

Enclosure

The Raw Structural Materials Necessary and Sufficient for Any Identity to Exist

Derek Cabrera^{a,b,@}

a: Cornell University

b: Cabrera Lab

@: dac66@cornell.edu

ABSTRACT: Classical logic, built on bivalence and the Law of the Excluded Middle, has organized Western reasoning for over two millennia. It tells us that for any identity A there is a corresponding $\neg A$, and it excels at forcing clear either–or decisions. But it does not say what must be true for anything to count as an identity A in the first place. This paper introduces *Enclosure*, a structural result showing that any identity A necessarily entails the simultaneous co-existence of Distinction, Relationship, System, and Perspective (DSRP). Taking the Aristotelian commitment $A / \neg A$ as a starting point, we ask: if A implies $\neg A$, what else must be there for A to exist at all? The answer is that identity and otherness arise together as a distinction, are linked by a necessary co-implicative relationship, can only exist as parts of an enclosing system, and are determinable only from a perspectival framing that selects A rather than $\neg A$ as foreground. Each of these structures is individually necessary and none is sufficient alone; together they form a minimal jointly necessary and jointly sufficient generating set for identity. This explains why there are exactly four such conditions—why not more, and why not fewer—by showing that any proposed addition is derivative and any omission renders identity incoherent or indeterminate. Enclosure is qualitatively distinct from intra-structural mechanics: it does not describe how structure behaves, but why any structured identity—logical, physical, cognitive, institutional, or social—can exist at all, and why structurally incomplete logics predictably generate the kinds of binary pathologies we see in practice.

KEYWORDS: Enclosure | Identity | Structural Necessity | Distinction | Relationship | System | Perspective | Boundary Conditions | Structural Mechanics | Systems Thinking | DSRP | Ontology | Epistemology | Law of the Excluded Middle | Co-implication

Cite this paper: Cabrera, D. (2025). Enclosure: The raw structural materials necessary and sufficient for any identity to exist. *Journal of Systems Thinking*, 5(1), 1–12.

<https://doi.org/10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6dee16>

1. Introduction

Aristotelian logic [1–3] commits us to a simple scheme: if something is A , there is necessarily a corresponding *not- A* . Identity implies otherness. That move has been baked into the way we think, teach, design, and build for more than two thousand years. Logic, science, technology, law, and everyday reasoning all inherit it [4–7].

Aristotle’s logic is bivalent: either A or $\neg A$. That kind of logic is incredibly useful. We need it. But it fits best inside a wider, multivalent structure that reality already has. When Aristotle “excluded the middle,” he didn’t just rule out a third option between A and $\neg A$. He also pushed out a whole middle field of structure: the relationship between A and $\neg A$, the whole that holds them together, and the point of view from which A is picked out. *Enclosure* is simply the move that brings that middle field back into view and names it. It doesn’t add anything new to the world—it makes explicit what has been there all along.

Formally, let A denote an identity. Aristotle correctly observed that for any element x , relative to A , either $x \in A$ or $x \in \neg A$, and not both. This is the Law of the Excluded Middle (LEM) at its proper scope: a rule for classifying elements within an already-defined identity. At this level, bivalency is a perfectly reasonable way to ask, “Is this inside or outside the boundary we’ve drawn?”

The problem begins when that local rule is silently elevated into a global picture of reality. Once A and $\neg A$ themselves are treated as mutually exclusive existents, rather than as two sides of a single structural enclosure, identity, negation, and boundary all collapse onto one logical line. Bivalency stops being a useful way to sort elements inside a concept and starts acting like a claim about what can and cannot exist. The “middle” that gets excluded is not just a third option between A and $\neg A$; it is the entire structural field that makes A and $\neg A$ possible in the first place. That helps explain why so much of our thinking, and many of our systems, end up organized around hard binaries and polarized choices.

This paper takes Aristotle’s technique and reapplies it. He said that for A to exist, whether you like it or not, *not- A* must also exist. We agree. But Aristotle stopped there and excluded the middle. When he did, he also excluded from view a number of other things that come along for the ride whether we like them or not. We take his premise as true and ask a narrower question: if A *necessarily* implies $\neg A$, what else must *necessarily* exist—and is *sufficient*—for A to come into existence in the first place?

