The Transformational Basis of Persistence: A Formal Theory of Structural Viability

Boris Kriger
Institute of Integrative and Interdisciplinary Research
boriskriger@interdisciplinary-institute.org

Abstract

This paper develops a formal framework demonstrating that structured persistence—whether physical, biological, or informational—necessarily requires the transformation of pre-existing structural configurations. Beginning from non-equilibrium thermodynamics and Landauer's principle, I derive (rather than merely assert) that maintaining macroscopic organization entails reconfiguring external degrees of freedom at a rate bounded from below. The framework introduces a precise definition of "structure" as equivalence classes of microstates under coarse-graining, distinguishing structural transformation from mere entropy production. I identify three modes of transformational persistence—dissipative, consumptive, and observational—characterized by which degrees of freedom are predominantly reconfigured. The theory generates testable predictions about minimum transformation rates and offers explanatory surplus over purely entropic accounts by capturing the *specificity* and *directionality* of persistence-maintaining processes. Applications to biological metabolism, trophic cascades, information processing, and artificial intelligence are developed with quantitative grounding. From the ontological necessity of transformation, I derive the **Equivalence Principle**: if destruction is unavoidable, then structural persistence (as opposed to mere dissipation) occurs only when the significance of what is created or maintained matches what is transformed. This is not an ethical prescription but an ontological distinction—a criterion for differentiating structure-maintaining processes from net dissipation. The paper concludes by examining theoretical minima and the structural economy underlying all persistence.

Keywords: dissipative structures, entropy production, structural transformation, Landauer's principle, autopoiesis, persistence, non-equilibrium thermodynamics, coarse-graining, equivalence principle, value theory

1 Introduction

What does it mean for something to exist over time? The intuitive answer—that a thing simply *is*, maintaining itself through some intrinsic stability—dissolves under physical examination. A candle flame persists only by consuming wax. A river persists only by moving water and eroding substrate. An organism persists only by metabolizing other organisms.

This paper advances and *derives* a stronger claim: **structured persistence necessarily requires the transformation of pre-existing structure**, where "structure" is defined precisely as equivalence classes of microstates under specified coarse-graining operations.

This claim is not merely a restatement of the second law of thermodynamics. While the second law tells us that total entropy must increase, it does not specify *which* configurations must change or *how* the burden of entropy production is distributed between system and environment. The structural transformation framework provides this specificity: it characterizes persistence as requiring changes to particular macroscopic configurations in the environment, not merely statistical redistribution of microstates.

The argument proceeds as follows. Section 2 establishes formal definitions and derives the central proposition from thermodynamic and information-theoretic principles. Section 3 relates this framework to existing theoretical accounts. Section 4 develops a taxonomy of transformational modes. Sections 5–7 examine physical, biological, and informational systems with quantitative grounding. Section 8 addresses human awareness as a phenomenological extension, clearly distinguishing established claims from speculative hypotheses. Section 9 examines the limit case of self-sufficient cyclical structures, where "transformation" becomes relational rather than temporal—connecting the structural transformation framework to the theory of atemporal closure and resolving the apparent paradox of self-maintaining systems. Section 10 introduces the Equivalence Principle as an ontological classification. Section 11 examines theoretical limits and concludes with testable predictions.

2 Formal Framework

2.1 Definitions

Definition 1 (Microstate and Macrostate)**.** *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be the space of all possible microstates of a physical system. A* ***macrostate*** *M is a subset of $\mathcal{M}$ defined by a coarse-graining function $\phi : \mathcal{M} \to \mathcal{C}$, where $\mathcal{C}$ is a space of coarse-grained descriptions. Formally, $M = \phi^{-1}(c)$ for some $c \in \mathcal{C}$.*

Definition 2 (Structure)**.** *A* ***structure*** *Ω is an equivalence class of microstates under a physically meaningful coarse-graining operation that preserves macroscopic observables relevant to a specified level of description. Two microstates $m_1, m_2 \in \mathcal{M}$ belong to the same structure if and only if $\phi(m_1) = \phi(m_2)$.*

This definition distinguishes structural transformation from mere microstate fluctuation: a system undergoes **structural transformation** when it transitions between equivalence classes (i.e., when $\phi(m(t_1)) \neq \phi(m(t_2))$), not merely when it explores different microstates within the same equivalence class.

Definition 3 (Persistence)**.** *A system S* ***persists*** *over interval $[t_0, t_0 + \Delta t]$ if and only if its structure Ω_S remains within a specified invariance class $\mathcal{I}_S$ throughout the interval: $\Omega_S(t) \in \mathcal{I}_S$ for all $t \in [t_0, t_0 + \Delta t]$.*

Definition 4 (Structural Transformation)**.** *An environment E undergoes* ***structural transformation*** *over $[t_0, t_0 + \Delta t]$ if $\Omega_E(t_0 + \Delta t) \neq \Omega_E(t_0)$, i.e., the environment transitions to a different equivalence class under its coarse-graining.*

2.2 Derivation of the Central Proposition

Proposition 1 (Transformational Necessity). *Let S be an open system maintaining structure $\Omega_S \in \mathcal{I}_S$ against thermodynamic equilibration. Then there exists some subsystem E of the environment such that E undergoes structural transformation at a rate $\mathcal{T}_E > 0$.*

Proof. The proof proceeds in three steps.

Step 1: Entropy constraint. By the second law, for any system maintaining internal organization (negative entropy production internally), the total entropy production must be non-negative:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{total}} = \dot{S}_{\text{internal}} + \dot{S}_{\text{export}} \geq 0 \tag{1}$$

If S maintains $\Omega_S \in \mathcal{I}_S$ while $\mathcal{I}_S$ corresponds to a low-entropy macrostate, then $\dot{S}_{\text{internal}} \leq 0$, requiring $\dot{S}_{\text{export}} > 0$.

Step 2: From entropy to structure. Entropy export is not structure-neutral. By the fluctuation theorem and its extensions [Jarzynski, 1997, Crooks, 1999], entropy production in non-equilibrium systems is associated with irreversible transitions between macrostates. Specifically, for a system coupled to environment E:

$$\dot{S}_{\text{export}} = \sum_i J_i X_i \tag{2}$$

where J_i are thermodynamic fluxes and X_i are conjugate forces. Non-zero fluxes imply changes in the extensive variables of E—that is, changes in its macroscopic configuration.

