, not discovered, and they lack any account of how identity, part–whole structure, interaction, or perspective arise as measurable operators.

Phenomenological and process ontologies, including Husserl and Whitehead, move closer to describing dynamical structure, but still do not specify minimal primitives or a calculus. They offer rich descriptive vocabularies—intentional objects, actual occasions, prehensions—without reducing these to a small set of interaction rules that can be precisely defined, recursively applied, and empirically assessed across physics, biology, cognition, and social systems.

Formal and analytic programs such as Quine’s bound-variable criterion, Bunge’s system ontology, and mereology each capture an important fragment of the structural field. Quine’s criterion is explicitly linguistic and set-theoretic; it does not treat relationships or perspectives as ontological operators. Bunge correctly foregrounds “system,” but without decomposing systems into part–whole duals governed by general mechanics, and without integrating Distinction, Relationship, and Perspective. Mereology formalizes parts and wholes but is, by design, blind to identity/other boundaries, interaction structure, and perspectival orientation. These approaches therefore model S in isolation, leaving D, R, and P untheorized.

Ontic Structural Realism (OSR) comes closest in spirit to DSRP by asserting that “structure is fundamental.” Yet OSR typically leaves “structure” undefined or treats it at a high level of abstraction, without identifying a minimal set of generators, elemental duals, or shared mechanics. It lacks an explicit calculus and does not specify how its structures are instantiated in cognition. In practice, OSR functions as a meta-commitment rather than a worked-out set of interaction rules.

DSRP differs from all of these in four ways. First, it is minimal: it posits four operators, each defined by a specific elemental polarity (i/o, p/w, a/r, p/v) and a special relationship, and shows that removing any one makes organized phenomena impossible. Second, it is axiomatized: the operators are governed by explicit structural dynamics (Equality, Coimplication, Simultaneity) and mechanics (duality, mutual containment,

recursive fractality, observer–observed entanglement, relativity, cognitive structuring) formalized in the Unified Calculus. Third, it is empirically grounded: the same operators are instantiated in natural systems (existence evidence) and in cognition (effect evidence), with measurable consequences for understanding, bias, and performance. Fourth, it is falsifiable: if a domain were found in which organized phenomena could be fully described without Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, or Perspectives—and without any isomorphic polarity structure—the ontology would be refuted.

In this sense, DSRP is not a competitor to classical, phenomenological, process, or structural-realist ontologies at the level of content. It is a meta-ontology: the structural grammar that those ontologies unknowingly rely on when they differentiate entities, assemble wholes, describe causal or conceptual linkages, or adopt viewpoints. Where other frameworks specify what exists, DSRP specifies how anything can exist as an organized phenomenon at all.

2.2 Falsifiability Conditions for DSRP

These falsifiability conditions apply to the formal definitions of the four operators—Distinction (i/o), System (p/w), Relationship (a/r), and Perspective (v/p)—as defined by their elemental duals, not to their ordinary-language interpretations. Claims such as “atoms do not take perspectives” (they do, see [34,35]) rest on organismic or psychological meanings of ‘perspective’ and therefore do not apply to the structural operator P as defined in this ontology.

A scientific ontology must be empirically vulnerable: it must specify clear conditions under which its claims could be shown false. Because the ontology advanced here is structural rather than categorical, falsification applies not to the existence of particular entities, but to the presence or absence of the minimal organizational operators and mechanics that make any entities possible. DSRP would be falsified if organized phenomena were discovered that violated the structural invariants defined by the operators or their elemental duals.

Specifically, DSRP would be empirically falsified under any of the following conditions:

1. **A natural system is identified that exhibits coherent, organized behavior without any discernible Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, or Perspectives**, nor any isomorphic polarity structure (i/o, p/w, a/r, p/v). If organization can arise without these operators or any equivalent dualities, the ontology would be proven incomplete or incorrect.
2. **A physical, biological, ecological, or social phenomenon is shown to maintain structure without part–whole recursion, boundary conditions, interaction dynamics, or perspectival orientation**. This would undermine the claim that the four operators are necessary for organization.
3. **Cognitive systems are found that reason, learn, or form mental models without employing any of the four operators, nor any isomorphic polarity-based structure**. This would contradict the empirical evidence that cognition uses the same SIR architecture manifested in natural systems.

4. **Experimental or observational studies demonstrate that improving or degrading explicit use of D, S, R, or P has no measurable effect on cognitive structure, systems thinking, or model–world alignment.** This would contradict effect evidence showing structural learning depends on operator activation.
5. **Empirical measurements reveal that the four operators do not co-occur, do not exhibit structural equality or coimplication, or fail to operate simultaneously across scale.** This would undermine the shared structural mechanics that unify the operators as projections of a single generative polarity.

These conditions make the ontology empirically vulnerable and scientifically testable. While the existing evidence base across physics, chemistry, biology, ecology, cognition, and artificial systems strongly supports the invariance of the four operators and their mechanics, the ontology is falsifiable in principle and thus satisfies a central criterion for scientific ontologies.

3. The Four Ontological Operators of Nature (DSRP)

While the four operators can be described as ontological primitives, they may also be understood in the language of complexity science as Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs). Each D, S, R, and P unit acts as a local informational agent, and the micro-elements (i/o , p/w , a/r , $v/\dot{p}$) specify the SIR governing its behavior. In this view, all higher-order structure emerges from the recursive application of these SIRs across informational agents in a complex adaptive system.

If ontology is nature’s practice of organizing information, then the task of a scientific ontology is to identify the minimal set of operators that nature uses to accomplish this organization. The introduction established that these operators are both ontological (used by nature) and epistemological (used by mind), differing only in their structural bias profile as documented in the *Pareto Structure of Thought* [9]. This section formalizes the four operators and their microstructural elements as ontological primitives—not conceptual categories or abstractions, but empirically verifiable structural necessities.

Across all known physical, biological, ecological, cognitive, and social systems, four operators recur with perfect invariance:

- Distinctions ($D = i \leftrightarrow o$)
- Systems ($S = p \leftrightarrow w$)
- Relationships ($R = a \leftrightarrow r$)
- Perspectives ($P = v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$)

Each operator consists of two coimplicative elements (e) linked by a special relationship (r); neither element can exist as such without the other. These operators are not symbolic conveniences. They are the minimal generative rules by which matter, energy, information, and meaning differentiate, combine, interact, and orient. They are the grammar of structure itself.

3.1 Distinctions (D): Identity and Other

Distinctions are the birthplace of boundary. Every phenomenon that exists does so through the co-definition of an identity (i) in contrast to an other (o). Ontologically, this is the first condition for existence: there is no phenomenon without a separation between what something is and what it is not. Epistemologically, this is the first condition for knowing: to conceive of anything is to differentiate it from everything else.

The two coimplicative elements are identity (i) and other (o), linked by the special relationship of existence/negation (r):

$$D : \quad i \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{exists}} \\ \xleftrightarrow{\phantom{\text{exists}}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{negates}} \end{array} o$$

A Distinction occurs only when identity and other arise together, coimplicatively generating one another through mutual existence and mutual negation. This is not a symbolic convenience; it is the structural operation that brings identity into being.

Ontological distinctions in nature

Distinctions occur in nature long before and far below anything we would call cognition. They are physical operations enacted by informational agents within complex adaptive systems.

- Quantum decoherence: a quantum state becomes a definite identity only relative to an environmental or measurement frame. The transition from a superposition to a specific state is an ontological distinction: the system becomes this rather than that.
- Cell membranes and ionic asymmetry: a cell exists only because it enforces an internal/external boundary. The cytosol (i) is maintained against the external environment (o) by transporters, gradients, and membrane potentials. Collapse of this i/o boundary destroys the identity of the cell.
- Molecular recognition and docking: enzyme–substrate pairing is a distinction rule executed biochemically. A substrate is recognized only because its geometric and electrostatic identity is distinguished from non-substrates.

Distinction is therefore not a metaphor or purely cognitive act. It is a structural operator used by the universe to create entities.

Epistemological distinctions in thought

The mind performs the same structural operation when it organizes information.

- Recognizing a person: “That is my friend” is an identity claim that simultaneously negates everyone who is not that friend.
- Categorizing an object: to think “apple” is to impose an identity boundary around a concept cloud, separating it from “not-apple.”

- Moral and evaluative distinctions: judgments such as “fair/unfair,” “safe/unsafe,” or “true/false” are i/o boundaries drawn in conceptual space.

These are epistemological distinctions—reifications of mental identity/other boundaries used to navigate experience.

Bridging ontology and epistemology

Nature and mind use the same Distinction rule, but with a crucial divergence: nature distinguishes with structural fidelity; mind distinguishes with systematic bias, overweighting some elements and underweighting others [9]. In practice, mind often: sees identity but leaves the other implicit or externalized; creates identities without recognizing others; creates others without recognizing the identity; omits identities or others; conflates identity and other; or ignores the special relationship (exists/negates).

The operator does not change—only its bias profile does. Without $i \leftrightarrow o$, no phenomenon can exist and no concept can be known. Distinction formation is the universal ground of ontology and epistemology alike.

3.2 Systems (S): Part and Whole

If Distinction is the formation of boundary, System is the formation of structure. A system exists when multiple identities (parts) are organized into a coherent whole. Ontologically, this is the operation through which complexity arises; epistemologically, this is the operation through which the mind groups and organizes information into meaningful units.

The two coimplicative elements are part (p) and whole (w), linked by the special relationship of belongs/contains (r):

$$S : \quad p \begin{array}{c} \text{belongs} \\ \leftrightarrow \\ \text{contains} \end{array} w$$

In order for a System to exist, a part must belong to a whole, and the whole must contain that part. A part cannot exist as a part without belonging to a whole, and a whole cannot exist as a whole without containing parts. The two define each other. This mutuality is ontological, not optional.