The answer is *Enclosure*. To get an A , you don’t just get A and $\neg A$. You also get the relationship between them, the whole that contains them, and the point of view from which A is picked out as “the thing” rather than $\neg A$. In other words, any identity A comes wrapped in four structural conditions: Distinction, Relationship, System, and Perspective. Take away any one of them and A falls apart. Nothing more is required.

What follows is the argument that this is not an opinion or a framework choice, but a structural necessity—and that missing it goes a long way toward explaining why our logics, systems, and institutions keep breaking in the same familiar ways.

2. Distinction Necessity

For an identity A to exist, it has to be distinguished. An undistinguished “something” is not an identity; it is indeterminate. Distinction is not a property that an identity later acquires. It is the condition that makes identity possible at all.

A distinction necessarily has two poles: an identity and an other. To distinguish A is simultaneously to distinguish what A is and what A is not. These two arise together and define each other.

Thus, the existence of A requires both D_i (identity) and D_o (other):

$$A \Rightarrow \{A, \neg A\}$$

There is no identity without otherness.

This is not a psychological or linguistic claim. It is ontological. A world in which identities existed without others would be a world without boundaries. Nothing could be individuated, referenced, counted, compared, or acted upon. Identity would collapse into undifferentiated being.

The trouble starts when D_o is ignored or suppressed. When identity is treated as if it can exist without its other, identity becomes absolute rather than bounded. It stops being a distinction and starts being a self-sufficient thing. Ontologically, that produces entities that appear fixed and independent, as if they carry their identity inside themselves rather than at the boundary that distinguishes them.

The results are familiar. In reasoning, neglect of D_o produces essentialism: categories are treated as intrinsic essences rather than cuts drawn against alternatives. In social and institutional life, it produces rigid labels that pretend to be exhaustive rather than partial. In cognition and communication, it produces assertions that float free of the alternatives that actually give them meaning. At the psychosocial level, it produces polarization: identities that define themselves without acknowledging the constitutive role of the other become brittle and defensive.

These problems do not come from distinction itself. They come from using only one side of it. Identity without otherness is not stronger identity; it is incoherent identity.

Properly understood, distinction does not divide the world into enemies. It brings the world into structure by jointly generating identity and otherness. Any framework that treats identity as ontologically prior to its other has already abandoned the conditions under which identity can exist at all.

3. Relational Necessity

The distinction between A and $\neg A$ is not inert. Once identity and otherness exist, they do not just sit next to each other. They are structurally linked. The other ($\neg A$) simultaneously negates A —marking what A is

not—and enables A to exist as bounded. These two functions cannot be separated. Negation without enabling collapses identity; enabling without negation dissolves distinction.

Thus, the existence of A requires a necessary relationship between A and $\neg A$:

$$A \Leftrightarrow \neg A$$

There is no identity without relation.

This is not logical equivalence and not propositional symmetry. It is structural co-implication. Identity and otherness do not mirror each other; they require each other. This requirement entails both R_a (action) and R_r (reaction): the act of drawing a distinction produces an effect, and that effect reciprocally constrains the very identity it enables.

Ontologically, identity without relation is impossible. A world made of isolated identities—entities with no relational consequences—would be a world in which nothing can interact, change, constrain, or affect anything else. Such a world would be indistinguishable from non-existence.

When relational necessity is ignored, distinctions harden into static oppositions. Identity and otherness are treated as adversaries rather than mutually enabling poles. Negation becomes pure opposition rather than boundary formation. Explanation collapses into isolation: things are described as if they “just are,” rather than as what they are by virtue of how they stand in relation to what they are not.

The failures that follow are predictable. In reasoning, exclusion of R_a/R_r yields monocausal stories: effects are pinned on single entities rather than relational configurations. In institutions and law, actors are treated as isolated causes rather than as nodes in reciprocal systems. In technology and modeling, relations are treated as afterthoughts or “interactions” bolted on top of entity lists. In human life, conflict is experienced as pure opposition rather than as a loop that both sides are co-creating.

These failures do not arise because relations are complicated. They arise because relations are treated as optional. Relational necessity is not an extra layer on top of identity. It is what makes identity real. To distinguish without relating is to posit boundaries that do nothing. To relate without reciprocity is to erase the very distinction that made relation possible.

Identity exists only where relation exists. Any ontology that treats relations as secondary properties of already-existing things has already forfeited the conditions under which those things could exist at all.

4. System Necessity

Once identity (A) and otherness ($\neg A$) exist, and once they are necessarily related, another condition follows immediately: they cannot exist except as parts of a whole. Relation without a whole is unintelligible. A relation must relate *within* something.