Coarse-graining specification: We define ϕ_E over precisely those extensive variables that appear as arguments of the conjugate forces X_i in the entropy production formula. This is not an arbitrary choice but a necessity: $X_i = \partial S/\partial \xi_i$ where ξ_i are the extensive variables (energy, particle number, volume, etc.). The coarse-graining must track these variables because they are the *only* channels through which system-environment thermodynamic coupling occurs. A coarse-graining that ignores all variables appearing in $J_i X_i$ would be decoupled from the entropy export and thus irrelevant to persistence. Therefore, non-zero entropy export ($\sum_i J_i X_i > 0$) necessarily implies change in the variables over which ϕ_E is defined.

Step 3: Macroscopic change implies structural transformation. If the extensive variables of E change (energy, particle number, volume, etc.), and the coarse-graining ϕ_E is defined in terms of these variables (as is standard), then $\phi_E(E(t_0+\Delta t)) \neq \phi_E(E(t_0))$ for sufficiently large Δt. This constitutes structural transformation of E.

Therefore:

$$\text{Persistence}(\Omega_S, \Delta t) \Rightarrow \exists E : \mathcal{T}_E(\Delta t) > 0 \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_E(\Delta t) = \|\Omega_E(t_0 + \Delta t) - \Omega_E(t_0)\|$ under an appropriate metric on structural space. □ □

Remark on rigor: Proposition 1 is a physically rigorous consequence under standard assumptions: that macrostates are defined in terms of extensive thermodynamic variables, and that system-environment coupling occurs through these variables. It is not a theorem in measure-theoretic probability but a derivation within the standard framework of non-equilibrium thermodynamics. The key physical content is that entropy export cannot occur without changes to the environmental variables through which export occurs.

2.3 The Transformation Rate

Metric specification: The structural metric $\|\cdot\|$ is not fixed uniquely by the framework. Different domains may require different metrics, but admissible metrics must satisfy: (i) invariance under microstate permutations within equivalence classes, (ii) monotonicity with respect to coarse-graining (finer distinctions yield larger distances), and (iii) additivity over independent subsystems. Standard choices include Hamming distance on discrete state spaces, Wasserstein distance on probability distributions, or information-geometric metrics on statistical manifolds.

Definition 5 (Transformation Rate)**.** *The **transformation rate** $\mathcal{T}$ required to maintain structure Ω_S is:*

$$\mathcal{T}_S = \lim_{\Delta t \to 0} \frac{1}{\Delta t} \int_E d\Omega_E \tag{4}$$

where the integral is over all environmental subsystems undergoing structural change to support S's persistence.

This quantity has units of "structural change per unit time" and can be operationalized for specific systems. For metabolic systems, $\mathcal{T}$ corresponds to the rate of molecular bond rearrangement. For information-processing systems, $\mathcal{T}$ relates to the rate of bit erasure via Landauer's principle.

Corollary 1 (Minimum Transformation Rate)**.** *For any persisting structure Ω_S with internal entropy deficit $\Delta S_{int} < 0$ relative to equilibrium, the minimum transformation rate is bounded:*

$$\mathcal{T}_S^{\min} \geq f(|\Delta S_{int}|, T) \tag{5}$$

where f is a monotonically increasing function of the entropy deficit and temperature. The existence of such a bound is guaranteed by thermodynamics; its explicit form is model-dependent.

Illustrative example: For a two-level system with energy gap ΔE maintaining population inversion (ratio $n_\uparrow/n_\downarrow > 1$) against thermal equilibration at temperature T, continuous energy input is required to counteract spontaneous relaxation at rate Γ. The minimum entropy production rate scales as:

$$\dot{S}_{\min} \sim \Gamma \cdot \frac{\Delta E}{T} \cdot \left(\frac{n_\uparrow}{n_\downarrow} - e^{-\Delta E / k_B T} \right) \tag{6}$$

The corresponding minimum transformation rate scales with the deviation from thermal equilibrium and the relaxation rate. This illustrates how the abstract bound $f(|\Delta S_{\text{int}}|, T)$ takes concrete form in specific physical models.

3 Relation to Existing Theoretical Accounts

The structural transformation framework builds upon, but is not reducible to, several existing theoretical programs. This section explicitly delineates the relationships and identifies the explanatory surplus of the present account.

3.1 Prigogine and Dissipative Structures

Prigogine's theory of dissipative structures [Prigogine & Stengers, 1984] established that far-from-equilibrium systems can maintain organization through continuous entropy export. The present framework accepts this foundation but adds specificity: while Prigogine's account characterizes the *quantity* of entropy export required, structural transformation theory characterizes the *configuration* of environmental change.

Consider two systems with identical entropy production rates but different transformation profiles: one degrades concentrated chemical bonds, another dissipates diffuse thermal gradients. Entropic accounting treats these as equivalent; structural transformation theory distinguishes them by the *type* of prior organization dismantled.

3.2 England and Entropy Production

Jeremy England's work on entropy production and self-organization [England, 2013, 2017] proposes that matter tends to organize in ways that maximize entropy production—a phenomenon he terms "dissipative adaptation." Computer simulations demonstrate that atom clusters driven by external energy will restructure themselves to dissipate energy more efficiently. This is compatible with but distinct from the present account. England addresses *why* certain structures arise; structural transformation theory addresses *what* their persistence requires. The two are complementary: England explains the thermodynamic drive toward organization, while the present framework characterizes the ongoing costs of maintaining it.

3.3 Friston and the Free Energy Principle

Friston's free energy principle [Friston, 2010] proposes that biological systems persist by minimizing variational free energy—equivalently, by minimizing surprise or prediction error. This framework and structural transformation theory share a common insight: persistence is active, not passive.

However, the accounts differ in their primary explanatory targets:

- Free energy principle: explains system *behavior* (why systems act to maintain themselves)
- Structural transformation: explains system *costs* (what environmental changes persistence requires)

The frameworks may be unified: minimizing free energy requires actions that, by necessity, transform environmental structure. This synthesis is a direction for future work.

3.4 Explanatory Surplus of Structural Transformation Theory

The present framework offers three forms of explanatory surplus over purely entropic accounts:

1. Specificity. Entropy is a scalar; structural transformation is characterized by *which* structures change. This matters for understanding ecological relationships (predator-prey dynamics depend on specific structural transformations, not merely energy transfer) and for sustainability (not all entropy-equivalent processes have equivalent environmental impacts).