Ontological systems in nature

Nature does not simply group things; it constrains, organizes, and stabilizes them through part–whole SIRs.

- **Cellular architecture:** a living cell is not a heap of molecules; it is a regulated whole whose volumetric, kinetic, and thermodynamic limits constrain its parts. Ribosomes, polymerases, cytoskeletal components, and metabolic pathways must exist in precise ratios. The whole (w) dictates what the parts (p) can be.

- **Molecular systems:** covalent bonds form not from isolated atoms but from atoms belonging to a larger whole defined by orbital overlap, geometry, and energy minimization. The whole molecule constrains electron distribution, angles, reactivity, and stiffness; the parts inherit these constraints.
- **Ecological assemblages:** an ecosystem is defined by niches, trophic levels, and resource flows. Each organism is a part that belongs to larger wholes which shape its identity, fitness, and survival. Keystone species show how changing one part can reorganize the whole.

These are ontological system operations—a p/w SIR executed by informational agents in a CAS.

Epistemological systems in thought

The mind uses the same p/w SIR to construct structured meaning.

- Topics and subtopics: when thinking about “climate change,” the mind creates a whole composed of parts (greenhouse gases, energy systems, policy, behavior, etc.). Each part is meaningful only relative to the whole.
- Conceptual schemas: a schema such as “democracy” contains conceptual parts like representation, rights, institutions, and norms. These are not isolated concepts; they belong to a systemic whole.
- Personal identity systems: people think of themselves as wholes composed of parts—roles, traits, memories, values. The mind organizes these into a coherent p/w system that underwrites the sense of self.

In all these cases, the same $p \leftrightarrow w$ operator structures cognition.

Bridging ontology and epistemology

Nature and mind use identical System ($p \leftrightarrow w$) operators, but with different bias profiles. Nature applies S with strict structural fidelity—systems self-organize according to physical constraints. Mind applies S with variable fidelity—cognitive systems may oversimplify, fragment, or distort part–whole relations, a component of the Pareto cascading bias [9]. In practice, mind often: confuses parts; creates parts without recognizing wholes; creates wholes without recognizing parts; omits parts; conflates parts and wholes; or ignores the special relationship (belongs/contains).

Without $p \leftrightarrow w$, there is no structure in the universe and no structure in thought. System is the operator through which nature organizes phenomena into wholes and through which the mind organizes information into meaning.

3.3 Relationships (R): Action and Reaction

If Distinction gives rise to boundary and System gives rise to structure, Relationship gives rise to interaction. A relationship exists whenever two identities co-vary: when what one does affects the other, and what the other does affects the first. Ontologically, this is how causation, correlation, signaling, and influence occur. Epistemologically, it is how meaning, association, and inference emerge.

The two coimplicative elements are action (a) and reaction (r), linked by the special relationship of effect/affect (r):

$$R : a \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\text{effects}} \\ \xleftarrow{\text{affects}} \end{array} r$$

In order for a Relationship to exist, an action must effect a reaction, and that reaction must be affected by that action. Each relation is a dynamic exchange: a influences r, and r influences a. The two cannot be separated without dissolving the relationship itself.

Ontological relationships in nature

Interaction is not something layered onto entities; it is what entities are doing at every scale. Relationships are ontological events: informational agents affecting and being affected.

- At the biochemical scale, enzyme catalysis occurs because an active site acts upon a substrate while the substrate simultaneously modifies the enzyme's conformation, energy state, or reaction pathway. The catalytic cycle is an $a \leftrightarrow r$ dynamic.
- In electron-transfer chains, each redox pair is an interaction event. The electron donor acts; the acceptor reacts; and the reaction alters the donor's potential for subsequent interactions.
- In ecosystems, predator-prey dynamics, pollination networks, nutrient flows, and symbiotic exchanges are all action-reaction structures. Organisms are relational nodes whose identities and survival depend on reciprocal patterns of influence.

Relationships are therefore not “between” things; they are the processes that constitute things.

Epistemological relationships in thought

The mind also organizes information relationally; ideas gain meaning only through the ways they influence and modify one another.

- Concepts such as “inflation” become meaningful only through their relations to wages, prices, interest rates, and past experiences.
- In narrative cognition, events are understood through causal linkages: this happened because that happened. The mind constructs arcs of action and reaction, using R to impose coherence on experience.
- Emotional interpretation is relational: a facial expression is understood relative to context, prior cues, and the observer's own affective state.

The same structural mechanic of $a \leftrightarrow r$ organizes cognitive meaning.

Bridging ontology and epistemology

Nature and mind share the same Relationship rule but differ in how reliably they enact it. Nature instantiates relationships through strict physical constraints: biochemical cycles, energy exchanges, and ecological dependencies must obey natural law. The $a \leftrightarrow r$ structure is enforced, not optional.

Mind, however, enacts relationships with bias. Cognitive associations may be illusory, one-directional, or unsupported by evidence. The Pareto Structure of Thought shows that humans systematically misinterpret, overweight, or underweight relational patterns relative to other operators, generating errors in inference and meaning-making [9]. In practice, mind often: omits action and reaction entirely; creates actions without recognizing reactions and vice versa; conflates action and reaction; or ignores the special relationship (effects/affects).

Yet despite these biases, the structural symmetry remains: what something does and what it receives co-define the relationship both in reality and in thought. Without $a \leftrightarrow r$, there is no interaction in the universe and no meaning in the mind. Relationship is the operator that brings dynamics, influence, causation, and sense-making into existence.

3.4 Perspectives (P): Localized Perspective Framing as an Ontological Operator

Perspective is often misinterpreted as a cognitive overlay—a mental stance an observer takes toward a system. That view is epistemic and anthropocentric. Ontologically, Perspective is far deeper: every informational agent enacts a localized orientation toward its environment. This Localized Perspective Framing (LPF) is structurally real and contributes causally to system dynamics.

Formally, Perspective consists of two coimplicative elements: the point ($\dot{p}$), representing the localized agent, and the view (v), representing the informational horizon or context within which that agent acts:

$$P : \quad v \overset{\text{observes}}{\longleftrightarrow} \underset{\text{observed}}{\dot{p}}$$

$\dot{p}$ and v must not be understood narrowly as “a mind observing an object.” They are universal structural operators instantiated by informational agents at every scale:

- Atoms possess perspectival orientation through orbital symmetry, quantum numbers, and available energy states.
- Molecules enact LPFs through spatial conformation, hybridization, and reaction affordances.
- Cells instantiate LPFs through chemotaxis, receptor expression, and intracellular signaling gradients.
- Organisms express behavioral LPFs governing threat detection, foraging, mating strategies, and niche navigation.
- Species enact ecological LPFs through evolved constraints and affordances.

- Groups, cultures, institutions, and nations maintain collective LPFs that shape interpretation of constraints, opportunities, and interactions.

These LPFs are not merely subjective experiences; they are ontological variables. They structure what interactions are possible, what constraints apply, and what systemic patterns can emerge.

LPFs form part of a system's causal grammar. They modulate flows of matter, energy, information, and meaning by altering relational possibilities, systemic constraints, and evolutionary pressures. This applies universally: a carbon atom hydrogen-bonds differently depending on orbital orientation; a T-cell responds differently depending on its LPF toward antigenic context; a company allocates resources differently depending on its LPF toward market signals; a nation behaves differently depending on its LPF toward perceived geopolitical threats. In all cases, the perspectival operator is internal to the system, not external to it.

Thus, Perspective is the ontological operator by which informational agents enact a local framing of their context, generating asymmetries, orientations, and affordances that modify not only agent behavior and decision-making but also the behavior of the system itself. P is not optional. It is not merely anthropocentric or organism-bound, nor is it only epistemic. P is a Simple Interaction Rule: a universal structural operator governing how informational agents orient themselves to their environment and how that orientation recursively shapes systemic structure.

By treating P as LPF, we restore its rightful place as a full, coequal ontological operator—symmetrical with D, S, and R—and indispensable for understanding the generative structure of all complex adaptive systems. Just as Relationships (R) play out across a system with both local and global effects, Perspectives (P) do the same.

Bridging ontology and epistemology

Nature and mind share the same Perspective rule but differ in how reliably they enact it. Nature instantiates perspectival structure through physical orientation, asymmetry, vantage, and information flow; the $v \leftrightarrow p$ structure is enforced, not optional.

Mind, however, enacts perspectives with bias. Cognitive frames may be partial, distorted, or unexamined. The Pareto Structure of Thought [9] shows that humans systematically misinterpret, overweight, or underweight perspective-taking relative to other operators, generating errors in framing, interpretation, and understanding [9]. In practice, mind often: omits points altogether; forms views without grounding them in a point and vice versa; conflates point and view; or ignores the special relationship (observes/observed).

Yet the structural symmetry remains: what something sees and what it sees from co-define the perspective both in reality and in thought. Without $v \leftrightarrow p$, there is no viewpoint in the universe and no interpretation in the mind. Perspective is the operator that brings orientation, meaning, relevance, and understanding into existence.

3.5 Why These Four Operators Are Ontological

The four operators satisfy the standard conditions for treating a structure as ontologically fundamental within scientific and philosophical ontology. They are:

- **Necessary:** no phenomenon—physical, biological, cognitive, or social—can be realized without Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives. Remove any operator and the phenomenon ceases to exist.
- **Sufficient:** recursive application of D, S, R, and P generates the full range of natural and cognitive structures observed across scales.
- **Minimal:** each operator expresses a distinct structural role grounded in its elemental dual; although the operators co-emerge through shared mechanics, removing any one eliminates the universe's ability to generate organized phenomena.
- **Empirical:** all four operators are instantiated across quantum, molecular, cellular, ecological, social, and cognitive systems. They are not abstractions; they are recurrent structural invariants found in the world.
- **Axiomatizable:** each operator follows formal structural rules grounded in its dual elements (i:o, p:w, a:r, p:v) and their corresponding special relationships.
- **Generative:** arbitrary complexity emerges from iterative combinations of these operators, producing the diversity of structures seen in nature and mind.

