The Allure of Quantum Drama

Abstract

This essay explores the symbolic and philosophical implications of quantum theory beyond its mathematical formalism, focusing on the ontological consequences of indeterminacy, relationality, and observation. Drawing on the conceptual tension between presence and absence, the text reframes quantum phenomena as sites of performative ambiguity, where reality is neither fixed nor fully knowable, but always contingent upon interaction and inscription. Rather than presenting quantum theory as an exotic realm of counterintuitive physics, the essay reinterprets it as a dramatic field in which matter itself becomes a script in flux—continuously rewritten through its encounters with measuring apparatuses, language, and interpretation. This approach highlights a deeper affinity between physical indeterminacy and symbolic instability, suggesting that meaning and matter may share a common logic of emergence—a resonance echoed in Karen Barad's agential realism. Rejecting the opposition between the hard sciences and the humanities, the text proposes a transversal perspective in which metaphysics, epistemology, and aesthetics converge. Quantum drama, thus, becomes a conceptual device to rethink the relationship between knowledge, form, and uncertainty. The essay ultimately invites the reader to consider quantum theory not simply as a physical theory of particles, but as a philosophical gesture that deconstructs the very notion of objective description—opening space for a new ontology of becoming, resonance, and situated meaning.

Keywords Selection for Submission:

- Quantum Mechanics
- Ontological Theatre
- Material Agency
- Emergence
- Symbolic Action
- Posthumanism

In our cultural imagination, few concepts have captured the public's fascination quite like quantum physics. Its strange vocabulary—superposition, entanglement, wavefunction collapse—has transcended the laboratories of physicists and settled into the popular lexicon, often stripped of its mathematical rigor and recast as a grand metaphor for uncertainty, possibility, and the limits of human knowledge. In this climate of intellectual seduction, works like *Quantum Drama: From the Bohr–Einstein Debate to the Riddle of Entanglement* readily embrace this cultural narrative.

Co-authored by Jim Baggott and John L. Heilbron, the book positions itself as both a historical chronicle and a philosophical inquiry into the quantum revolution. It promises to illuminate the great debates that have shaped our understanding of the quantum world, tracing their impact from the technical disputes between Niels Bohr and Albert Einstein to the cultural mythologies surrounding Schrödinger's unfortunate cat. And yet, beneath this promise of clarity and insight, *Quantum Drama* ultimately delivers something far more familiar: a seductive dramatization of quantum strangeness that neither advances scientific understanding nor contributes meaningfully to serious philosophical reflection.

This is not merely an academic complaint. In a time when the boundaries between science and speculative philosophy grow increasingly blurred — what Isabelle Stengers might call the transformation of scientific practice into public theatre — where terms like "quantum consciousness" and "observer-created reality" freely circulate through public discourse—there is an urgent need to confront how these concepts are presented to the wider world. *Quantum Drama*, for all its intellectual theatre, becomes a case study in how the careful demarcation between empirical science and philosophical analysis is too often sacrificed on the altar of cultural spectacle.

The fundamental issue lies not in the book's attempt to make quantum physics accessible to a broader audience—that is a worthwhile and necessary endeavour—but in its choice to prioritize narrative appeal over conceptual rigor. It dramatizes historical debates without fully engaging their philosophical stakes. It invokes philosophical concepts without anchoring them in the demanding traditions of epistemological and ontological analysis. And it gestures at scientific explanations while avoiding the mathematical formalism and experimental evidence that give those explanations their weight.

In doing so, *Quantum Drama* exemplifies a broader intellectual trend: the replacement of critical analysis with what might be called a *rhetoric of pseudo-profundity*. This is the art of invoking complexity without resolving it, of conjuring mystery rather than pursuing understanding. It is a mode of discourse that traffics in suggestiveness and ambiguity, content to hover in the twilight between knowledge and speculation—what Michel Serres might frame as the parasitic space of noise and interference—without ever taking the risk of clear, disciplined thought.

In the following analysis, I will argue that this rhetorical mode does more harm than good. I will examine how *Quantum Drama* transforms the real scientific and philosophical problems at the heart of quantum theory into cultural myths, how it misuses or dilutes key philosophical concepts, and how it ultimately retreats from the very intellectual challenges it purports to address.