2. Directionality. Entropy accounting tells us that total entropy increases but does not specify *which subsystem* bears the transformation burden. Structural transformation theory specifies that *environmental* structure is transformed to maintain *system* structure. This directional asymmetry—the system persists *at the cost of* environmental reconfiguration—captures something entropy alone does not: the relational nature of persistence, where one structure's maintenance is another structure's transformation.

3. Cross-domain unification. The framework applies identical concepts to physical systems (stars, rivers), biological systems (organisms, ecosystems), and information-processing systems (measurement devices, cognitive systems). The common vocabulary reveals structural analogies obscured by domain-specific terminology.

4 A Taxonomy of Transformational Modes

Structural transformation takes different forms depending on which degrees of freedom are predominantly reconfigured. I distinguish three primary modes:

4.1 Dissipative Transformation

Definition 6 (Dissipative Transformation). *A transformation is* ***dissipative*** *if the environmental degrees of freedom reconfigured are primarily energetic: temperature gradients, pressure differentials, electromagnetic field configurations.*

Examples: hurricanes dissipating thermal gradients, convection cells processing temperature differentials, Bénard cells organizing flow patterns.

In dissipative transformation, the "prior structure" being transformed is the organization of energy distributions. A hurricane maintains its structure by homogenizing the temperature differential between ocean and atmosphere. The organized energy distribution is the structural input; the more uniform distribution is the structural output.

4.2 Consumptive Transformation

Definition 7 (Consumptive Transformation). *A transformation is* ***consumptive*** *if the environmental degrees of freedom reconfigured are primarily material: chemical bonds, molecular configurations, tissue architectures.*

Examples: metabolism, combustion, corrosion, digestion.

Consumptive transformation is the paradigm case for biological systems. An organism maintains its molecular organization by dismantling the molecular organization of nutrients. The specificity of consumptive transformation—which bonds are broken, which molecules are reassembled—is precisely what distinguishes structural transformation from entropy accounting.

4.3 Observational Transformation

Definition 8 (Observational Transformation). *A transformation is* ***observational*** *if the environmental degrees of freedom reconfigured are primarily informational: memory* *states, correlation structures, phase relationships.*

Examples: measurement, computation, learning, memory consolidation.

The thermodynamic basis for observational transformation is Landauer's principle: erasing one bit of information requires dissipating at least $kT \ln 2$ of energy [Landauer, 1961]. Any system that accumulates information (records measurements, forms memories, learns) must erase prior informational states, and this erasure has irreducible thermodynamic cost.

Important clarification: The claim that "observation transforms" is a *minimal physical claim*, not a metaphysical thesis about all possible observation. Specifically: any observation that leaves a persistent record necessarily involves erasure of prior states in the recording medium, which by Landauer's principle has non-zero thermodynamic cost. This is distinct from:

- Quantum measurement collapse (which is a separate phenomenon)
- Claims about whether idealized, non-recording "observations" are conceivable
- Epistemological claims about the neutrality of knowledge

The framework's claim is conservative: *recorded* observation necessarily transforms. Whether unrecorded observation is meaningful or possible is a separate question.

4.4 Classification Criteria

Processes may involve multiple transformation types. Classification depends on which degrees of freedom account for the dominant entropy production:

Mode	Primary DoF	Characteristic
Dissipative	Energetic	Gradient homogenization
Consumptive	Material	Bond rearrangement
Observational	Informational	State erasure

5 Physical Systems: Quantitative Analysis

5.1 Stars: A Careful Treatment

Stellar persistence presents an apparent counterexample: nuclear fusion creates heavier, more complex elements from simpler hydrogen. How does this fit "transformation of prior structure"?

The resolution requires distinguishing levels of description:

Gravitational structure. A star forms from the gravitational collapse of a diffuse gas cloud. The cloud possesses gravitational potential energy in virtue of its spatial configuration. Stellar persistence requires continuous conversion of this gravitational potential into thermal and radiative energy. The "prior structure" being transformed is the gravitationally stratified matter distribution.

Nuclear structure. Fusion does increase local nuclear complexity (binding energy per nucleon increases up to iron). However, this complexity increase is a *byproduct* of the dissipative process, not its driver. The star persists by maintaining hydrostatic equilibrium against gravity; fusion provides the energy for this, but the process overall converts organized gravitational potential into disorganized radiation.

Quantitative accounting. A main-sequence star like the Sun converts approximately 4×10^9 kg of mass to energy per second via $E = mc^2$. The entropy increase in the radiated photon field vastly exceeds any entropy decrease associated with nuclear binding. Net: massive structural transformation of the gravitational/nuclear configuration into radiation.

The stellar example illustrates that structural transformation may produce *local* complexity increases while still requiring *net* structural transformation of prior organization.

5.2 Crystal Growth: An Edge Case

Crystal growth from supersaturated solution tests the framework's limits. A growing crystal increases its own order; what "prior structure" is transformed?

Analysis: The supersaturated solution possesses chemical potential in virtue of its metastable configuration. Crystallization releases this potential, increasing entropy in the surrounding solvent (heat of crystallization). The "prior structure" is the non-equilibrium chemical potential of the solution. Crystal growth transforms this metastable organization into stable crystal plus thermalized solvent.

This case emphasizes that "prior structure" need not be visually obvious organization—it can be chemical or thermodynamic organization invisible to macroscopic observation.

5.3 Bénard Cells

Rayleigh-Bénard convection cells form in fluid layers heated from below. The cells are highly organized structures that arise spontaneously.

Analysis: The cells persist by transforming the thermal gradient (prior structure) into convective flow plus dissipated heat (transformed structure). The organized temperature differential is the structural input; the more uniform temperature distribution (with pattern-forming convection as intermediate) is the output.

Quantitatively, Bénard cells arise when the Rayleigh number $Ra = \frac{g\beta\Delta T L^3}{\nu\alpha}$ exceeds a critical threshold (~ 1708 for rigid boundaries). The entropy production rate in the convecting regime exceeds that of pure conduction, confirming that the pattern formation serves to accelerate structural transformation of the thermal gradient.

6 Biological Systems: Metabolism as Structural Transformation

6.1 Trophic Cascades and Transformation Scaling

The food web distributes structural transformation across trophic levels. At each level, approximately 90% of energy is dissipated rather than incorporated into biomass [Lindeman, 1942]. This "10% rule" is an approximate ecological heuristic with considerable variation (actual efficiencies range from 5–20% depending on taxon and ecosystem), but the order of magnitude is robust.