Thus, any two related identities necessarily constitute a system—not just A and $\neg A$, but A , $\neg A$, *and their relationship*.

Formally, if A and $\neg A$ are related by $A \Leftrightarrow \neg A$, then all three are parts (S_p) of a whole (S_w):

$$Sw_A = Sp_A(A, \neg A, \Leftrightarrow)$$

There is no identity without system structure.

This is not an empirical generalization and not a modeling choice. It is a structural necessity. A relation that does not belong to a whole is not a relation; it is an abstraction severed from existence. Systemhood is therefore not an additional layer placed on top of identities and relations—it is the condition that makes *relations themselves* real. Relations are not just links between parts; they are also parts of the whole that encloses them.

Identity is thus not primitive. It presupposes systemhood.

A world in which identities and relations existed without systems would be a world in which relations had no context, no boundary, and no coherence. Such a world would be indistinguishable from one in which nothing is related at all. Relation collapses without enclosure; enclosure collapses without a whole.

When system necessity is excluded, identities are treated as independent units rather than as parts of larger wholes. This produces an atomistic ontology in which entities appear self-contained and interactions appear accidental. Causes are localized, responsibility is individualized, and context is treated as optional background rather than structural condition.

In reasoning, neglect of S_p/S_w produces reductionism: phenomena are explained by isolating parts rather than by understanding the wholes in which those parts live. In design and governance, it leads to optimizing subsystems at the expense of global function. In social life, it undermines belonging: people experience themselves as isolated actors rather than as parts of shared systems.

These failures do not arise because systems are complex. They arise because systems are denied. Systemhood is not an analytical convenience. It is an ontological requirement. Where there is relation, there is a whole. Where there is a whole, there are parts—which include the relations themselves. Any ontology that treats systems as optional abstractions layered onto reality has already removed the conditions under which identity and relation could exist.

Identity exists only within systems.

5. Perspective Necessity

Once identity (A), otherness ($\neg A$), their relation, and the system that encloses them exist, one further condition follows: identity has to be referenced. A system without a reference point does not determine which identity is foregrounded. Without reference, identity is indeterminate.

The system S_A is defined as A -centered. But this centering is not intrinsic to the system itself. The same enclosure could just as well be described by letting $\neg A = B$, in which case $A = \neg B$. Nothing in the structure privileges A over B . Both identities exist symmetrically within the same system.

Therefore, for A to exist as A, a perspective is required. Perspective consists minimally of:

- a P_p (point) from which the system is referenced, and
- a P_v (view) that renders A rather than $\neg A$ as the identity.

Formally, the underlying enclosure is:

$$E = A, \neg A. E = A, \neg A$$

An A-centered perspective assumes A as the identity and $\neg A$ as its other:

$$P_{\dot{p}=A} : E \mapsto (A, \neg A)$$

We can rename the other and flip the frame:

$$B = \neg A \Rightarrow \neg B = A.$$

A B-centered perspective instead takes B as the identity and $\neg B$ as its other:

$$P_{\dot{p}=B} : E \mapsto (B, \neg B)$$

There is no identity without perspectival framing.

This requirement is structural, not psychological. Perspective does not introduce bias into an otherwise neutral reality; it makes determinacy possible in the first place. A world without perspective would not be objective—it would be undefined.

Without perspective, identity collapses into symmetry. The system still contains identities, relations, and boundaries, but there is no reference that picks out this from that. Identity becomes present but unnameable, existent but unlocatable.

When perspective necessity is excluded, identities are treated as viewless facts rather than as reference-dependent determinations. This produces a persistent illusion: that identity can be fully specified without specifying a point from which it is specified.

The consequences are widespread. In reasoning, neglect of P_p/P_v produces naïve realism: descriptions are taken as neutral mirrors rather than perspectival renderings. In politics and social systems, groups collide as if their positions were absolute rather than vantage points in shared systems. In law and ethics, rules are treated as context-free rather than applied from particular standpoints. In technology, systems are built around assumed users and environments that go unnamed.

Perspective is not optional, and it is not a concession to subjectivity. It is a condition of identity's existence. Attempts to eliminate perspective in pursuit of objectivity do not produce neutrality; they produce indeterminacy.

Identity exists only where reference exists. Any ontology that treats perspective as an epistemic afterthought rather than an ontological necessity has already erased the conditions under which identity can be specified at all.