Taken together, these properties show that D, S, R, and P constitute the ontology of organization—the structural mechanisms by which the universe organizes itself.

Section 3 therefore provides the ontological primitives required for Section 4, where we formalize the shared meta-structure (duality, mutual containment, recursion, etc.) that unifies all four operators into a single generative field.

4. The Structural Mechanics of DSRP as Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs)

The four operators introduced in Section 3 function as the minimal structural primitives of the universe. Through the lens of complexity science, their deeper identity becomes clear: *they are Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs)* that govern how informational agents behave within any Complex Adaptive System (CAS). In this view:

- (1) Information is the agent.
- (2) DSRP are the Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs) information uses to self-organize.
- (3) Everything we observe—atoms, cells, organisms, cultures—is the emergent structure of information self-organizing under these rules.

This does not replace physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, or sociology. Rather, *those fields are the*

empirical study of how information has been, is, and can be organized. DSRP does not supply the *content* of reality; it supplies the *organizational grammar* that makes content possible.

Within this SIR framing:

- **Distinctions** generate boundary-making informational agents.
- **Systems** generate aggregation and constraint agents.
- **Relationships** generate interaction and influence agents.
- **Perspectives** generate orientation and context agents.

Each SIR is a *local update rule*. All higher-order patterns—atomic orbitals, cell membranes, ecological niches, personal identities, institutional strategies—are complex emergent structures generated by simple rules applied recursively across scales.

This framing aligns with O-Theory's claim that mind and nature organize information via the same underlying operations [36], with model–world alignment studies showing shared organizational grammars across cognition and reality [31], and with empirical Pareto findings demonstrating systematic biases in cognitive activation of these same SIRs [9].

The remainder of this section formalizes the *six structural mechanics* shared by all four SIRs. These mechanics define the single generative field from which complexity emerges.

4.1 Duality

Duality is the foundational structural mechanic of all four operators. Every D, S, R, and P is composed of a dual pair—an e^+ and e^- —that arise together and co-define one another. These duals are not opposites in the colloquial sense; they are *coimplicative complements*. Each pole exists only through the presence of its counterpart.

Formally, the dual structure can be represented as:

$$e^{\pm} = (e^+, e^-)$$

In Distinctions, identity exists only against an other.

In Systems, part exists only within a whole.

In Relationships, action exists only through a reaction.

In Perspectives, a point exists only through a view.

In every case, *the poles are ontologically inseparable*: removing either collapses the operator itself. The universe does not present isolated identities, parts, actions, or points; it presents *paired structures* that emerge together and recursively generate one another.

Duality is therefore the minimal unit of organization. It is the structural atom underlying all four operators and the basic generative polarity from which higher-order forms emerge [36]. The dual unit $e^{\pm}$ is not a metaphor but an ontological regularity instantiated across physical, biological, cognitive, and social scales

[31].

Understanding DSRP as dual structures clarifies why organization is inherently relational, recursive, and co-emergent. Every operator begins with a polarity, and every polarity expresses a tension that generates structure.

4.2 Mutual Containment

Mutual Containment describes the way each pole of a dual unit $e^{\{\pm\}}$ is structurally nested within the other. e^+ and e^- do not merely coexist—they co-carry one another. Each pole implicitly contains the other as part of its definition, context, and functional role.

Formally:

$$e^+ \in e^-, \quad e^- \in e^+$$

This mechanic appears in every operator:

- **Distinctions:** identity contains the trace of its other, and the other contains the boundary of the identity.
- **Systems:** parts imply the whole they belong to, and the whole is constituted by the parts it contains.
- **Relationships:** an action presupposes the reaction it brings forth, while the reaction presupposes the action that effects it.
- **Perspectives:** every point implicitly contains the view it orients toward, while every view contains the point from which it is taken.

Mutual Containment is what makes duality recursive rather than binary. The poles are not two isolated units but two complementary interiors. The identity of each pole is shaped by the presence of the other nested within it. This nesting is ontological, not metaphorical: it is observable across atomic, molecular, cellular, organismal, cognitive, and social scales [36].

This mechanic also clarifies why the four operators cannot be cleanly separated in practice. Making a distinction invokes a point of view, which requires a relational orientation and implies a broader system. Each pole contains the others implicitly, and each operator contains their structural traces.

Mutual Containment therefore provides the foundation for the fractal, scale-free nature of organization. Because poles are nested within one another, distinctions contain systems, systems contain relationships, and perspectives contain both. This recursive interiority underlies the generative field formalized in the Unified Calculus [31].

4.3 Recursive Fractality

Recursive Fractality describes how the dual unit $e^{\{\pm\}}$ repeats its structure at every scale. Because each

operator is built from the same elemental polarity, the organization of the universe is fractal: the same structural pattern recurs in atoms, cells, organisms, minds, and societies. The recursion is not visual or aesthetic; it is ontological.

Formally:

$$e^{\pm} \in e^{\pm}$$

This means that every dual structure nests within others, and every operator expresses smaller-scale and larger-scale versions of itself. The universe consists of recursively embedded dualities—patterns within patterns—each generated by the same SIRs.

Recursive fractality is visible across all four operators:

- **Distinctions:** every identity contains sub-identities and belongs to larger identities; boundaries appear inside boundaries.
- **Systems:** every whole is a part of a larger whole, and every part is itself a whole composed of parts.
- **Relationships:** interactions contain sub-interactions and participate in larger relational webs; causal chains nest inside broader causal networks.
- **Perspectives:** every view contains sub-views and is itself nested within broader viewpoints; lenses embed within lenses.

The fractal nature of organization means that local interactions scale up to produce global structure while global constraints scale down to influence local behavior. This dual directionality is the hallmark of all complex adaptive systems [36].

Recursive fractality also explains why D, S, R, and P appear simultaneously rather than sequentially. At any scale, once a dual structure is present, smaller-scale and larger-scale versions of the same structure immediately propagate. A distinction implies sub-distinctions; a relationship implies sub-relations; a perspective implies sub-perspectives. Organization is therefore not layered by domain but by repeated structural motifs.

This recursive property provides the continuity between microstructure and macrostructure. The same generative rules apply whether the informational agent is an electron, a neuron, a cell, a person, or an institution. This cross-scale invariance is central to the Unified Calculus, which formalizes how simple local rules generate the fractal architecture of complexity [31].

4.4 Observer–Observed Entanglement

Observer–Observed Entanglement expresses the fact that the two elements of Perspective— $\dot{p}$ (the point) and v (the view)—arise together, constrain one another, and cannot be disentangled. This mechanic is often misunderstood as implying a human observer or a psychological stance. In reality, $\dot{p}$ and v are ontological operators: they describe how any informational agent, at any scale, is structurally oriented toward its informational context.

Formally:

$$\dot{p} \leftrightarrow v$$

This relation does not require consciousness, biology, or even life. It simply expresses that *every informational agent has a localized position relative to the informational horizon within which it interacts*. An electron's spin state, a molecule's reaction geometry, a cell's receptor layout, and an organism's sensory frame are all instantiations of $v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$. Each one “takes” a structural standpoint—an LPF—not because it “chooses” to, but because *its organization embeds an orientation toward available information*.

This extends beyond physical systems. Conceptual structures also instantiate perspectives. A concept like *risk* has a point (what counts as risk) and a view (the horizon of possible outcomes it frames). So do *justice, market, future, strategy, identity, or threat*. These LPFs are informational orientations: ways that abstract entities frame their relations to context. When a model, a policy, a narrative, or a theory acts as an informational agent, it, too, enacts $v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$.

Thus, Perspective is neither anthropocentric nor organism-centric. It is a structural operator that emerges whenever information organizes. LPFs occur in electrons, molecules, cells, organisms, computational models, social institutions, and abstract constructs. The observer–observed dynamic is universal: *what something is oriented from ($\dot{p}$) and what it is oriented toward (v) co-define each other*.

This entanglement creates directional constraints. The point shapes the view by determining what is accessible, relevant, or meaningful; the view shapes the point by determining what possibilities, affordances, or responses are available. This mutual shaping is seen in physical measurement, molecular recognition, cellular signaling, ecological niche construction, social identity formation, and conceptual framing [36].

Importantly, the entanglement of $\dot{p}$ and v is ontological, not merely cognitive. It is not that minds “impose” a perspective onto the world; rather, *the world itself is perspectivally structured*, and minds inherit this pre-existing organizational rule. Cognitive perspective-taking is simply one special case of a universal LPF mechanic. Perceptual, conceptual, institutional, and physical LPFs all operate according to the same underlying structure.

Observer–Observed Entanglement therefore reveals Perspective as a fundamental ingredient of organization. The world is not view-from-nowhere; it is a network of informational standpoints recursively interacting. The operator P formalizes this structural fact, grounding both natural and cognitive orientation in a single generative rule [31].

4.5 Relativity

Relativity expresses the fact that every informational agent is defined only in relation to a larger set of agents and structures (I and O) that defines “context.” No point, boundary, part, action, or view exists in isolation; each is meaningful only within a relational field. This mechanic ensures that D, S, R, and P are

not standalone operators but context-dependent ones.