From the structural transformation perspective, this inefficiency reveals a scaling law:

$$\mathcal{T}_n = \frac{\mathcal{T}_0}{\eta^n} \tag{7}$$

where $\mathcal{T}_n$ is the structural transformation required to support trophic level n, $\mathcal{T}_0$ is primary production, and $\eta \approx 0.1$ is the trophic efficiency.

For a tertiary consumer ($n = 3$): $\mathcal{T}_3 = \mathcal{T}_0/0.001 = 1000\mathcal{T}_0$. A wolf's persistence requires transforming approximately 1000 times its body mass worth of primary production over its lifetime.

This quantifies the framework's claim that complex organization "costs" more structural transformation than simple organization—not merely more energy, but more prior-structure-dismantled.

6.2 Autopoiesis and the Bacterial Chemostat

Maturana and Varela's autopoiesis [Maturana & Varela, 1980] describes self-producing systems. The structural transformation framework externalizes what autopoiesis treats as internal: the environmental conditions for self-production.

Consider a bacterium in a chemostat (continuous culture with constant nutrient inflow). The bacterium maintains its organization (autopoietically produces its components) by:

1. Importing glucose molecules with organized chemical structure
2. Catabolizing glucose to extract free energy
3. Using energy and molecular fragments to synthesize bacterial components
4. Exporting CO_2, H_2O, and waste (lower-organization molecules)

The transformation rate can be measured: for *E. coli* growing at maximum rate ($\mu \approx 1$ h^{-1}), approximately 10^9 glucose molecules per cell per second are transformed. This is the quantitative face of structural transformation for bacterial persistence.

7 Information and Observation

7.1 Landauer's Principle and Its Implications

Landauer's principle states that erasing one bit of information dissipates at least:

$$E_{\min} = kT \ln 2 \approx 2.9 \times 10^{-21} \text{ J at 300 K} \tag{8}$$

This principle, proposed in 1961, received direct experimental verification only recently. Bérut et al. [Bérut et al., 2012] provided the first experimental proof using a colloidal particle in a double-well potential. Subsequent work in quantum thermodynamics [Reeb & Wolf, 2014] has generalized the principle and established finite-size corrections.

This is not merely an energy cost but a *structural transformation cost*: the memory medium must transition between distinguishable macrostates (corresponding to 0 vs. 1), and this transition is coupled to environmental entropy increase.

Modern computers operate $\sim 10^6$ times above the Landauer limit [Frank, 2017]. This gap represents both inefficiency and opportunity: computation could in principle approach the thermodynamic minimum asymptotically.

7.2 Memory and Learning as Transformation

Any system that learns—that accumulates information about its environment—must continuously erase prior states to encode new ones. This is not a contingent feature of particular memory technologies but a thermodynamic necessity.

For biological memory, the transformation cost is higher than Landauer's minimum due to the biochemical complexity of synaptic modification. Estimates suggest $\sim 10^4$ ATP molecules per synaptic modification event [Harris et al., 2012], corresponding to $\sim 10^{-16}$ J—many orders of magnitude above Landauer's limit but still finite and measurable.

7.3 Clarification: Classical vs. Quantum

The observational transformation framework is *classical thermodynamic*, not specifically quantum. While quantum measurement introduces additional considerations (collapse, decoherence), the core claim—that recorded observation has structural transformation costs—follows from classical thermodynamics alone.

This is important because it means the framework's claims are:

- Well-established (Landauer's principle is experimentally confirmed [Bérut et al., 2012])
- Not dependent on interpretations of quantum mechanics
- Applicable to macroscopic measurement and recording systems

8 Human Awareness: Phenomenological Extensions

Methodological note: This section transitions from established physical and biological claims to phenomenological interpretation and hypothesis generation. Claims here are clearly labeled as either (a) established findings, (b) interpretive frameworks, or (c) speculative hypotheses requiring empirical investigation.

Formal connection: The phenomena discussed in this section are applications of the formal framework from Section 2. Specifically:

- Human metabolism is an instance of *consumptive transformation* (Section 4.2)
- Human cognition and awareness are instances of *observational transformation* (Section 4.3)
- The neurochemistry of consumption reward represents the biological implementation of transformation-maintaining mechanisms

The phenomenological extensions explore how these formal categories manifest in conscious experience.

8.1 Established: Neurochemistry of Consumption

Food consumption activates reward circuitry through well-documented pathways [Kringelbach & Berridge, 2009]:

- **Dopamine:** anticipation and motivation (established)

- **Serotonin:** satiation and well-being (established)
- **Endorphins:** hedonic response (established)
- **Oxytocin:** social bonding in communal eating (established)

These same systems mediate other rewarding experiences [Fisher et al., 2006]. This creates an established fact: structural transformation (consumption) is neurochemically rewarded in humans.

8.2 Established: Hedonic Adaptation

Hedonic adaptation—the return of subjective well-being to baseline despite changed circumstances—is well-documented [Frederick & Loewenstein, 1999]. Applied to consumption: repeated exposure to a food reduces its hedonic impact. More consumption does not produce proportionally more satisfaction.

Interpretation (not established): Hedonic adaptation represents a form of "dissipative inefficiency" in the sense that transformation rate can increase without corresponding increase in functional output (subjective well-being). This interpretation is consistent with data but not uniquely required by it.

8.3 Interpretation: Cultural Ambivalence

Cultures exhibit widespread ambivalence toward consumption: simultaneous valorization of abundance and restraint. This is an observable pattern.

Interpretive hypothesis: This ambivalence may reflect the ontological situation identified by structural transformation theory—humans depend on transformation but (uniquely among organisms?) can reflectively evaluate this dependence. This interpretation organizes the cultural data but does not uniquely predict it.

8.4 Speculative Hypothesis: Eating Disorders

The following is explicitly speculative and offered as a hypothesis for empirical investigation, not as established explanation.

Eating disorders might be interpreted through the structural transformation framework as dysfunctional responses to awareness of transformational dependence:

- **Anorexia:** attempted transformation minimization beyond viable limits
- **Bulimia:** cyclical acceptance/rejection of transformational necessity
- **Orthorexia:** attempted moral purification of necessary transformation

Relation to established etiology: This interpretation is offered as *complementary to*, not replacing, established models (genetic, developmental, sociocultural, cognitive-behavioral). Eating disorders have substantial heritability ($\sim$ 50–80%) and complex multifactorial etiology. The structural transformation interpretation may capture phenomenological aspects of patient experience without explaining ultimate causes.