6. Enclosure

From these necessities, we arrive at the central result. The existence of any identity A requires the simultaneous co-existence of Distinction (D_i, D_o), Relationship (R_a, R_r), System (S_p, S_w), and Perspective (P_p, P_v). None of these structures can be removed without collapsing identity itself. Identity is therefore not primitive, self-subsistent, or atomistic. It is structurally generated.

This irreducible structural condition is *Enclosure*. There is no A without $\{D, R, S, P\}$, and $\{D, R, S, P\}$ is sufficient for A . Formally:

$$\nexists A \text{ without } \{D, R, S, P\}$$

$$\{D, R, S, P\} \Rightarrow A$$

These expressions do not describe a temporal process or a construction sequence. Enclosure is not four independent components assembled like parts. It is a *co-arising* condition: whenever identity exists, Distinction, Relationship, System, and Perspective exist together as a single structural field.

The stepwise derivation in the previous sections is methodological, not ontological. It is a way of making necessity explicit. Ontologically, none of the four comes first. Remove any one, and the remaining three lose their meaning. Each component plays a distinct, non-redundant role in the enclosure of identity:

Table 1. Enclosure: the necessary and sufficient structures required for identity to exist.

Component	Necessary for A to exist?	Sufficient alone?	Role in Enclosure
Distinction (D)	Yes	No	Generates identity and otherness
Relationship (R)	Yes	No	Establishes co-implication of identity and other
System (S)	Yes	No	Encloses identities and relations within a whole
Perspective (P)	Yes	No	Determines which identity is foregrounded
$\{D, R, S, P\}$ jointly	Yes	Yes	Minimal sufficient generating set for identity

Each component is individually necessary: remove any one and identity collapses. None is sufficient alone: no single component can generate identity independently. Sufficiency appears only at the level of the complete set. Enclosure is therefore both irreducible and minimal.

This answers a question that has remained implicit across philosophy, logic, systems theory, and cognitive science: why exactly four such structural conditions? Why not fewer? Why not more?

The answer is structural necessity. There are four because four—and only four—are required for identity to exist at all. Any proposed fifth condition presupposes one or more of these four. Any omission renders identity indeterminate or incoherent. Enclosure is not a taxonomy chosen among alternatives; it is the minimal generating condition for identity itself.

This conclusion does not depend on domain assumptions. It holds whether A is a physical object, a biological organism, a legal category, a mathematical construct, a social role, a concept, or a proposition. Wherever identity exists, Enclosure exists. Where Enclosure is absent, identity is impossible.

Enclosure requires that whenever anything exists, a complete structural field exists with it. Identity cannot arise piecemeal. There is no such thing as “just a distinction,” “just a relationship,” or “just a system.” For any A to exist at all, the full enclosure must be present simultaneously: the four patterns, their dual elements, and the bidirectional special relationships that bind each dual together. These are not analytical conveniences; they are ontological requirements. If any row of the table below is missing, identity collapses. If the table is complete, identity is possible.

Table 2. Enclosure: the minimal structural field required for identity to exist.

Pattern, Elements + Special Relationship (r)	Structural Meaning
$D : \quad i \begin{array}{c} \text{exists} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{negates} \end{array} o$	Identity and other arise together; a thing exists only by negating what it is not, and the other exists only by negating the identity
$S : \quad p \begin{array}{c} \text{belongs} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{contains} \end{array} w$	Parts belong only because a whole contains; a whole exists only because parts belong
$R : \quad a \begin{array}{c} \text{effects} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{affects} \end{array} r$	Action and reaction are co-implicated; interaction is inherently reciprocal, even when asymmetric
$P : \quad v \begin{array}{c} \text{frames} \\ \longleftrightarrow \\ \text{framed} \end{array} \dot{p}$	A point and a view arise together; reference is required for identity to be determinate

Interpreted historically, each row blocks a recurring failure in Western thought. Distinction blocks atomism by showing that identity cannot exist without otherness. Relationship blocks strictly one-way causation by showing that action and reaction co-implicate each other. System blocks reductionism by showing that parts and wholes arise together. Perspective blocks objectivism by showing that identity is indeterminate without reference. These are not random errors; they are the predictable consequences of omitting one or more rows of the enclosure. Enclosure prevents them not by adding nuance, but by restoring structural necessity.

7. Enclosure as a Generative Meta-Mechanic

Enclosure is not a dynamic, pattern, or behavior operating inside an already-given structure. It is a *generative meta-mechanic*: a necessity condition that explains why any structure is there to begin with and whether further structures are required.