Formally, Relativity can be expressed as:

$$\forall e \in E, \quad e \sim E$$

Every element e derives its identity, role, and meaning through its relationship to the encompassing set E . The operator's properties are not fixed; they shift with scale, context, and the surrounding network of informational constraints.

Relativity manifests in all four operators:

- **Distinctions:** what counts as identity or other depends on the frame of reference, the level of analysis, and the informational horizon from which the distinction is drawn.
- **Systems:** part-whole relations vary with scale; what is a whole at one level becomes a part at another, and what is salient in one system may be irrelevant in another.
- **Relationships:** the meaning of an action or reaction depends on the broader relational field, including competing influences, prior states, and downstream consequences.
- **Perspectives:** point-view structures shift depending on context, vantage, accessibility of information, and the surrounding network of LPFs.

Relativity explains why organization cannot be understood from a single vantage point. It is not enough to identify elements or operators; *their significance is always relative to the broader informational environment*. No operator acts absolutely. Distinctions require a context to be meaningful; systems require a boundary that is relative to scale; relationships require a network to define influence; and perspectives require a horizon shaped by context and constraints.

This mechanic also clarifies why complex adaptive systems exhibit emergent behavior. Because every informational agent is defined relative to its environment, local changes propagate upward and downward across scales. A shift in what counts as a relevant distinction, a critical part, a dominant relationship, or a salient perspective alters the behavior of the entire system. This is central to understanding cross-scale dynamics in physics, biology, cognition, and social systems [36].

Relativity therefore shows that organization is inherently contextual. The operators D, S, R, and P do not float independently; they acquire meaning, function, and causal power only in relation to the field in which they operate. The generative capacity of the four operators emerges from this contextual entanglement, which is formalized in the Unified Calculus [31].

4.6 Cognitive Structuring

Cognitive Structuring describes how the mind organizes information using the same SIRs that structure the physical world. The mind does not create a separate kind of organization; it inherits the generative rules already present in nature. Cognition is therefore not an exception to the ontology of organization but a continuation of it. Formally, Cognitive Structuring can be expressed through the Cognitive Law:

$$M = I \cdot O$$

A mental model M is the product of informational content I and its organization O . Because O is instantiated by D, S, R, and P, cognition is fundamentally a structural process. The mind's ability to understand, predict, remember, reason, or decide emerges from how effectively it applies these operators to incoming information.

This structural parallel underlies model–world alignment: the degree to which the organization applied in the mind resembles the organization inherent in the world. When the cognitive application of D, S, R, and P aligns with natural structure, mental models are accurate, coherent, and adaptive. When misaligned, errors arise.

Cognitive Structuring is therefore both powerful and fallible. Humans do not enact D, S, R, and P with the same reliability as natural systems. *The Pareto Structure of Thought* demonstrates that people systematically underuse, misapply, or overapply certain operators relative to others. Common patterns include:

- omitting distinctions or imposing false ones,
- failing to recognize part–whole structure,
- reducing relationships to linear or directional chains,
- taking perspectives narrowly, rigidly, or unconsciously.

These biases are not cognitive failures in the abstract; they are structural mismatches between the organization of mind and the organization of reality. Because cognition uses the same operators as nature, misusing them distorts understanding, prediction, meaning, and decision-making.

Cognitive Structuring thus reveals the continuity between ontology and epistemology. The same SIRs that organize electrons, molecules, cells, organisms, and institutions also organize perception, memory, attention, reasoning, and narrative. The generative grammar of reality becomes the generative grammar of thought [36]. The task of cognition is to align these structures as closely as possible [31].

In this sense, Cognitive Structuring is not merely a description of how the mind works. It is the bridge between the world's organization and human understanding. Cognition is one mode of the universe organizing itself.

4.7 Why These Mechanics Matter

These six mechanics reveal that D, S, R, and P are not four independent rules but four projections of a single generative field. This unified field governs how informational agents produce:

- emergence
- complexity
- identity
- interaction
- adaptation

- cognition
- meaning
- information organization

Taken together, the mechanics show that organization is not a patchwork of domain-specific processes—physical, chemical, biological, psychological, or social. It is one structural process instantiated differently at different scales.

In other words, all of reality consists of information organized by four Simple Interaction Rules acting through six universal structural mechanics. What we call *quantum physics*, *classical physics*, *chemistry*, *biology*, *psychology*, *cognition*, *society*, or any other ontological domain reflects the emergent results of these SIRs applied recursively across scale.

The diversity of phenomena does not arise from different kinds of structure but from different contents organized by the same structural grammar. DSRP does not describe what the universe is made of; it describes how the universe organizes whatever it is made of. The mechanics in this section formalize the generative substrate that enables the operators to produce the full range of complexity observed across nature and mind [36], and to align cognitive organization with the organizational structure of reality [31].

4.8 Emergence: Why All Observed Phenomena Are Expressions of SIRs

The structural mechanics above converge on a single ontological insight: *everything we observe across the sciences is the emergent result of simple interaction rules acting on informational agents*. This is not a philosophical assertion; it is a scientific one. Across physics, biology, computation, and the social sciences, complexity consistently arises from simple local rules iterated recursively across scale.

In physics, statistical mechanics explains thermodynamic behavior through aggregated micro-interactions; quantum information theory treats quantum states as informational objects whose dynamics depend on informational relations; and quantum field theories model fields as carriers of information. In computation and complexity research, cellular automata reveal how arbitrarily rich complexity emerges from extremely simple local update rules, while agent-based models show that social and ecological systems arise from rule-based interactions among individual agents. Evolutionary biology demonstrates how phenotypes and ecological strategies emerge from the simple variation–selection–retention process. Deep learning systems exhibit generalization and world-modelling through recursive updates across simple computational units. Fractal systems physics explains cross-scale structure through recursive rules that repeat at multiple magnitudes.

This view is reinforced by major theoretical programs: Gell-Mann and Lloyd’s work on complexity from simple rules [37]; Wolfram’s computational universe [38]; Friston’s free energy principle identifying information self-organization as the root of adaptive behavior [39]; Landauer’s demonstration that information is physical [40]; Shannon and Kolmogorov’s formalization of structure as compression [41,42]; Holland, Kauffman, and Mitchell’s foundational CAS theory [43–45]; Tononi’s integrated information theory [46]; and ontic structural realism’s claim that structure—not substance—is fundamental [47]. Across these domains, a shared insight emerges: complexity = simple rules + recursion

+ local update.

DSRP fits directly within this consensus. The informational agents governed by its SIRs are the same kinds of agents treated as fundamental across physics, biology, neuroscience, ecology, sociology, and AI. Quantum states encode information; gene networks transact information; neural circuits process information; ecological interactions embed informational constraints; social identities and institutions organize information; and artificial neural networks are explicitly engineered information processors. Contemporary science increasingly adopts the view that information is the fundamental ontology—that matter, energy, and dynamics are expressions of informational organization. This echoes Wheeler’s *It from Bit* [48], Rovelli’s relational quantum mechanics [13], Baez’s information physics [49], Fields and Glazebrook’s quantum information realism [50], Friston’s free energy principle [39], and enactive information-processing models by Barandiaran and Di Paolo [51].

Within this landscape, DSRP contributes what these programs lack: a minimal, axiomatized set of Simple Interaction Rules specifying *how* informational agents organize into the patterns studied across the sciences. Physics, chemistry, biology, psychology, and sociology remain indispensable because they investigate the content and constraints of informational organization. DSRP does not replace them; it explains them. It specifies the generative grammar by which information organizes, without making any claims about the particular information in question. It is content-agnostic and universally structural.

Beyond conceptual framing, this SIR-based account of emergence is fully formalizable. Prior work provides explicit operators for structural and behavioral emergence—most concisely expressed as $E = \Delta O$, the change in system behavior resulting from changes in system organization. The Unified Calculus specifies the general emergence functional, the normalized behavioral index, and the structural emergence index, showing mathematically how simple interaction rules scale into complex patterns. These equations give the SIR framework a mechanistic footing absent in traditional emergence theories, linking local SIR updates to measurable shifts in organizational structure and system behavior.

Thus, the familiar structures of nature—atomic orbitals, cell membranes, neural circuits, ecological networks, individual identities, cultural norms, institutional hierarchies—are not primitive ontological forms. They are emergent expressions of simple rules applied recursively across informational agents. DSRP provides the universal grammar underlying that emergence.

Table 5. Structural Mechanics (Ontological Invariants) and Their Dependence on the Structural Dynamics (Operational Invariants) The six Structural Mechanics describe the ontological invariants of organization—the universal structural patterns by which information organizes itself. The three Structural Dynamics describe the operational invariants—the modes by which all structural forms function. Each mechanic depends on all three dynamics: *Equality* (the symmetric co-presence of dual elements or $\mathbb{P} := \langle e^+ \leftrightarrow e^- \rangle$), *Coimplication* (the mutual generation and internal nesting among elements or $e^+ \leftrightarrow e^-$), and *Simultaneity* (the concurrent activation of all operators at every scale or $\forall I_x, I_x \rightarrow e$). Together, these invariants constitute the complete structural–operational ontology underlying the DSRP SIR framework.