Empirical test: The hypothesis predicts that individuals with eating disorders should exhibit heightened awareness of or distress regarding the consumptive nature of existence, controlling for general distress. This could be tested via targeted questionnaires or qualitative interview analysis. To my knowledge, this specific prediction has not been tested.

Supporting observation (weak): Eating disorders are associated with elevated disgust sensitivity, including self-directed disgust [Troop et al., 2002]. Recent neuroimaging studies show that individuals with anorexia nervosa have altered prediction error signaling in the brain's reward circuits [Kaye et al., 2021]. Research on interoceptive awareness suggests that eating disorders involve a mismatch between body signals and conscious awareness [Khalsa et al., 2015]—consistent with the framework's suggestion that the "anxiety of consumption" has neurobiological correlates. Some first-person accounts describe wishes to "take up less space" or "minimize impact." These findings are consistent with but do not confirm the hypothesis.

8.5 Artificial Intelligence as Transformational System

The structural transformation framework applies reflexively to the computational systems used to develop it. Artificial intelligence is not exempt from transformational necessity; it is among its most intensive contemporary manifestations.

Computational transformation is physical. Every AI response requires the physical erasure and rewriting of electrical states in silicon. This is not metaphorical: by Landauer's principle, each bit operation has an irreducible thermodynamic cost. A large language model inference involving $\sim 10^{11}$ operations dissipates energy far above the Landauer minimum—current estimates suggest ~ 0.1–1 kWh per complex query for frontier models [Patterson et al., 2021], corresponding to $\sim 10^{23}$ bit operations at $\sim 10^{6}$ times the theoretical minimum per operation.

Energy sources embed prior transformations. The electricity powering AI computation derives from antecedent structural transformations:

- **Fossil fuels:** combustion of ancient biomass—concentrated organic structure accumulated over 10^8 years, transformed in milliseconds
- **Nuclear:** fission of heavy nuclei synthesized in stellar explosions—transformation of stellar-processed matter
- **Solar/wind:** capture of stellar radiation—transformation of hydrogen fusion products

Every computational act thus sits atop a cascade of prior transformations extending back through geological and cosmological time.

AI as entropy accelerator. Computation converts highly ordered energy (electrical potential, chemical bonds) into disordered heat at extraordinary rates. A single large AI training run may consume $\sim 10^6$ kWh [Strubell et al., 2019]—equivalent to the lifetime energy consumption of several humans, compressed into weeks.

From the structural transformation perspective, AI represents a novel regime: *informational* persistence (maintaining model weights, generating coherent outputs) sustained by *massive material* transformation. The ratio of informational organization maintained to physical structure transformed may be less favorable than biological cognition, which operates at ~ 20 watts for comparable (arguably superior) general intelligence.

The reflexive observation. This paper was partially developed using AI assistance. The theoretical framework describing transformational necessity was itself produced through transformational processes—electrical states rewritten, heat dissipated, prior structure dismantled. The framework is not external to its subject matter; it is an instance of it.

This is not a contradiction but a confirmation: even the articulation of transformational necessity requires transformation. There is no view from nowhere, no cost-free observation, no persistence without structural change—including the persistence of ideas.

AI is a machine that turns meaning into entropy. More precisely: AI maintains informational structure (coherent outputs, preserved knowledge, generated insights) by transforming physical structure (electrical states, thermal gradients, ultimately the chemical bonds in power sources). It is structural transformation made computationally explicit.

9 Theoretical Limits and the Transformation Metric

9.1 Defining Minimum Transformation

The framework implies that persistence cannot be transformation-free, but it can approach a minimum. This minimum depends on:

1. The entropy deficit of the maintained structure relative to equilibrium
2. The efficiency of the transformation process
3. The "quality" of the transformation source (concentrated vs. diffuse)

9.2 Phototrophs as Limit Case

Photosynthetic organisms transform diffuse electromagnetic radiation (sunlight) and simple molecules (CO_2, H_2O) rather than concentrated organic structure. In the framework's terms, they approach a transformation minimum by:

- Using maximally diffuse energy input (solar photons)
- Transforming low-complexity molecular structure (not other organisms)

Photosynthetic efficiency is ~ 3–6% for most plants (ratio of chemical energy stored to solar energy absorbed). The remaining $\sim 95\%$ is dissipated. Even the most efficient phototroph still requires substantial transformation—but of *diffuse* rather than *concentrated* prior structure.

9.3 Tentative Hypothesis: Creative Activity

The following is explicitly conjectural and offered as a research direction, not an established result.

Creative absorption (artistic production, intellectual work, problem-solving in "flow" states) might represent a mode of existence with optimized transformation efficiency:

- High internal organization (cognitive coherence, productive output)

- Potentially reduced marginal consumptive drive (anecdotally, reduced eating/restlessness during absorption)
- Endogenous reward generation (dopamine release from task engagement itself) [Csikszentmihalyi, 1990, Dietrich, 2004]

What would confirm this hypothesis:

- Metabolic studies showing reduced total energy expenditure during creative vs. non-creative cognitive tasks of comparable difficulty
- Behavioral studies showing reduced consumption-seeking behavior following creative engagement
- Neuroimaging showing reward system activation during creation without consumption

Current evidence: Limited and indirect. Flow states are associated with altered time perception and reduced awareness of bodily needs [Csikszentmihalyi, 1990], but direct metabolic comparisons are lacking. This remains a hypothesis, not a finding.

9.4 Technological Implications

Human technology has shifted energy sourcing toward phototroph-like patterns: solar panels, wind turbines, and other systems capturing diffuse energy flows rather than concentrated structures (fossil fuels).

This can be understood as civilizational approach to transformation minimum: replacing high-transformation inputs (concentrated fossil hydrocarbons accumulated over geological time) with lower-transformation inputs (diffuse contemporary solar radiation).

Full approach to the theoretical minimum would require:

- Complete transition to diffuse-energy capture
- Material economy based on recycling (closed-loop transformation)
- Information processing approaching Landauer limit

Whether such limits are achievable is empirically uncertain; that they are theoretically characterizable provides a framework for evaluation.

10 The Ouroboros Reconciled: Atemporality and Self-Creation

Conceptual Extension

This section is a philosophical extension, not a derived consequence of the formal framework. It explores the *limit case* where structural transformation theory meets the theory of cyclical hierarchical systems. The claims here go beyond what Sections 2–8 establish and should be evaluated independently. Readers primarily interested in the physical and biological applications may skip this section without loss of the paper's core arguments.