Structural mechanics such as duality, mutual containment, recursion, observer–observed entanglement, relativity, and cognitive structuring all presuppose identity–other boundaries, action–reaction relations, part–whole systems, and view–point reference frames. They describe how structure behaves and changes once it exists. Enclosure operates one level up. It explains why there is a structural field in which any mechanic—of any kind—could ever operate.

Treating Enclosure as “one more mechanic” alongside others is therefore a category error. A mechanic operates on entities; Enclosure explains how entities become possible. A dynamic presupposes a state space; Enclosure explains why there is a state space. A pattern presupposes distinctions; Enclosure explains why distinctions must arise.

In this sense, Enclosure occupies the same logical position as foundational conditions in other domains. It is analogous to axioms in formal systems, which make theorems possible but are not themselves theorems; to boundary conditions in physics, which enable equations of motion but are not forces; and to grammatical rules, which make sentences meaningful but are not themselves sentences. Enclosure is not an operation within a system; it is the condition that allows a system to exist.

This placement also clarifies Enclosure’s relationship to systems thinking, complexity science, and cognitive science. Systems thinking assumes systems. Complexity theory assumes interacting entities in defined state spaces. Cognitive science assumes representational structures and perspectives. Enclosure explains why those assumptions must hold whenever identity exists. It is not a contribution inside those fields; it is a structural result that sits prior to them.

Because Enclosure operates at the level of ontological necessity rather than empirical behavior, it is neither reducible to nor validated by downstream dynamics. Empirical studies can show the effects of aligning with Enclosure, just as experiments can show the consequences of respecting boundary conditions in physics. But Enclosure itself is not an empirical hypothesis. It is a structural precondition.

Many debates about emergence [8], observer dependence, context sensitivity, and irreducibility arise because the generative conditions of structure are treated as optional rather than necessary. Enclosure

shows that these features are not add-ons to an otherwise complete ontology; they are part of the minimal requirements for ontology itself.

Enclosure therefore marks the upper boundary of explanation. Beyond it, explanation cannot proceed by adding more mechanisms or variables. What Enclosure offers is not another theory of structure, but an account of why structure has to be there at all.

8. Implications

Recognizing Enclosure has consequences across ontology, epistemology, logic, AI, institutions, technology, and social life—not because Enclosure is “applied” to these domains, but because all of them presuppose identity. Wherever *identity* exists, *Enclosure* is already in force. Wherever it is omitted, the same failures recur.

First, *Enclosure* shows that boundaries are structurally necessary, not arbitrary. Boundaries are often treated as subjective conventions, modeling choices, or political constructions laid on top of an otherwise continuous reality. Enclosure reverses this: boundaries are not imposed on identity; they generate it. Eliminate boundaries in the name of purity, unity, or objectivity and you do not remove arbitrariness—you remove identity. What's more, boundaries are frame-dependent.

Second, *Enclosure* shows that observer dependence is unavoidable. Perspective is usually treated as an epistemic nuisance, a bias to be minimized. From the standpoint of Enclosure, this is impossible. Perspective framing is not a distortion added by observers; it is a structural requirement for identity to be determinate. A perspective-free description is not more objective—it is *undefined*. This reframes (no pun intended) debates about objectivity and bias: reference is ontologically prior to truth claims.

Third, *Enclosure* explains the persistence of false dichotomies. When Distinction is preserved but Relationship, System, or Perspective are suppressed, identities harden into oppositions: true/false, guilty/not guilty, normal/pathological, us/them. These dichotomies do not reflect the structure of reality; they are artifacts of incomplete enclosure. The problem is not that distinctions exist, but that the structures that make distinctions intelligible have been removed.

Fourth, *Enclosure* clarifies why certain paradoxes recur. Puzzles about emergence, self-reference, causation, responsibility, free will, identity over time, and observer effects are often treated as domain-specific problems. From Enclosure's standpoint, they share a common source: formal frameworks that assume identity while omitting one or more of the conditions that make identity possible. Once Enclosure is made explicit, many paradoxes dissolve; others are revealed as category errors.

Fifth, *Enclosure* provides a structural account of model–world misalignment. Because the same conditions govern identity in reality and in cognition [9–12], error arises less from lack of information than from asymmetric enclosure. Cognition selectively attenuates Distinction, Relationship, System, or Perspective, producing models that are internally consistent but structurally misaligned with the world. Alignment is therefore less about “more data” and more about restoring the full enclosure that already exists.