Structural Mechanic (Ontological Invariant)	English Definition	Symbolic Notation	Equality Dynamic	Coimplication Dynamic	Simultaneity Dynamic
1. Duality	Every structural element contains a positive and negative pole that define a structural polarity.	$e^{\pm}$	Required – pattern exists only as polarity.	Required – poles generate each other.	Required – any agent can instantiate either pole.
2. Mutual Containment	Each pole contains aspects of the other; the structure is co-emergent.	$e^{+} \in e^{-}, \quad e^{-}$	Required – containment is part of the polarity structure.	Required – containment is reciprocal.	Required – any agent can take either containment role.
3. Recursive Fractality	Structural polarity self-replicates across scales; patterns contain sub-patterns.	$e^{\pm} \in e^{\pm}$	Required – same polarity at all scales.	Required – scale levels imply each other.	Required – agents can embody elements at any scale.
4. Observer–Observed Entanglement	Every structural act is relative to a localized orientation (LPF); point and view are poles of perspectival polarity.	$\dot{p} \leftrightarrow v$	Required – point/view polarity defines P.	Required – each generates the other's frame.	Required – any agent can be point or view.
5. Relativity	All structure exists only within an informational field or context; no element is absolute.	$e \sim E$	Required – element/context polarity is structural.	Required – context and element imply each other.	Required – agents can serve as element or context.
6. Cognitive Structuring	Mind organizes information using the same polarity structures as nature; biases arise from uneven activation.	$\mathbb{M} = I \cdot O$	Required – mental/real polarity shares same structure.	Required – cognition and reality coimply each other.	Required – agents can instantiate cognitive or world roles.

4.9 The Unified Calculus

The Unified Calculus synthesizes the ontology into a single generative picture. Informational agents exist as the basic entities of structure, and these agents operate through Simple Interaction Rules (DSRP). Each SIR is governed by the three Structural Dynamics—*Equality*, *Coimplication*, and *Simultaneity*. Under these dynamics, SIRs always instantiate the six Structural Mechanics (duality, containment, fractality, entanglement, relativity, and cognitive structuring). Together, these invariants specify how information organizes at every scale.

In the full calculus, these mechanics are expressed through a formal polarity operator that defines $\mathbb{U}$, the minimal structural unit of organization. $\mathbb{U}$ -units concatenate into recursive, multi-scale informational networks, and the familiar structures of the physical, biological, cognitive, and social worlds emerge from these networks. Cognition uses the same polarity-based structure but exhibits measurable structural biases [9]. Model–world alignment follows naturally: alignment depends on structural equivalence between the organization of mind and the organization of reality, not on semantic similarity.

The purpose of this section is conceptual. The complete mathematical formalization—including the polarity operator, the $\mathbb{U}$ -unit, recursive graph rules, emergence operators, and alignment equations—appears in the companion paper *The Unified Calculus of Organization, Structure, Emergence, and Meaning* [2]. DSRP, when formalized through that calculus, provides a unified ontological grammar for both mind and nature. This is the ontological thesis.

4.9.1 Worked Example: How a $\mathbb{U}$ -Unit Generates D, S, R, and P Structure

To illustrate how the Unified Calculus operates, consider a minimal informational agent $\mathbb{U}$ interacting with another agent in a simple physical–biological system: the formation of a hydrogen molecule (H_2). This example is intentionally basic; its purpose is to show how the polarity structure and the coimplicative dualities generate Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives in a single, unified process.

Step 1: Start with a $\mathbb{U}$ -unit A $\mathbb{U}$ -unit is the minimal structural unit in the calculus. It encodes a generative polarity $e^{\{\pm\}}$ and carries the three structural dynamics (Equality, Coimplication, Simultaneity). Two hydrogen atoms are represented as two $\mathbb{U}$ -units, $\mathbb{U}_1$ and $\mathbb{U}_2$.

Step 2: Distinction ($\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{i} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{o}$) Each $\mathbb{U}$ -unit generates a Distinction by producing an identity ($\mathbf{i}$) relative to its other ($\mathbf{o}$).

For hydrogen: $\mathbf{i}$ = “this hydrogen atom,” $\mathbf{o}$ = “not-this hydrogen atom.” The polarity is mutual: each atom is both $\mathbf{i}$ to itself and $\mathbf{o}$ to the other. This creates the $\mathbf{i} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{o}$ structure necessary for the atoms to exist as differentiated entities.

Step 3: System ($\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{p} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{w}$) Through the coimplicative polarity of part and whole, the two $\mathbb{U}$ -units recursively generate a System. Each hydrogen atom becomes a part ($\mathbf{p}$), and together they form a whole ($\mathbf{w}$) that did not previously exist: the H_2 molecule. The relations $\mathbf{p} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{w}$ hold simultaneously: the molecule exists only because the parts belong to it, and each part is meaningful only within the whole.

Step 4: Relationship ($R = a \leftrightarrow r$) Bond formation emerges from the action–reaction polarity ($a \leftrightarrow r$). Each atom’s electron exerts an action on the other’s electron cloud, and each atom reacts by redistributing electron density, lowering system energy. This coimplicative $a \leftrightarrow r$ cycle is the structural basis of the covalent bond. The calculus treats this not as a separate phenomenon but as the relational expression of the same generative polarity.

Step 5: Perspective ($P = v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$) Finally, each U-unit enacts a localized perspective framing (LPF). Each atom has a point ($\dot{p}$)—its spatial position and electron configuration—and a view (v)—the orbital geometry it “sees” relative to the other atom. Bond angle, symmetry, and orbital overlap are perspectival structures: $v \leftrightarrow \dot{p}$ expresses how each atom’s orientation constrains and is constrained by the other’s.

Step 6: Simultaneity of Operators All four operators emerge together because they are projections of the same polarity structure. Distinction (D) enables System (S) by generating parts; System structures constrain Relationship (R) by determining interaction symmetries; and Perspective (P) orients the entire interaction. The calculus expresses these not as separate layers but as a single, simultaneous structural field.

Outcome: A generative, unified model From a single generative polarity in each U-unit, the calculus produces the full D/S/R/P organization of the physical phenomenon: a differentiated identity, a part–whole structure, an interaction dynamic, and a perspectival orientation. The same procedure applies to cells, concepts, ecosystems, institutions, and cognitive models; only the informational content changes.

5. Empirical Existence Evidence

DSRP’s organizational invariants are instantiated in reality independent of human thought. For DSRP, this means the four Simple Interaction Rules (SIRs)—and the deeper polarity structure that generates them—must be empirically instantiated in the natural world, not merely described by cognition. The question is not whether humans can *interpret* the world using DSRP, but whether the world itself already exhibits these structural invariants prior to any act of interpretation.

This section presents *existence evidence*: empirical demonstrations that natural systems instantiate the four SIRs (D, S, R, P) and their six structural mechanics independent of cognition. The cases are drawn from physics, chemistry, biology, ecology, social systems, and cognitive systems. They are not metaphors, analogies, or reinterpretations. They are examples of how the natural sciences already measure, model, and formalize the world using structures that are isomorphic to the SIR architecture.

These examples proceed from microphysical to cognitive scales, illustrating that the structural invariants of DSRP are embedded in nature long before any mind conceptualizes them. They are selective and illustrative, not exhaustive, but they demonstrate a consistent pattern: the ontology proposed here reflects the structural grammar the universe already uses [4].

5.1 Physical Systems: Quantum and Relativistic Invariants

Modern physics provides some of the clearest empirical instantiations of the DSRP structural invariants at the most fundamental levels of nature. Rather than suggesting conceptual analogies, the structures below are objectively measured, mathematically formalized, and experimentally validated properties of the physical world.

Distinction (i/o): State Definition and Boundary Conditions Quantum states are defined through boundary-making operations in Hilbert space. A state ($|\psi\rangle$) is an identity only relative to the projection operators that distinguish it from its complement within a basis. This is not a cognitive distinction but a physical one: the identity/other structure is required for state preparation, evolution, and measurement. Distinction is literally built into the formalism of quantum mechanics.

System (p/w): Recursive Part–Whole Composition Quantum field theory treats elementary particles as excitations of underlying fields. These fields themselves belong to larger gauge structures within the Standard Model. Renormalization procedures and effective field theories make this part–whole recursion explicit: entities are wholes at one scale and parts at another. The S-operator is therefore empirically instantiated in the ontology of modern physics.

Relationship (a/r): Entanglement and Nonlocal Correlation Entanglement is a purely relational structure $|\Psi\rangle \neq |\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle$: the joint state cannot be decomposed into independent parts. The behavior of each subsystem is conditioned by the other through non-factorizable correlation. This is not mediated by forces but reflects an irreducible action–reaction pattern encoded in the system’s joint state. Relationship is therefore a structural, not dynamical, feature of quantum systems.

Perspective (v/p): Measurement Frames and Observational Orientation

Quantum measurement requires a choice of basis; every measurement is made from a specific point–view orientation. In relativistic physics, simultaneity, length, and time depend on the observer’s inertial frame. These are not psychological perspectives but structural properties of spacetime and quantum interaction. The P-operator is therefore instantiated as frame-dependent orientation embedded in physical law.

Physics demonstrates that all four SIRs—and their deeper mechanics of polarity, entanglement, fractality, and perspectival relativity—are fundamental features of the natural world. These structures are not imposed by cognition; they are measured, modeled, and mathematically required by the physical theories that describe reality.

5.2 Chemical Systems: Orbital Structure, Bonding, and Emergence

Chemistry makes DSRP structure visible at the scale where quantum rules generate emergent matter. The organizational invariants that appear in physics reexpress themselves in orbital geometry, bonding behavior, and molecular interaction.

Distinction (i/o): Atomic Identity and Electronic Configuration Chemical identity is defined by proton number Z , which creates a hard distinction among elements. Electron configuration further sharpens

identity/other boundaries by determining valence, reactivity, and orbital occupancy. These distinctions are not conceptual categories but physically measurable boundary conditions produced by quantum constraints. The periodic table itself is an empirical map of distinction structures.