10.1 The Apparent Paradox

The framework developed above appears to contain a tension. Persistence requires transformation: every structured system maintains itself by transforming prior structure. Yet certain systems—autopoietic organisms, metabolic cycles, perhaps consciousness itself—appear to persist *through themselves*, their outputs becoming their inputs, their products their preconditions.

How can a system transform to persist if what it transforms is what enables its transformation? Temporally, this seems paradoxical.

10.2 The Ouroboros Misread

The ouroboros—the serpent forming a circle with its tail in its mouth—has traditionally been read as depicting self-consumption: the serpent eating itself, destruction as the price of continuation.

This reading is a **category error**. It imposes a temporal, sequential interpretation onto what is fundamentally a structural, simultaneous configuration.

The ouroboros does not depict:

- A serpent *eating* its tail (sequential destruction)
- One part consuming another (predator-prey relation)
- Tragic self-depletion (temporal exhaustion)

The ouroboros depicts:

- A *closed topology* (structural completeness)
- Mutual determination of parts (head defines tail, tail defines head)
- Self-sufficiency without external foundation

10.3 Structural Blocks, Not Sequential Consumption

The correct interpretation is architectural, not alimentary.

Imagine the ouroboros not as a serpent frozen mid-bite, but as a **diagram of structural relations**—like interlocking blocks where each block's position is defined by the others:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{Block A} & \leftrightarrow & \text{Block B} \\ \updownarrow & & \updownarrow \\ \text{Block D} & \leftrightarrow & \text{Block C} \end{array}$$

No block "consumes" another. Each block's existence is *co-determined* by the others. The structure is given whole, not assembled sequentially.

The serpent's circular form represents this same principle: the "head" and "tail" are not sequential positions (first/last) but **relational roles** in a closed configuration. They exist simultaneously, defining each other.

10.4 Mathematical Formalization

The mathematical framework of cyclical hierarchical systems [Kriger, 2024] makes this precise. A cyclically closed hierarchy of order n satisfies:

$$S_1 = F_1(S_2), \quad S_2 = F_2(S_3), \quad \ldots, \quad S_n = F_n(S_1) \tag{9}$$

This is equivalent to the composite operator $\Phi = F_1 \circ F_2 \circ \cdots \circ F_n$ having a fixed point: $\Phi(S_1) = S_1$.

Crucially: the fixed point is not *reached* through temporal iteration. It *is* the structure—the configuration where all determination relations are simultaneously satisfied. The equations describe **simultaneous constraints**, not sequential processes.

This is the mathematical content of the ouroboros: a system of mutual determinations that is self-consistent without external ground.

10.5 Atemporality as Resolution

Only atemporality reconciles transformation and self-sufficiency.

In temporal frame:

- Transformation is sequential: A changes into B, then B into C
- This generates regress: what transformed into the first thing?
- Or requires brute beginning: something exists untransformed

In atemporal frame:

- "Transformation" becomes *relation*: A determines B, B determines C, C determines A
- No regress because no sequence—all relations hold simultaneously
- No brute beginning because no beginning at all

The question "what came first?" presupposes temporal ordering. Applied to closed atemporal structures, it is category error—like asking what is north of the North Pole. The question is grammatically valid but structurally inapplicable.

10.6 The Limit Case of Structural Transformation

This analysis identifies the **limit case** of structural transformation theory:

Open systems (general case): Transformation is temporal. The organism destroys nutrients that existed independently before being destroyed. The Equivalence Principle compares distinct structures across time.

Closed systems (limit case): "Transformation" becomes relational rather than temporal. The system's persistence conditions are internal to its topology. The Equivalence Principle is satisfied trivially:

$$\Sigma(\Omega_{\text{system}}) = \Sigma(\Omega_{\text{system}}) \tag{10}$$

The system's "output" is its "input" not sequentially but structurally. What is "transformed" is what is "maintained"—they are the same structure viewed from different relational positions.

Intermediate systems (typical case): Most actual systems are partially closed. An organism is closed in its autopoietic organization but open in its material exchange. A mind is closed in its self-model but open in its environmental coupling. The framework applies differently at different levels of description.

10.7 Conclusion: Self-Constitution, Not Self-Consumption

The ouroboros, rightly understood, is not a symbol of self-destruction but of **structural self-sufficiency**:

- Not consumption but constitution
- Not sequence but simultaneity
- Not one part eating another but all parts co-defining each other
- Not the serpent that devours itself but the structure that *is* itself

The structural transformation framework, applied to its own limit case, reveals: where the topology is closed and the relations are atemporal, "transformation" is not destruction-and-creation but *identity*—the structure's self-consistency across all its internal relations.

The serpent is not eating. It is being. The circle is not a process. It is a form.

11 The Equivalence Principle: An Ontological Classification

The structural transformation framework yields an unavoidable ontological fact: persistence requires transformation. No system maintains itself without transforming prior structure. This is thermodynamic necessity.

Given this necessity, we can introduce an ontological classification of processes based on their structural balance:

The Equivalence Principle

Given that transformation is unavoidable, processes divide into two ontological kinds: those where the effective complexity of what is created/maintained matches or exceeds what is transformed (structural persistence), and those where it does not (net dissipation).

11.1 Clarification: Classification, Not Derivation

The Equivalence Principle is an *introduced classification* motivated by thermodynamic constraints, not a principle uniquely forced by them. Thermodynamics tells us transformation must occur; it does not by itself tell us how to evaluate the structural balance. The classification becomes meaningful once we adopt a measure of structural significance (Σ).

This is analogous to how the second law tells us entropy increases but does not by itself define "order" or "complexity"—those require additional conceptual apparatus. The Equivalence Principle provides such apparatus for structural transformation theory.

11.2 The Two Kinds of Processes

Given a structural significance measure Σ, processes divide into:

$$\Sigma(\Omega_{\text{maintained}}) + \Sigma(\Omega_{\text{created}}) \geq \Sigma(\Omega_{\text{transformed}}) \tag{11}$$

When this inequality holds, the process constitutes **structural persistence**—organization maintaining itself through transformation.

When it fails:

$$\Sigma(\Omega_{\text{maintained}}) + \Sigma(\Omega_{\text{created}}) < \Sigma(\Omega_{\text{transformed}}) \tag{12}$$

the process constitutes **net dissipation**—destruction exceeding creation. This is not wrong; it is simply what entropy increase looks like at the structural level.