At a time when the public's appetite for grand narratives and existential mysteries is stronger than ever, we must ask: Are we content to trade precision for spectacle? Are we satisfied with dramatizing the paradoxes of quantum mechanics while avoiding the hard work of conceptual clarification and scientific inquiry? If we are to take both science and philosophy seriously, the answer must be a resounding no.

Historical Context or Historical Fetish?

There is a long and honourable tradition in the history of science of revisiting foundational disputes, not merely to reconstruct what happened, but to clarify what is still at stake. The Bohr–Einstein debates, arguably the most iconic of such episodes in 20th-century physics, offer fertile ground for both historians and philosophers. These were not merely technical disagreements, but deep collisions between epistemological worldviews—Bohr's complementarity and pragmatic acceptance of quantum uncertainty versus Einstein's commitment to realism and causal determinism. Any serious engagement with this debate must respect its depth, ambiguity, and continued relevance. Unfortunately, *Quantum Drama* treats this history not as a site for philosophical excavation, but as a stage for dramatization.

The book devotes substantial space to recounting the correspondence and exchanges between Bohr and Einstein, but this reconstruction remains largely superficial. There is little sustained analysis of the actual philosophical arguments at play—no extended discussion of Bohr's insistence on the indispensability of classical concepts, no

critical engagement with Einstein's use of thought experiments to probe the theory's completeness, and no mention of the tension between local realism and quantum nonlocality that would later be formalized in Bell's inequalities. Instead, these exchanges are presented as part of a larger narrative arc—a dramatic contest of personalities rather than an unresolved clash of foundational ideas.

One passage is especially revealing. In Chapter 3, Baggott and Heilbron describe the 1927 Solvay Conference, where Bohr and Einstein famously clashed over the implications of quantum theory. The authors write:

"Einstein, who was increasingly isolated in his views, offered one thought experiment after another in an attempt to challenge the prevailing orthodoxy. Bohr, calm and unflappable, met each challenge with clever rebuttals, leaving most participants convinced that Einstein's concerns were philosophically outdated."

This account, while not inaccurate in its basic chronology, reduces a complex intellectual exchange to a simplistic narrative of resistance and triumph. It leans heavily on Bohr's rhetorical success without analysing the philosophical cost of his evasiveness. Bohr's responses, as has been documented by later commentators such as John Bell and Don Howard, were often logically opaque and semantically evasive. His triumph at Solvay was, in large part, rhetorical, not analytical. To describe Einstein's interventions as "philosophically outdated" is to echo the very dismissiveness that has prevented generations of physicists from seriously engaging with the conceptual incompleteness of the theory.

More problematically, *Quantum Drama* fails to contextualize these debates within the broader history of philosophy of science. There is no engagement with logical empiricism, no mention of Reichenbach or Carnap, no recognition that the dispute between Bohr and Einstein maps onto fundamental questions about the nature of explanation, the role of probability, and the limits of theoretical representation. The historical narrative remains self-contained, cut off from the deeper philosophical currents that would give it relevance today.

Such an assertion overlooks the ongoing philosophical struggle to reconcile quantum formalism with a coherent metaphysical framework. This isolation of history from philosophy produces a form of historical fetishism. Rather than treating the Bohr–Einstein debates as entry points into current epistemological and ontological questions, the book treats them as episodes of intellectual theatre. The reader is invited to admire the drama, but not to take sides, not to think more deeply about what is at stake. In a telling moment, the authors conclude their account of the debates with the remark:

"Whatever one makes of Einstein's reluctance, it is clear in hindsight that Bohr's view became the default position. The strange world of quantum mechanics had been defended—and domesticated."

But has it? The interpretation of quantum mechanics remains one of the most contested areas in the foundations of physics. From Many-Worlds to QBism, from objective collapse theories to relational interpretations, the question of how to make sense of the formalism remains unresolved. Bohr's "domestication" of quantum strangeness was not a conclusion, but the beginning of a conceptual stalemate that continues to this day. To suggest otherwise is to mistake institutional inertia for philosophical resolution.

In short, the historical treatment offered in *Quantum Drama* flattens the depth of the foundational debates it seeks to recount. It prefers narration over analysis, character over concept, closure over open-ended questioning. It tells us what happened, but not what it means—at least not in any way that could illuminate the ongoing philosophical and scientific work still to be done.