System (p/w): Orbitals → Electrons → Atoms → Molecules Chemical organization is explicitly part–whole recursive. Orbitals compose electron shells; electrons compose atomic structure; atoms compose molecules; molecules compose macromolecular assemblies. Molecular orbital theory formalizes bonding as the formation of wholes out of parts through mathematically precise linear combinations of atomic orbitals. System structure is inherent in how chemistry explains matter.

Relationship (a/r): Energetic Interaction and Bond Formation Chemical bonds are interaction structures—not substances that exist independently of relational dynamics. Covalent, ionic, hydrogen bonding, and van der Waals interactions all instantiate action–reaction patterns governed by energy exchange, electron density redistribution, and potential surfaces. Bonding behavior is defined relationally: how one entity’s action (electron sharing, charge attraction) affects and is affected by another. R-structures are literal, not metaphorical, in chemical theory.

Perspective (v/p): Orbital Symmetry, Spatial Orientation, and Stereochemistry Chemical behavior depends critically on spatial orientation. Hybridization, chirality, conformation, and orbital symmetry create distinct perspectival orientations relative to reaction partners and energetic environments. A molecule “views” its environment differently depending on its orientation, dihedral angle, or stereochemical configuration. These LPFs are objective constraints—orientation changes reactivity, catalysis, and interaction likelihood. Perspective is therefore structurally embedded in molecular behavior.

Chemistry thus empirically instantiates all four SIRs and their deeper mechanics. Atomic identity arises through distinction; molecular composition arises through part–whole structure; bonding arises through relational interaction; and reactivity arises through perspectival orientation. Chemical phenomena are emergent expressions of recursive SIR application under quantum constraints.

5.3 Biological Systems: Cells as SIR-Engines

Biology operationalizes DSRP structure at every level. Living systems are not merely metaphorically organized; they are literal SIR-engines in which boundary formation, hierarchical structure, interaction networks, and perspectival orientation co-occur continuously and recursively.

Distinction (i/o): Membrane Segregation and Self–Non-Self Boundaries Cell membranes enforce explicit physical distinctions: inside/outside, self/non-self, permissible/impermissible transport. These boundaries are measurable through electrochemical gradients, lipid bilayer permeability, receptor specificity, and immune signaling. Distinction is a fundamental organizer of biological function, not an interpretive layer.

System (p/w): Multilevel Biological Hierarchy Biological organization is recursively part–whole: molecules → organelles → cells → tissues → organs → organisms → ecosystems. At each level, wholes are composed of interacting parts, and each whole becomes a part of a larger system. The part–whole

logic of developmental biology, physiology, and ecosystem structure is a direct empirical instantiation of the S-operator.

Relationship (a/r): Metabolic, Regulatory, and Signaling Networks Metabolic pathways, gene regulatory networks, neural circuits, and cell–cell signaling are defined by directional interaction. Enzymes act on substrates; transcription factors regulate genes; neurons fire in response to inputs; cells release and receive signaling molecules. These are formal action–reaction sequences measurable through flux analysis, electrophysiology, and network reconstruction. Biology is built on relational operators.

Perspective (v/p): Gradient Sensing, Receptor Fields, and Positional Information Cells possess localized perspective framing through receptors, morphogen gradients, and chemotactic pathways. A cell’s LPF is defined by what it “sees” from its location—ligand concentrations, directional cues, and local microenvironment structure. Organisms extend this LPF through sensory systems, attention, and behavioral orientation. These perspectival structures are not cognitive abstractions; they are quantifiable informational orientations embedded in biological organization.

Biology therefore instantiates all four SIRs and all six structural mechanics. Recursive fractality is expressed through hierarchical organization; mutual containment through nested regulatory loops; observer–observed entanglement through LPFs; and relational dependence through metabolic and signaling networks. Biological systems are empirical demonstrations of SIR-based organization operating in real time.

5.4 Ecological and Social Systems: Multi-Agent Networks Across Scales

Ecological and social systems reveal the same organizational invariants seen in physics, chemistry, and biology, but expressed through interacting informational agents at larger scales. These systems are not conceptual overlays—they are empirically measurable networks of distinctions, part–whole organization, interactions, and perspectival orientations that govern real behavior and dynamics.

Distinction (i/o): Role, Category, Boundary, and Niche Structure Species boundaries, population identity, territorial limits, social roles, and institutional categories are enforced by physical, energetic, or informational constraints. Predator–prey classifications, foraging guilds, trophic levels, organizational divisions, and cultural identities are all real distinctions that affect outcomes. These boundaries are not interpretive—they are measurable differences in interaction potential, access to resources, and ecological or social affordances.

System (p/w): Nested Ecological and Institutional Organization Food webs, nutrient cycles, social groups, governments, and economies are recursively nested wholes composed of interacting parts. Organisms form populations; populations form communities; communities form ecosystems. Individuals form teams; teams form organizations; organizations form societies. These systems exhibit explicit part–whole dependencies: remove or alter a part, and the whole changes; alter the whole, and the roles of the parts shift. This is a direct instantiation of the S-operator at macro scales.

Relationship (a/r): Energy Flow, Exchange, Competition, Cooperation, and Interdependence

Ecological interactions—competition, predation, symbiosis, parasitism—are defined by directional influence among agents. Social interactions—communication, trade, conflict, coordination, incentive structures—are likewise action–reaction networks. These relationships are empirically reconstructed using flow models, interaction matrices, network analysis, and game-theoretic dynamics. They are literal R-structures: influence systems, not metaphors.

Perspective (v/p): Distributed Knowledge, Local Orientation, and Viewpoint Structure Ecological actors possess different informational vantage points depending on their location, sensory capacities, and environmental histories. A honey badger’s LPF toward a lion is structurally different from the lion’s LPF toward the honey badger. Migratory animals experience habitat structure from unique spatial and temporal orientations. Social actors likewise operate from distinctive viewpoints shaped by access to information, institutional position, culture, and norms. These LPFs are objective informational orientations that determine behavior, niche selection, conflict patterns, and coordination strategies.

Ecology and sociology therefore instantiate all four SIRs and all six structural mechanics at macro scales. Distinctions define niches and identities; systems define nested organizational layers; relationships define flows and interdependencies; perspectives define situated informational orientation. These structures arise naturally from multi-agent interaction and are not imposed by human interpretation [4].

5.5 Cognitive and Conceptual Systems: Mental Structure Mirrors Natural Structure

Cognitive and conceptual systems demonstrate that the mind organizes information using the same structural invariants instantiated throughout nature. These are not metaphors or reinterpretations of mental life; they are measurable regularities in perception, memory, reasoning, language, and concept formation. Cognition is an informational system, and it therefore expresses the same SIR architecture—Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives—as physical, chemical, biological, and ecological systems.

Distinction (i/o): Category Formation and Boundary-Making Human cognition creates distinctions automatically. Infants discriminate phonemes, shapes, and object boundaries; adults categorize continuously, segmenting experience into identities and contrasts. These operations are robust across cultures and developmental stages and supported by extensive empirical research in categorization, prototype theory, and concept acquisition [5]. Distinction is the default organizing strategy of the brain.

System (p/w): Mental Models and Recursive Concept Structure Concepts do not exist in isolation; they embed recursively within larger conceptual wholes. Words form part of semantic fields, propositions belong to theories, and schemas belong to explanatory frameworks. Developmental and cognitive psychology show that human understanding depends on part–whole conceptual structure and that learning involves restructuring these hierarchies [6]. The mind builds systems.

Relationship (a/r): Causal, Associative, and Inferential Networks Human reasoning depends on relational operators. Causal judgments, associative links, implication, correlation, conditional reasoning, and analogical mapping all rely on directional influence among concepts. Cognitive neuroscience reveals that semantic memory and thought are implemented as relational networks of activation. The R-operator

is not optional in cognition; it is foundational [7].

Perspective (v/p̂): Frames, Viewpoints, and Localized Orientation (LPFs) Cognition is inherently perspectival. Attention, framing effects, point-of-view reasoning, mental rotation, spatial navigation, cognitive empathy, bias, and perceptual salience all reflect the mind's use of LPFs. A perspective is a structured orientation: what the mind is oriented *from* (p̂) and what it is oriented *toward* (v). These perspectival operators are measurable in vision science, decision-making research, and social cognition [8]. The mind organizes through LPFs just as natural systems do.

Structural Bias (Pareto Findings) Empirical studies show systematic overactivation of certain elements (i, p, v) and underactivation of others (o, w, a, r, p̂) across individuals and tasks, yielding predictable errors in inference, learning, prediction, and decision-making [3,9,28,30]. These results confirm the cognitive structuring mechanic: cognition uses the same polarity-based structure as nature but does so unevenly.

Cognitive systems therefore mirror the structural invariants found in physical, biological, and ecological systems. The mind does not impose DSRP onto experience; it expresses DSRP because cognition is itself a natural instance of information organization. Like any other informational agent, the mind distinguishes, composes, relates, and orients—and it does so using the same SIR architecture found throughout the universe.

5.6 Purpose and Ontological Significance

Taken together, these examples establish *existence evidence*: empirical demonstrations that the structural invariants of DSRP are instantiated in the world independent of human cognition. Physics, chemistry, biology, ecology, social systems, and cognitive systems do not merely resemble DSRP when reinterpreted; they *already operate* through the same boundary-making, part-whole, relational, and perspectival structures that the SIR framework formalizes.

Science did not set out to validate DSRP. Yet the structures it measures and models—state boundaries in quantum mechanics, orbital symmetries in chemistry, membrane distinctions in cells, nested hierarchies in ecosystems, interaction networks in societies, and perspectival frames in cognition—are isomorphic to the SIR architecture and its six structural mechanics. These patterns are not conceptual overlays. They are empirical facts about how information organizes itself in nature.