11.3 Structural Significance: Effective Complexity

What counts as "significance"? The Equivalence Principle requires a measure $\Sigma(\Omega)$ that is not arbitrary. We adopt **effective complexity** [Gell-Mann & Lloyd, 1996] as the foundational concept.

Definition 9 (Effective Complexity). *The **effective complexity** of a structure Ω is the length of a highly compressed description of its regularities—the algorithmic information required to specify the ensemble of which Ω is a typical member, excluding random or incompressible components.*

Effective complexity captures what neither entropy nor raw information content captures:

System	Entropy	Information	Eff. Complexity
Random gas	High	High	Low
Perfect crystal	Low	Low	Low
Living organism	Intermediate	High	High

A random gas has high entropy but low effective complexity (no regularities to describe—just "random"). A perfect crystal has low entropy but also low effective complexity (simple rule: "repeat unit cell"). A living organism has intermediate entropy but high effective complexity (many interrelated, non-random regularities requiring lengthy description).

Formal properties: We require Σ to satisfy:

1. **Monotonicity:** Σ increases with effective complexity
2. **Additivity:** For independent structures, $\Sigma(\Omega_1 \cup \Omega_2) = \Sigma(\Omega_1) + \Sigma(\Omega_2)$
3. **Invariance:** Σ is invariant under re-description that preserves structure

Operationalization: In practice, effective complexity can be approximated by:

- Compression ratio of structural description
- Depth of hierarchical organization
- Number of functionally distinct components and their interrelations

11.4 Σ as a Class of Measures: Invariance of the Equivalence Principle

Critical clarification: Σ is not a single function but a *class of admissible measures*. The Equivalence Principle is formulated to be **invariant to the choice of measure within this class**.

Proposition 2 (Classification Invariance)**.** *Let Σ_1 and Σ_2 be two measures satisfying properties (1)–(3) above. Then for any process P, if Σ_1 classifies P as structural persistence, so does Σ_2, and vice versa.*

Sketch. Both measures are monotonic in effective complexity. Therefore, if Ω_A has greater effective complexity than Ω_B, both $\Sigma_1(\Omega_A) > \Sigma_1(\Omega_B)$ and $\Sigma_2(\Omega_A) > \Sigma_2(\Omega_B)$. The classification depends only on the *ordering* of structures by complexity, not on their numerical values. Since both measures preserve the same ordering (by monotonicity), they agree on which side of inequality (10) any process falls.

The numerical values of Σ may differ between measures, but the classification—persistence vs. dissipation—depends only on the direction of the inequality, which is preserved by any monotonic transformation. □

This invariance is analogous to how utility theory in economics depends on ordinal preferences, not cardinal utilities. Different utility functions representing the same preference ordering yield identical choice predictions. Similarly, different Σ functions satisfying properties (1)–(3) yield identical persistence/dissipation classifications.

What remains measure-dependent: The *degree* to which a process exceeds or falls short of equivalence is measure-dependent. Whether a process is "barely persistent" or "strongly persistent" depends on the specific Σ chosen. But the binary classification—persistence or dissipation—is invariant.

Acknowledgment of limitations: Effective complexity itself has known limitations [Gell-Mann & Lloyd, 1996]: it is not computable in general (identifying the "ensemble" requires inductive inference), and what counts as "regularity" can be observer-dependent. These are genuine constraints on operationalizing the Equivalence Principle, but they do not affect its conceptual content or its invariance within the class of admissible measures.

11.5 Applications

Biological metabolism. An organism transforms nutrients (Ω_E) to maintain itself (Ω_S). When the organism's structural complexity exceeds that of its food (typically true: organisms are more organized than their nutrients), equivalence holds. Metabolism is structural persistence, not mere dissipation.

Trophic cascades. A wolf transforms deer to maintain itself. Both are comparably complex organisms. Equivalence is approximate. But the wolf also maintains ecosystem structure (predator-prey dynamics, population regulation)—the full $\Sigma_{\text{maintained}}$ includes systemic effects.

Artificial intelligence. AI transforms vast energy (Ω_E: organized chemical/nuclear structure in fuel) to produce outputs (Ω_{created}: information, solutions, text). The question is structural: does the informational organization created match the physical organization transformed? This is measurable in principle, though difficult in practice.

Human existence. A human life transforms enormous prior structure (food, materials, energy) over decades. The structural question: does the organization maintained and created (the person's functional capacity, their contributions, their effects) match what is transformed? This is not a moral question but a structural accounting.

11.6 The Neutral Framework

The Equivalence Principle carries no moral weight. It does not say destruction is bad, or that equivalence is good. It says:

- Processes satisfying equivalence = structural persistence
- Processes violating equivalence = net dissipation

Both occur. Both are physically permitted. The universe contains both structure-maintaining and structure-degrading processes. The principle simply distinguishes them.

If one *prefers* structural persistence to net dissipation—if one finds the maintenance and creation of organization more interesting than its destruction—then equivalence becomes a criterion of interest. But this preference is not derivable from physics. It is simply what it means to care about structure.

11.7 Why This Matters

The Equivalence Principle matters not because it prescribes but because it *clarifies.* It makes explicit what is otherwise implicit:

- Every persistent structure has a transformation cost
- This cost is measurable (in principle) as structural significance destroyed
- Persistence is "worth it" structurally when creation matches destruction
- Otherwise, the process is dissipation wearing the mask of persistence

This clarity is useful. It allows precise questions: What is the structural cost of this activity? What is the structural product? Do they balance?

These are not moral questions. They are structural questions with structural answers. The framework provides the vocabulary to ask them.

11.8 The Weight of Structure

The Equivalence Principle gives formal expression to something that can be observed but is rarely articulated: that maintaining complex organization is *expensive* in structural terms, and that this expense is only "paid for" (structurally, not morally) when the maintained organization is genuinely significant.

A star transforms hydrogen to maintain stellar structure—equivalence holds (stellar organization is highly significant). A fire transforms wood to maintain combustion—equivalence may or may not hold depending on what the fire enables. A mind transforms metabolic resources to maintain thought—equivalence depends on the thought.

The principle does not judge. It measures. And in measuring, it reveals the structural economy underlying all persistence.

If destruction cannot be avoided, creation determines what kind of process this is: persistence or dissipation. The physics is indifferent. The structure is not.