Superposition as Spectacle: The Rhetoric of Quantum Strangeness

Nowhere is the tension between narrative seduction and conceptual clarity more evident than in *Quantum Drama*'s handling of Schrödinger's Cat. This infamous thought experiment—intended by Erwin Schrödinger as a reductio ad absurdum of the Copenhagen interpretation—has, over time, become the most recognizable symbol of quantum "weirdness." Popular culture has enthusiastically adopted the image of the unfortunate feline suspended between life and death, but few treatments pause to consider whether this metaphor clarifies or confounds our understanding of quantum mechanics.

Quantum Drama eagerly embraces this cultural narrative. The cat becomes, in Baggott and Heilbron's hands, not a cautionary tale about the dangers of philosophical sloppiness, but a character in a broader cultural mythology. In Chapter 5, they write:

"The image of the cat, simultaneously dead and alive, has transcended its origins in the rarefied discourse of quantum theorists and now inhabits our collective imagination as a symbol of uncertainty, choice, and the unknowability of outcomes."

This statement is revealing for what it omits. It makes no mention of Schrödinger's original intent, which was not to celebrate quantum indeterminacy but to highlight the absurdity of uncritically extending quantum principles to macroscopic systems. His 1935 paper was a direct response to the incompleteness of the Copenhagen view and a pointed challenge to its defenders. To present the cat simply as a "symbol of uncertainty" is to strip it of its original philosophical and critical power.

Indeed, the very fact that *Quantum Drama* repeatedly references the cat without engaging with the later development of decoherence theory illustrates how the spectacle of paradox is allowed to stand in for genuine explanatory work. Decoherence, while not a final resolution of the measurement problem, offers a sophisticated account of how classical outcomes emerge from quantum superpositions through the entanglement of a system with its environment. While the book briefly acknowledges the concept of decoherence, it does so without exploring its formal implications or the unresolved debates surrounding its sufficiency as a solution to the measurement problem.

This superficial engagement with decoherence exemplifies a larger trend: complex concepts are introduced, gestured at, and then left behind before their full philosophical and scientific implications are unpacked. Rather than asking whether the image of the cat truly represents a meaningful epistemological or ontological challenge, the book seems content to use it as a narrative device—a symbol of profundity rather than a problem to be resolved.

Consider how the book handles the issue of observation and the so-called "collapse" of the wavefunction. At several points, the authors flirt with the idea that the act of observation plays a special role in determining quantum outcomes, only to retreat into ambiguity when pressed for clarification. In Chapter 6, they write:

"The collapse of the wavefunction remains an enigma, a place where the observer and the observed seem inextricably entangled. It is a riddle that has fascinated physicists and philosophers alike and continues to haunt the edges of our understanding."

While such prose is undoubtedly evocative, it is also evasive. The idea that the observer "haunts" the edges of our understanding may satisfy a reader seeking existential mystery, but it does nothing to clarify the very real conceptual problems at hand. Is the observer a necessary agent of collapse, as von Neumann and Wigner once suggested? Or is collapse merely an effective description of decoherence in an open system? The book does not say. Instead, it indulges in what might be called *ontological suggestiveness*—the invitation to marvel at mystery without committing to any serious attempt at resolution.

One cannot help but be reminded here of Carnap's critique of metaphysics as "pseudo-problems arising from the misuse of language." In the absence of clear distinctions between epistemological limits and ontological claims, concepts such as "observation," "collapse," and even "existence" become unmoored from their logical foundations. *Quantum Drama* falls prey to precisely this kind of confusion, using language to create an atmosphere of profundity while failing to subject that language to the rigours of philosophical or scientific analysis.

This rhetorical stance has consequences. By reinforcing the cultural narrative that quantum mechanics is inherently paradoxical and forever beyond rational comprehension, works like *Quantum Drama* discourage the critical engagement that is essential both to science and philosophy. They transform genuine intellectual challenges into spectacles of unresolved mystery, content to marvel rather than to think.

If cultural narratives are to illuminate rather than obscure, we must foster a new ethic of intellectual responsibility—one that favors lucidity over mystification and dialogue over dramatization.