Additional independent evidence comes from large-scale cross-disciplinary reviews. For example, a comprehensive literature review of the universal and atomic elements of complex cognition [4] surveyed findings across cognitive psychology, neuroscience, education, linguistics, and AI. Without reference to DSRP, the review identified recurrent structural invariants—boundary formation, hierarchical embedding, relational operators, and perspectival orientation—that parallel the SIR architecture. This body of work shows that multiple scientific fields independently converge on the same generative structures, further supporting the existence of DSRP-like invariants across domains.

This yields the central ontological claim: *DSRP is not a cognitive lens imposed on reality; it is the structural grammar that reality already uses*. The mind does not project DSRP onto the world. It detects, amplifies, and often distorts the DSRP structures that pre-exist cognition. Because cognition is itself an informational system, it mirrors the same operators and mechanics expressed throughout the natural world.

Thus, existence evidence shows that the SIRs, their structural mechanics, and their deeper polarity structure are not human inventions. They are ontological invariants. The world organizes using DSRP whether or not the mind knows it, and cognition succeeds or fails to the extent that it aligns its internal organization with these natural structures.

6. Empirical Effect Evidence (Mind)

If Section 5 demonstrated the existence of DSRP structures in nature, Section 6 addresses a different question: *Does the same structural architecture govern the organization of the mind—and can this be shown empirically rather than philosophically?*

The answer, established through multiple research programs, is yes [1,2,4–8,28,52]. Cognition organizes information using the same polarity-based SIR architecture that characterizes natural systems. What differs is not the structure of cognition but the distribution of its activation: unlike nature, the mind exhibits systematic structural bias.

Empirical studies in systems thinking, metacognition, concept formation, causal reasoning, and model-building consistently show overactivation of certain elements (especially *i*, *p*, *v*) and underactivation of others (notably *o*, *w*, *a*, *r*, *p*). This imbalance, demonstrated in the Pareto Structure of Thought research, reveals a skewed activation profile in which a small subset of structural tendencies produces a disproportionate share of cognitive error [3,9,30].

Crucially, this bias is not only measurable—it is correctable. When individuals are trained to deliberately activate the underused SIR poles, especially whole, relationship, and view, they exhibit significant improvements in systems-thinking accuracy, transfer, and cognitive flexibility. These improvements are reliable and quantifiable; several studies report performance gains exceeding 500% over content-only control conditions [29].

The Six Pareto Moves distill these corrections into operator-level interventions. They are not heuristics but structural counterweights designed to rebalance polarity activation within cognitive organization. When practiced, they reliably shift mental models toward greater structural fidelity, providing empirical support for O-Theory's central claim:

$$\mathbb{M} = I_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{M}}$$

and the accompanying result that epistemic accuracy arises from structural alignment [31].

Thus, empirical effect evidence corroborates the ontological thesis: the same SIR structure that organizes nature also organizes the mind. Epistemology diverges from ontology only in its bias profile, not in its underlying structural form.

7. DSRP as a Universal Meta-Ontology

If DSRP structures exist both in nature and in mind, a further implication follows: DSRP is not one ontology among many. It is the *meta-ontological structure* that underlies all ontologies.

A brief survey of the history of philosophy and science reveals that every major ontological system—Aristotelian categories, mereology, causality, process philosophy, structural realism, analytic ontology, and modern scientific ontologies—converges on the same recurring primitives: identity and difference, part and whole, action and reaction, point and view. These are not competing foundations. They are fragments of a single deeper polarity structure:

$$\mathbb{P} := \langle e^+ \leftrightarrow e^- \rangle$$

Distinction expresses identity/difference. System expresses part/whole. Relationship expresses interaction/causation. Perspective expresses viewpoint/frame.

Disciplines “reinvent” these primitives in local dialects—the language of physics, biology, ecology, sociology, or philosophy—but the underlying grammar is invariant. DSRP does not replace these traditions; it reveals the structural field that gives rise to them. It is not a domain ontology. It is a meta-ontology: the *structure of structure*.

Once this structure is formalized, the boundary between ontology (what exists) and epistemology (how we know it) dissolves. Both are woven from the same polarity-based generative fabric.

8. Implications for Science, Modeling, and Cognition

Recognizing DSRP as the structural ontology of the universe has direct consequences across scientific domains.

For systems science, it provides a neutral generative grammar for constructing models. DSRP is content-agnostic; it does not prescribe a worldview but supplies the structural operators needed to build accurate models in any domain. It resolves decades of confusion in systems thinking by grounding “system” not in metaphor or diagram but in measurable, falsifiable structural invariants.

For cognitive science, it reframes intelligence—biological or artificial—as structural cognition. Minds and machines reason by organizing information through Simple Interaction Rules. This offers a shared substrate linking human reasoning, neural computation, and AI architectures.

For epistemology, DSRP makes model–world alignment measurable rather than rhetorical. Alignment becomes the structural ratio:

$$\frac{\mathbb{M}}{\mathbb{R}} = \frac{I_{\mathbb{M}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{M}}}{I_{\mathbb{R}} \cdot O_{\mathbb{R}}}$$

a formal measure of epistemic accuracy as structural isomorphism.

For philosophy, DSRP shifts ontology away from classification and toward generativity. Categories are not ontological types; they are cognitive residues of DSRP’s polarity structure.

For science broadly, DSRP provides a basis for measurement, training, falsification, developmental standards, and cross-disciplinary unification—criteria rooted not in disciplinary convention but in universal structural invariants.

9. Implications for Artificial Intelligence and Human–AI Structural Integration

If DSRP provides the generative structure of both natural systems and cognition, then its implications for artificial intelligence are immediate and profound. Contemporary AI systems—especially large language models—possess computational scale but lack structural ontology. They operate without Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, or Perspectives. They do not form boundaries, do not represent part–whole hierarchies, do not encode action–reaction dynamics, and do not maintain perspectival frames. Their internal organization is not *structured information* but *statistical correlation*.

This absence of structural ontology explains the well-known failure modes of generative AI: hallucination, semantic drift, conflation, contradiction, unstable frames, fabricated causal chains, and the uncontrolled spread of training-set bias. Without D, S, R, or P, an AI system has no way to represent identity or otherness, no way to track constituent structure, no way to encode interactions, and no way to maintain a stable viewpoint. It cannot form or preserve meaning because meaning is an emergent property of these operators. In short: today’s AI is powerful but ontologically blind.

A structural ontology changes this. DSRP provides the minimal generative grammar needed for an AI agent to construct, transform, and evaluate internal models in a way that mirrors the structure of reality itself. In place of correlation-driven token prediction, an AI system equipped with DSRP-based operators could:

- maintain explicit identity/other boundaries that stabilize reference, reduce hallucination, and preserve semantic coherence;
- build recursive part–whole structures that support multi-scale reasoning, mechanistic explanations, and grounded world-models;
- encode interaction rules that track causal, dynamic, and inferential relationships;
- maintain persistent point–view frames that anchor interpretation, context, and perspective-taking;

- and compute model–world alignment using the same structural operator shared by human intuition and natural systems.

In this view, intelligence—biological or artificial—is not the accumulation of content, but the organization of information through simple interaction rules. A structurally equipped AI would no longer improvise meaning from correlations; it would *construct meaning from structure*.

The implications are equally significant for the human–AI interface. If the mind organizes information through DSRP and AI does not, their interaction will always be unstable. Humans will misinterpret AI output, AI will misinterpret human intention, and neither system will be structurally aligned. But if AI is constrained inside the same structural operators used by human cognition, a shared generative grammar emerges. Humans and machines begin to reason within the same polarity field, exchange information in structurally compatible forms, and align their internal models through measurable structural equivalence.

This creates a future in which:

- AI becomes structurally interpretable rather than opaque;
- human reasoning becomes more explicit, visible, and correctable;
- hallucinations are reduced not by statistical patching but by structural constraint;
- AI can build and evaluate causal models with the same operators found in natural systems;
- humans can monitor and improve their own cognitive structure while interacting with AI;
- and the human–AI system becomes a unified cognitive architecture capable of reasoning with a shared ontology.

This is not “AI literacy” in the conventional sense. It is a structural integration between human cognition and artificial systems. Instead of humans adapting to the biases of AI, AI is brought into alignment with the structural invariants of human thought—and, ultimately, with the structural ontology of reality. The result is not smarter machines or more informed people, but a new hybrid intelligence grounded in the same generative mechanics that organize the natural world.

And because DSRP describes the minimal, complete operators of structure, no other team or framework can supply this ontological bridge. If the next generation of AI is to reason rather than merely predict, and if humans are to trust and collaborate with these systems at scale, the shared structural grammar provided by DSRP is not optional—it is foundational.

A practical illustration comes from the well-documented failure mode of large language models known as hallucination, in which the model produces fluent but structurally incoherent claims (e.g., inventing citations or fabricating mechanisms). In transformer architectures, hallucinations arise because the model lacks explicit Distinction and System operators: tokens are not represented as identity–other structures (i/o), nor embedded within part–whole constraints (p/w). As a result, the model can generate propositions that violate basic boundary conditions—merging incompatible entities, omitting necessary parts, or constructing wholes that contain elements never observed together. In a DSRP-enabled agent, these errors become structurally impossible because the generative process is constrained by the four operators and their mechanics. Every generated claim must preserve (1) valid identity/other distinctions; (2) system integrity via recursive part–whole containment; (3) relational coherence through action–reaction duals;

and (4) perspectival consistency via explicit point/view structure. For example, when prompted to generate a biochemical mechanism, a DSRP-based system would be unable to produce a molecule with incompatible orbital configurations or an enzyme without its necessary active-site distinctions, because violating those organizational constraints would break the calculus. Thus, where transformer models hallucinate due to lack of internal ontology, a structurally instantiated DSRP agent cannot: its generative space is ontologically gated, making incoherent outputs non-computable rather than merely undesirable.