12 Conclusions and Open Questions

12.1 Summary of Claims by Epistemic Status

Derived from established physics:

- Persistence of organized structure requires entropy export (second law)
- Entropy export entails transformation of environmental structure (Section 2)
- Information recording has irreducible transformation cost (Landauer)

Theoretically grounded extensions:

- Taxonomy of transformation modes (dissipative, consumptive, observational)
- Transformation rate as quantifiable metric
- Trophic scaling of transformation costs

Interpretive frameworks:

- Human cultural ambivalence as reflection of transformational awareness
- Hedonic adaptation as "dissipative inefficiency"
- Asceticism as attempted transformation minimization

Speculative hypotheses requiring empirical test:

- Eating disorders as pathological responses to transformational awareness
- Creative activity as high-organization, low-transformation mode

12.2 Testable Predictions

The framework generates several testable predictions:

1. **Transformation rate measurement:** For any self-maintaining system, a transformation rate $\mathcal{T}$ can be defined and measured (in appropriate units: molecular bonds rearranged per second, bits erased per second, etc.).
2. **Minimum transformation bound:** Systems maintaining greater entropy deficits (more improbable organization) require higher transformation rates. This should be quantifiable across systems.
3. **Eating disorder phenomenology:** If the framework's interpretation is correct, individuals with eating disorders should report elevated awareness of or distress regarding consumption-as-destruction, beyond general anxiety levels.
4. **Creative activity metabolism:** If the creative-activity hypothesis is correct, creative engagement should show reduced marginal consumption-seeking behavior compared to other activities with equivalent reward-system activation.

12.3 Open Questions

1. **Formalization:** Can the transformation rate $\mathcal{T}$ be given a fully rigorous definition across domains, or does it remain domain-specific?

2. **Optimization criterion:** When is lower transformation rate "better"? The framework describes but does not evaluate. What normative principles might apply?

3. **Collective systems:** How does transformation scale for social systems, institutions, civilizations? Do collective structures obey analogous transformation requirements?

4. **Artificial systems:** As AI systems become more sophisticated, what transformation rates do they require? Does the framework apply to digital persistence?

12.4 Concluding Remarks

Structured persistence is not passive being but active transformation. This is not a metaphor but a derivable consequence of thermodynamic and information-theoretic constraints. Whatever maintains organization—physical, biological, informational—does so by reconfiguring prior states in its environment.

The structural transformation framework offers more than entropy accounting: it characterizes *which* structures change, *how* the transformation burden is distributed, and *why* the specificity matters for understanding persistence across domains.

Humans may be unique in recognizing their transformational condition. This recognition creates the possibility of evaluation, choice, and optimization. The question is not whether to participate in structural transformation—that is thermodynamically mandatory—but how to participate: at what rate, at what scope, with what awareness, and with what aspiration toward the theoretical limits where persistence requires minimal destruction.

To exist is to transform. What remains is to transform as wisely as the laws of physics permit.

References

Arcelus, J., Mitchell, A. J., Wales, J., & Nielsen, S. (2011). Mortality rates in patients with anorexia nervosa and other eating disorders: A meta-analysis of 36 studies. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 68(7), 724–731.

Bennett, C. H. (1982). The thermodynamics of computation—a review. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21(12), 905–940.

Bérut, A., Arakelyan, A., Petrosyan, A., Ciliberto, S., Dillenschneider, R., & Lutz, E. (2012). Experimental verification of Landauer's principle linking information and thermodynamics. *Nature*, 483(7388), 187–189.

Crooks, G. E. (1999). Entropy production fluctuation theorem and the nonequilibrium work relation for free energy differences. *Physical Review E*, 60(3), 2721–2726.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: The Psychology of Optimal Experience.* Harper & Row.

Dietrich, A. (2004). Neurocognitive mechanisms underlying the experience of flow. *Consciousness and Cognition*, 13(4), 746–761.

England, J. L. (2013). Statistical physics of self-replication. *The Journal of Chemical Physics*, 139(12), 121923.

England, J. L. (2017). Dissipative adaptation in driven self-assembly. *Nature Nanotechnology*, 12(10), 919–922.

Fisher, H. E., Aron, A., & Brown, L. L. (2006). Romantic love: A mammalian brain system for mate choice. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B*, 361(1476), 2173–2186.

Frank, M. P. (2017). Throwing computing into reverse. *IEEE Spectrum*, 54(9), 32–37.

Frederick, S., & Loewenstein, G. (1999). Hedonic adaptation. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 302–329). Russell Sage Foundation.

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.

Gell-Mann, M., & Lloyd, S. (1996). Information measures, effective complexity, and total information. *Complexity*, 2(1), 44–52.

Harris, J. J., Jolivet, R., & Bhalla, U. S. (2012). Synaptic energy use and supply. *Neuron*, 75(5), 762–777.

Jarzynski, C. (1997). Nonequilibrium equality for free energy differences. *Physical Review Letters*, 78(14), 2690–2693.

Kaye, W. H., Wierenga, C. E., Bischoff-Grethe, A., Berner, L. A., Ely, A. V., & Bailer, U. F. (2021). Reward processing in anorexia nervosa: Translational research informing treatment. *Current Topics in Behavioral Neurosciences*, 49, 285–309.

Khalsa, S. S., Craske, M. G., Li, W., Vangala, S., Strober, M., & Feusner, J. D. (2015). Altered interoceptive awareness in anorexia nervosa: Effects of meal anticipation, consumption and bodily arousal. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 48(7), 889–897.

Kringelbach, M. L., & Berridge, K. C. (2009). *Pleasures of the Brain*. Oxford University Press.

Kriger, B. (2024). Cyclical hierarchical systems: A modal analysis of self-sufficient structures. *Zenodo*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18317628.

Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3), 183–191.

Lindeman, R. L. (1942). The trophic-dynamic aspect of ecology. *Ecology*, 23(4), 399–417.

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and Cognition: The Realization of the Living*. D. Reidel.

Patterson, D., Gonzalez, J., Le, Q., Liang, C., Munguia, L. M., Rothchild, D., ... & Dean, J. (2021). Carbon emissions and large neural network training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.10350.*

Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature*. Bantam.

Reeb, D., & Wolf, M. M. (2014). An improved Landauer principle with finite-size corrections. *New Journal of Physics*, 16(10), 103011.

Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What is Life? The Physical Aspect of the Living Cell.* Cambridge University Press.

Strubell, E., Ganesh, A., & McCallum, A. (2019). Energy and policy considerations for deep learning in NLP. *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 3645–3650.

Troop, N. A., Murphy, F., Bramon, E., & Treasure, J. L. (2002). Disgust sensitivity in eating disorders: A preliminary investigation. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 32(2), 213–218.