The irony is that, while the book celebrates uncertainty, it does so with a surprising degree of finality. The reader is invited to accept that some mysteries are simply beyond resolution, that the paradox of the cat must remain a paradox, and that any attempt to clarify it may somehow diminish its profundity. This is not the stance of philosophical rigor; it is a retreat into comfortable obscurity.

In the end, the cat remains both dead and alive—but it does so not in the realm of serious physics or philosophy, but in the theatre of cultural mythology.

Philosophical Shallowness Behind Grand Concepts

One of the most troubling features of *Quantum Drama* is its tendency to invoke heavyweight philosophical concepts—*ontology*, *epistemology*, *metaphysics*—without the discipline or clarity those terms demand. This is not merely a stylistic flaw; it reflects a deeper failure to engage with the intellectual traditions that have wrestled with these concepts for centuries. In doing so, the book not only weakens its philosophical credibility but contributes to the ongoing dilution of these terms in public discourse.

Take, for instance, the authors' casual use of the word *ontology*. Throughout the book, the term appears in contexts that suggest profound insight but rarely delivers it. In Chapter 7, the authors state:

"The quantum world resists easy ontological categorization. Is a particle truly a particle, or is it a wave? Or is it something else entirely—something for which our language has no adequate description?"

At first glance, this passage appears to raise an important question about the limits of classical ontology when applied to quantum phenomena. Yet, the authors make no attempt to connect this reflection to the rigorous debates in analytic philosophy regarding the nature of entities, properties, and their modes of existence. There is no mention of Quine's criterion for ontological commitment, no discussion of Putnam's work on conceptual relativity, nor any engagement with the rich literature on scientific realism and anti-realism.

Instead, the question is left hanging in a rhetorical void. It becomes a gesture toward profundity rather than a genuine inquiry into how our ontological frameworks might be adapted or challenged by quantum theory. The possibility that the problem lies not in the inadequacy of language, but in the conceptual laziness of refusing to specify clear ontological commitments, is never entertained.

Similarly, when the authors invoke *epistemology*, it is often to dramatize the unknowability of the quantum realm rather than to explore the actual conditions under which knowledge claims can be made about it. In Chapter 9, we read:

"At the quantum level, reality itself seems to resist being known. Knowledge becomes slippery, contingent, and forever incomplete."

This is a sweeping claim, but it is philosophically imprecise. What does it mean for "reality" to resist knowledge? Are we dealing with an epistemic limitation imposed by our measurement apparatus, as Bohr suggested, or are we confronting a deeper ontological indeterminacy? Is the uncertainty epistemological—about what we can know—or ontological—about what is? These are not minor distinctions; they go to the heart of the philosophy of science and have been rigorously examined in the works of philosophers such as Bas van Fraassen, Nancy Cartwright, and Ian Hacking.

Yet, *Quantum Drama* makes no effort to navigate these distinctions. By collapsing epistemic uncertainty into ontological indeterminacy, the authors fall into a common but hazardous error: mistaking our limitations in knowing for statements about the nature of reality itself. This is precisely the kind of confusion that logical empiricists and later philosophers of science worked so hard to untangle.

The book's handling of *metaphysics* is equally problematic. While the term is used frequently, it remains almost entirely undefined. It is invoked to lend an air of philosophical gravitas to the discussion but never receives the careful treatment it deserves. There is no engagement with the tradition of metaphysical inquiry from Aristotle to Kant to contemporary analytic metaphysics. Instead, the term serves as a kind of intellectual ornamentation, a signal to the reader that something deep is being discussed—even when it is not.

Consider the authors' treatment of the Many-Worlds Interpretation (MWI). They write:

"The multiverse posited by the Many-Worlds Interpretation is perhaps the ultimate metaphysical speculation—a vision of reality in which every possible outcome of every quantum event becomes real in a parallel universe."

And then, abruptly, they move on. There is no sustained reflection on the metaphysical implications of MWI, no exploration of its commitments to modal realism or its challenge to the principle of parsimony. The deep philosophical debates surrounding the coherence, plausibility, and ethical consequences of such a view are simply passed over.

The result is a text that uses philosophical language as a kind of narrative seasoning rather than as the core substance of critical inquiry. This practice does a disservice to both disciplines. It impoverishes philosophy by reducing it to vague gestures and loose associations, and it impoverishes science by failing to offer the conceptual clarity needed to make sense of complex empirical findings.