10. Discussion

The argument of this paper is that DSRP is minimal, universal, empirical, and generative. Rather than proposing four unrelated principles, it reveals a single polarity operator whose projections manifest as Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives. These operators are governed by shared dynamics and mechanics that generate the recursive complexity of natural and cognitive systems.

This ontology is not metaphoric. It is evidenced in physical, chemical, biological, ecological, social, and cognitive domains. The same structure that organizes quarks organizes cells, ecosystems, institutions, and ideas. The same operators that organize the world organize the mind.

Thus, DSRP unifies ontology (the structure of the world) and epistemology (the structure of knowing) through a single generative grammar. It satisfies the four pillars of the Standard—practical, empirical, measurable, universal—because it captures the structural invariants that make systems exist and make systems thinking possible.

Continued independent replication is expected and welcomed. The existing empirical base already provides substantial evidence for DSRP's structural validity; ongoing research will further refine and extend this foundation across scales and disciplines.

11. Conclusion

DSRP is not a theory of systems. It is the structure that makes systems possible.

Across all scales of reality—from quantum fields to cells, from neural circuits to cultures—the same generative polarities recur. These elemental duals form the universe's organizational grammar: the Simple Interaction Rules by which information differentiates, combines, interacts, orients, and ultimately self-organizes into the physical, biological, social, and cognitive worlds.

Recognizing DSRP as the structural ontology of reality provides a unified scientific foundation for modeling, meaning-making, intelligence, and the emergence of complexity itself. It is both a description of how structure arises and the formal grammar that produces it.

If science seeks the rules by which the universe builds itself, DSRP is that rule set.

References

1. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. The grammar of reality: The organizing principles of structure and emergence. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–18. doi:10.54120/jost.2025-000003
2. Cabrera D. The Unified Calculus of organization, structure, emergence, and meaning: The patterns that connect mind and nature. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–41. doi:10.54120/jost.2025-000002
3. Kumar DCLC. The Thinking Quotient (TQ): Updated Psychometric Validation and Domain Reliability Results. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–30.
4. Cabrera D, Cabrera LL, Cabrera E. A Literature Review of the Universal and Atomic Elements of Complex Cognition. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2023; 1–85. doi:10.54120/jost.0000032
5. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Distinctions Organize Information in Mind and Nature: Empirical Findings of Identity–Other Distinctions (D) in Cognitive and Material Complexity. *Systems*. 2022;10. doi:10.3390/systems10020041
6. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Systems Organize Information in Mind and Nature: Empirical Findings of Part-Whole Systems (S) in Cognitive and Material Complexity. *Systems*. 2022.
7. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Relationships Organize Information in Mind and Nature: Empirical Findings of Action-Reaction Relationships (R) in Cognitive and Material Complexity. *Systems*. 2022.
8. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. Perspectives Organize Information in Mind and Nature: Empirical Findings of Point-View Perspective (P) in Cognitive and Material Complexity. *Systems*. 2022.
9. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. The Pareto structure of thought: empirical discovery of the six foundational mental moves. *J Syst Think*. 2025;2025: 1–41. doi:10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6par6
10. Kempes CP, Avila D, Mathis C. How hard is it to encapsulate life? The general constraints on encapsulation. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2025;380: 20240297. doi:10.1098/rstb.2024.0297
11. Nielsen MA, Chuang IL. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press; 2002.
12. Susskind L, Friedman A. *Quantum Mechanics: The Theoretical Minimum*. Basic Books; 2014.
13. Rovelli C. Relational quantum mechanics. *International Journal Theoretical Physics*. 1996.
14. Einstein A. On the electrodynamics of moving bodies. *Annalen der Physik*. 1905;17: 891–921.
15. Atkins P, de Paula J. *Atkins' Physical Chemistry*. Oxford University Press; 2014.
16. Levine IN. *Quantum Chemistry*. 7th ed. Pearson; 2013.
17. Eliel EL, Wilen SH. *Stereochemistry of Organic Compounds*. Wiley; 1994.

18. Alberts B, Johnson A, Lewis J, Others. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*. 6th ed. Garland Science; 2014.
19. Berg HC, Purcell EM. Physics of chemoreception. *Biophysical Journal*. 1977;20: 193–219.
20. Hartwell LH, Hopfield JJ, Leibler S, Murray AW. From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature*. 1999;402: C47–C52.
21. Odum EP, Barrett GW. *Fundamentals of Ecology*. 5th ed. Brooks/Cole; 2004.
22. Holling CS. Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*. 1973;4: 1–23.
23. Wasserman S, Faust K. *Social Network Analysis: Methods and Applications*. Cambridge University Press; 1994.
24. Barsalou LW. Perceptual symbol systems. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 1999;22: 577–660.
25. Gentner D, Markman AB. Structure-mapping in analogy and similarity. *American Psychologist*. 1997;52: 45–56.
26. Tversky A, Kahneman D. The framing of decisions and the psychology of choice. *Science*. 1981;211: 453–458.
27. Johnson-Laird PN. *Mental Models*. Harvard University Press; 1983.
28. Cabrera D, Cabrera L, Cabrera E. The “Fish Tank” Experiments: Metacognitive Awareness of Distinctions, Systems, Relationships, and Perspectives (DSRP) Significantly Increases Cognitive Complexity. *Systems*. 2022;10. doi:10.3390/systems10020029
29. Aljarri W 'ad, Bustamante J, Ingwell A, Labrada T, Nadig B, Shin J, et al. New Hope for policy schools: Examining systems thinking solutions to improve policy education. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2024; 1–61. doi:10.54120/jost.00000101
30. Di Marco G, Cabrera D. Common biases in systems thinking. *Journal of Systems Thinking Preprints*. 2024. doi:10.54120/jost.pr000037.v1
31. Cabrera D, Cabrera L. The structure of thought and reality: empirical evidence for the three universal laws linking mind, matter, and meaning. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–20. doi:10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6smio6
32. Wen, A., Hock, A., Carver, B., Ortega, A., Corsi, P., Jordan, J., Nicholson, A., Cabrera, L., & Cabrera, D. Framework Effectiveness and Prevalence in Public Policy: A survey of the field and a discussion of the need for an agent-based systems approach. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2022.
33. Cabrera L, Sokolow J, Cabrera D. Developing and Validating a Measurement of Systems Thinking : The Systems Thinking and Metacognitive Inventory (STMI). *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2023; 1–43. doi:10.54120/jost.0000042
34. Álvarez GA. Email exchange between Cabrera and Álvarez confirming findings that atoms take perspective are not metaphorical, but empirical. 2021.

35. Zwick A, Álvarez GA, Kurizki G. Maximizing Information on the Environment by Dynamically Controlled Qubit Probes. *Phys Rev Applied*. 2016;5.
36. Cabrera DCL. From DSRP Theory to O-Theory: The Science of Organization. *Journal of Systems Thinking*. 2025;5: 1–8.
37. Gell-Mann M, Lloyd S. Information measures, effective complexity, and total information. *Complexity*. 1996;2: 44–52. doi:10.1002/(sici)1099-0526(199609/10)2:1<44::aid-cplx10>3.0.co;2-x
38. Wolfram S. Chapter 1: The foundations of a new kind of science, Sections 1, 2, and 3. *A New Kind of Science*. Chicago, IL: Wolfram Media; 2002. pp. 1–16. Available: <http://www.wolframscience.com/nksonline/chapter-1>
39. Friston K. The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory? *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2010;11: 127–138. doi:10.1038/nrn2787
40. Landauer R. Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM J Res Dev*. 2000;44: 261–269. doi:10.1147/rd.441.0261
41. Shannon CE. The mathematical theory of communication. 1963. *MD Comput*. 1997;14: 306–317. Available: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9230594>
42. Kolmogorov AN. On tables of random numbers. *Theor Comput Sci*. 1998;207: 387–395. doi:10.1016/s0304-3975(98)00075-9
43. Holland JH. *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems*. Cambridge, MA: Bradford Books; 2019. doi:10.7551/mitpress/1090.001.0001
44. Kauffman SA. *The origins of order : self-organization and selection in evolution*. New York: Oxford University Press; 1993. p. xviii, 709 p.
45. Mitchell M. *Complexity: A Guided Tour*. 2009. p. 367. doi:10.1063/1.3326990
46. Tononi G. *The information integration theory of consciousness*. The Blackwell Companion to Consciousness. Malden, MA, USA: Blackwell Publishing; 2007. pp. 287–299. doi:10.1002/9780470751466.ch23
47. Ladyman J, Ross D, David And With Spurrett. *Every thing must go: Metaphysics naturalized*. Cary, NC: Oxford University Press; 2007.
48. Wheeler JA. Information, physics, quantum: The search for links. *Feynman and Computation*. CRC Press; 2018. pp. 309–336. doi:10.1201/9780429500459-19
49. Baez JC, Fritz T, Leinster T. A characterization of entropy in terms of information loss. *Entropy (Basel)*. 2011;13: 1945–1957. doi:10.3390/e13111945
50. Fields C. If physics is an information science, what is an observer? *Information (Basel)*. 2012;3: 92–123. doi:10.3390/info3010092
51. Barandiaran XE, Di Paolo EA. A genealogical map of the concept of habit. *Front Hum Neurosci*. 2014;8: 522. doi:10.3389/fnhum.2014.00522

52. Cabrera D. A Mathematical Theory of Organization: DSRP as Universal Code of Mind and Nature for Organizing, Evolving, and Understanding Information. Journal of Systems Thinking. 2024.