Finally, *Enclosure* reframes the logic underlying institutions and technologies. Legal systems, bureaucracies, computational architectures, and communication systems often succeed locally while failing globally because they preserve bivalent classification while excluding relational, systemic, and perspectival structure. These failures are not simply moral or technical mistakes; they are structural consequences of globalizing local rules. Enclosure makes it possible to see where bivalency is indispensable and where it is destructive.

Across these domains, the implication is the same. What has been excluded historically is not complexity or nuance for their own sake, but structure. Distinction, Relationship, System, and Perspective are not optional features of a sophisticated worldview. They are the minimal conditions under which any worldview—simple or complex—can exist at all.

10. Conclusion

Aristotle's enduring insight was that thought requires structure: identity, negation, and consistency must obey constraints if reasoning is to be possible. His laws of identity, non-contradiction, and the excluded middle remain powerful within their proper scope. The problem addressed here is not that these laws were stated, but that one of them—the Law of the Excluded Middle—was silently universalized.

By extending a rule that governs classification within identities to the existence of identities themselves, Western metaphysics excluded the very structures that make identity possible. What was lost was not “nuance,” but the generative conditions of structure: identity was treated as primitive rather than produced; boundaries as absolute rather than enabling; relations as secondary rather than constitutive; perspective as bias rather than necessity.

This paper has argued that *identity cannot exist without Enclosure: the simultaneous co-emergence of Distinction, Relationship, System, and Perspective*. These four are not a framework chosen for analytic convenience. They are the minimal, jointly necessary and jointly sufficient conditions for identity to exist at all. Remove any one, and identity collapses. Add any additional condition, and it presupposes one or more of the four.

Enclosure operates at a level prior to logic, systems, cognition, and science. It explains why identities can be distinguished, why relations must be reciprocal, why systems must enclose their parts, and why reference is unavoidable. In doing so, it clarifies why familiar problems—false dichotomies, observer paradoxes, reductionist explanations, brittle institutions, polarized social systems—persist despite advances in knowledge. These problems do not indicate that reality is incoherent. They indicate that the structural conditions of coherence have been omitted.

The result is not a rejection of classical logic, but a rescoping of it. Bivalency remains indispensable within enclosures. Enclosure explains how those enclosures come to exist. Logic governs what follows once identity is given; Enclosure explains how identity is possible in the first place.

Enclosure does not add gratuitous complexity to our picture of the world. It explains why complexity—and coherence—were always already there. It restores to ontology the structural middle that was excluded, reconnecting identity, relation, system, and perspective as inseparable aspects of being.

If Aristotle asked what must be true for reasoning to be possible, Enclosure asks a prior question: what must be true for anything to be identifiable at all? The answer is not another discipline or framework, but a structural condition that operates wherever identity exists—in thought, in nature, and in human affairs.

That condition is *Enclosure*.

References

1. Aristotle. *Prior Analytics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1928.
2. Aristotle. *Categories and De Interpretatione*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1963.
3. Aristotle. *Metaphysics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; 1980.
4. Smith R. Aristotle's Logic. 2004. Available: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle-logic/>
5. Ruf A, Yin K. Aristotle is Long Dead But His Wisdom Rules Us from the Grave: A Comparison of the Application of Logic in Legal Reasoning in Common Law and Civil Law Systems. *Comparative Law*. Singapore: Springer; 2024. pp. 1–23. doi:10.1007/978-981-97-7815-7_1
6. Crivelli P. Aristotle's Logic. In: Shields C, editor. *The Oxford Handbook of Aristotle*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2012. pp. 113–149. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187489.013.0006
7. Cabrera D, Colosi L, Lobdell C (2008) Systems thinking. *Eval Program Plann* 31:299–310. doi:10.1016/j.evalprogplan.2007.12.001
8. Cabrera D (2025) A general, measurable definition of emergence ($E = \Delta O$): Structure $\rightarrow$ behavior as the universal mechanism underlying emergent phenomena. *Journal of Systems Thinking* 5(1):1–23. doi:10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6gmde6
9. Cabrera D (2025) DSRP as universal ontology: The structural foundation of all systems. *Journal of Systems Thinking* 5(1):1–40. doi:10.54120/jost.v25i1.dc6sfas6
10. 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
11. 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
12. 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