At its best, philosophy disciplines the mind to think carefully about categories, distinctions, and commitments. It asks us to clarify what we mean when we say that something exists, that something is knowable, or that something is real. *Quantum Drama* sidesteps these demands in favour of theatrical uncertainty. In the process, it exemplifies what has become a broader cultural trend: the erosion of rigorous philosophical discourse in favour of aestheticized ambiguity.

The Science That Isn't There: Where Are the Real Problems?

If *Quantum Drama* falls short philosophically, it fares no better on the scientific front. While the book frequently gestures toward cutting-edge debates in quantum

mechanics, it systematically avoids engaging with their technical content. The result is a narrative that dwells comfortably in the historical and the metaphorical but leaves the reader uninformed about the very real scientific puzzles that continue to animate the field.

Perhaps the most conspicuous absence is any serious engagement with the mathematical and experimental dimensions of the measurement problem. While the authors repeatedly invoke the "collapse of the wavefunction" as a mysterious and unresolved phenomenon, they offer no detailed discussion of the concrete models that attempt to address it. Objective collapse theories, such as the Ghirardi-Rimini-Weber (GRW) model or Penrose's Objective Reduction (OR) theory, are briefly mentioned in passing—if at all—but their specific mechanisms, predictions, and experimental tests are never explored.

This omission is particularly striking because these theories represent some of the most scientifically rigorous attempts to solve precisely the problems the book dramatizes. GRW theory, for instance, provides a well-defined stochastic mechanism for wavefunction collapse, introducing a slight non-linearity into the Schrödinger equation that becomes significant at macroscopic scales. Penrose's OR theory connects collapse to gravitational effects, proposing a fundamentally new link between quantum theory and general relativity. These are not speculative musings; they are mathematically precise proposals subject to experimental scrutiny.

Yet, rather than engaging with these ideas, *Quantum Drama* retreats into vague appeals to "mystery" and "paradox." In Chapter 10, the authors write:

"The measurement problem remains one of the deepest puzzles in physics. Perhaps it is not a problem to be solved, but a mystery to be lived with."

This is the language of resignation, not inquiry. It reflects a cultural attitude more interested in preserving the mystique of quantum mechanics than in resolving its puzzles. Worse, it misleads readers into believing that no meaningful progress has been made toward addressing these foundational issues, when in fact experimental physicists are actively testing collapse models through increasingly precise interference experiments and studies of macroscopic quantum systems.

Consider, for example, the recent advances in testing macroscopic superpositions using optomechanical systems—experiments that attempt to place increasingly large objects into quantum superpositions and observe their behavior. These efforts have direct implications for the validity of decoherence theory and objective collapse models. If quantum superposition truly breaks down at certain scales, as collapse theories predict, such experiments may provide the critical data required to confirm or falsify these models.

Quantum Drama mentions none of this. It leaves the reader with the impression that the field is locked in the same debates it has wrestled with since the 1930s. But this is simply not true. The foundations of quantum mechanics have become one of the most vibrant areas of both theoretical and experimental research in physics. New models are proposed, old models are tested and refined, and increasingly sophisticated technologies are pushing the boundaries of what can be empirically investigated.

The book's treatment of decoherence is similarly superficial. While the authors correctly acknowledge that decoherence plays a significant role in explaining the emergence of classical behaviour from quantum systems, they fail to explore the ongoing debates over whether decoherence alone suffices to solve the measurement problem. Decoherence explains how interference terms vanish in the reduced density matrix of a system interacting with its environment, but it does not, by itself, explain why a specific outcome is realized in any given measurement—unless one adopts, as Gilbert Simondon

suggests, a view of individuation as a metastable process where form and outcome are always in the making.

This distinction—between explaining the appearance of classicality and resolving the ontological status of measurement outcomes—is a central issue in the philosophy of quantum mechanics. Yet, in *Quantum Drama*, it is glossed over in favor of rhetorical gestures about "the dissolution of quantum weirdness into classical familiarity." Such language flatters the reader's sense of intellectual satisfaction without delivering the substantive analysis needed to understand what is really at stake.

Finally, the book largely ignores the rich landscape of contemporary interpretations of quantum mechanics that go beyond the Copenhagen view. While the Many-Worlds Interpretation receives a passing mention—framed, predictably, as a "wild metaphysical speculation"—there is no serious treatment of its mathematical coherence or its explanatory advantages in addressing the measurement problem without collapse. Interpretations such as QBism, relational quantum mechanics, and the consistent histories approach are similarly absent or mentioned only superficially.

The result is a portrait of quantum physics that is oddly static, as though the field has remained trapped in its early 20th-century debates with no significant theoretical or experimental developments since. This is not just an incomplete picture; it is a fundamentally misleading one.

By failing to engage seriously with the real scientific work being done on these questions, *Quantum Drama* contributes to the false impression that quantum mechanics is a closed system of eternal mysteries rather than an open and evolving domain of inquiry. It replaces the dynamic, contested, and deeply technical reality of the field with a romanticized vision of unresolved paradoxes. In doing so, it flatters the reader's sense of wonder but denies them the satisfaction—and intellectual honesty—of understanding the actual scientific frontiers.

Toward a Proper Dialogue: Reclaiming the Roles of Science and Philosophy

If the enduring appeal of *Quantum Drama* teaches us anything, it is that our culture remains captivated by the romance of mystery. But mystery alone is not a virtue. When mystery becomes an end in itself—when it is preserved for its aesthetic and emotional allure rather than approached as a challenge to be clarified—it turns inquiry into spectacle and philosophy into theatre.

The relationship between science and philosophy need not be a confused entanglement of blurred categories and intellectual half-measures. On the contrary, their most productive collaboration emerges precisely when each discipline respects its methodological boundaries while remaining open to critical engagement with the other. Science advances through the development of formal models, empirical validation, and experimental refinement. Philosophy advances by clarifying concepts, exposing hidden assumptions, and providing the rigorous analytical frameworks that prevent confusion between what can be known and what must remain speculative.

It is only through this division of intellectual labour—this principled methodological humility—that we can hope to make progress on the deepest questions posed by quantum mechanics. Where science reaches the limits of current explanation, philosophy steps in not to conjure metaphysical solutions out of thin air, but to clarify what it is we are really asking and whether the questions themselves are properly formulated.

The danger exemplified by *Quantum Drama* is the temptation to abandon this critical discipline in favour of narrative convenience and intellectual spectacle. Rather

than illuminating the boundaries between scientific explanation and philosophical reflection, the book collapses them into a comfortable haze of suggestiveness. In doing so, it ultimately betrays the spirit of both traditions.

A proper dialogue between science and philosophy demands more. It demands the courage to think clearly, even in the face of uncertainty. It requires the patience to pursue precision where vagueness is more seductive. And it insists that we resist the easy temptation to elevate our ignorance into a badge of wisdom.

If cultural narratives are to illuminate rather than obscure, we must foster a new ethic of intellectual responsibility—one that favours lucidity over mystification and dialogue over dramatization.

As we look to the future, we would do well to recall the words of the logical empiricists who, nearly a century ago, sought to bring clarity to precisely the kinds of conceptual confusions that still haunt discussions of quantum theory today. "The elimination of metaphysics," Carnap wrote, "is not a rejection of the profound; it is a rejection of the meaningless." This remains a lesson worth remembering.

The mysteries of quantum mechanics are real. They are deep, they are unresolved, and they are worthy of our most careful thought. But they are not beyond inquiry. They are not invitations to surrender our critical faculties in the face of paradox. They are calls to think harder, to reason more clearly, and to recognize that the greatest respect we can show to mystery is not to preserve it—but to try, with all our intellectual discipline, to understand it.

"To confront the unknown is not to retreat before it, but to stand before it with intellectual honesty and disciplined wonder."

Bibliography

1 - Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

2 - Bohr, Niels. *Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

3 - Einstein, Albert, Boris Podolsky, and Nathan Rosen. "Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete?" *Physical Review* 47, no. 10 (1935): 777–780.

4 - Serres, Michel. *The Parasite*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982.

5 - Simondon, Gilbert. *L'individuation à la lumière des notions de forme et d'information*. Paris: PUF, 1964.

6 - Stengers, Isabelle. *The Invention of Modern Science*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000.

David Cota

(founder of the Ontology of Emerging Complexity.)