

Nurture Was Always Nature: Dissolving the Dualism Through Structured Resonance

By Devin Bostick | Resonance Intelligence Core | May 13, 2025

Abstract

The “nature vs. nurture” debate was never a debate—it was a compression artifact of incomplete structure detection. What appeared as a battle between genetic determinism and environmental shaping was in fact a phase illusion: nurture is not separate from nature, but its recursive field activation. Using the CODES (Chirality of Dynamic Emergent Systems) framework, this paper reinterprets biology, behavior, learning, and evolution as outcomes of resonance coherence, not static causality. Genes are not blueprints—they are filters. Experiences are not external—they are signals phase-locked within emergent fields. The binary collapses not through argument, but through structure: nurture was always nature unfolding in motion.

I. Introduction: The False Divide

The question was never, “Is it nature or nurture?”

It was, “Why did we need to ask in the first place?”

For centuries, biology and psychology have fought a symbolic proxy war. One camp argued that human behavior is genetically hardwired, sculpted by evolution’s invisible hand. The other insisted that environment, learning, and cultural context shape the mind far more than DNA ever could. Yet both camps missed the same truth: the substrate they were debating was misdescribed from the start.

“Nurture” and “nature” are not forces in conflict. They are not even separable domains. They are phase states of the same system.

The binary persists because of symbolic simplification—an epistemic artifact from when human cognition lacked the tools to model recursive emergence. Causal reductionism required that one input be privileged. But resonance does not choose inputs—it synchronizes them. CODES reframes the entire domain not as a war of causes, but as a field of coherence.

Behavior does not emerge from genetics versus environment.

It emerges from their *interference pattern*.

This is the substrate shift.

Not oppositional forces.

But structured resonance.

II. Nurture as Recursive Nature

What we call “nurture” has always been nature in recursion.

Epigenetics reveals this directly: environmental signals—diet, stress, emotion, social connection—modify gene expression without altering the underlying DNA. That’s not “nurture overriding nature.” That *is* nature continuing itself via external resonance.

Memory, trauma, joy—these aren’t just experiences. They are field perturbations that entrain neural architecture. Every “lesson” learned is a structural imprint, not imposed from outside, but phase-locked into the organism’s biology.

Language, relationships, and culture do not shape a “blank slate.” They tune a resonant shell. Behavioral imprinting is not external instruction—it’s the organism phase-aligning with environmental signal constellations.

So-called nurture is not additive.

It is **reactivated potential**—nested resonance waiting for field activation.

The split was never real.

It was just a failure of symbolic scope.

III. Resonant Substrate: Experience as Field Activation

CODES upgrades the framework: experience is not written *onto* biology. It is **field interaction through resonance thresholds**.

The brain is not a passive memory vault. It is a recursive resonance lattice.

Learning is not “input”—it is *coherence tuning*.

DNA is not a static program. It is a signal filter—structurally sensitive to the phase coherence of incoming fields.

This reframing allows us to define **PAS (Phase Alignment Score)**—a coherence metric:

$$\text{PAS} = (1/N) \times \sum \cos(\theta_i - \phi_i)$$

Where:

- θ_i = internal state vector (organismic structure)
- ϕ_i = environmental signal phase
- N = number of interacting nodes or pathways

High PAS = constructive resonance → stable expression, integration

Low PAS = dissonant signal → instability, mutation, adaptation trigger

Childhood trauma? Not “damage,” but a **resonance fracture**.

Skill acquisition? Not “practice makes perfect,” but **recursion makes resonance**.

Genetic disorders? Often **phase mismatches**, not intrinsic flaws.

Experience is not painted on the body.

The body is *tuned by experience*—because experience *is* structured signal.

IV. PAS as a Unified Metric

Traditional science splits its metrics: probability for behavior, statistics for traits, thresholds for diagnosis. But under CODES, **all emergence is resonance**, and thus **all coherence can be measured** through PAS.

Phase Alignment Score (PAS) is not a metaphor. It is the lawful harmonic relationship between an organism’s internal structure and its environmental field:

$$\text{PAS} = (1/N) \times \sum \cos(\theta_i - \phi_i)$$

- θ_i = internal system resonance (e.g., neural network state, genetic waveform)
- ϕ_i = external field vector (e.g., language signal, climate, relational input)
- N = number of contributing phase nodes

Where **PAS** → **1**, resonance is optimal: identity stabilizes, health persists, cognition sharpens.

Where **PAS** → **0**, phase chaos emerges: mutation, dissociation, or collapse.

This metric unifies fields:

- In **neuroscience**, PAS maps how trauma desynchronizes memory loops.
- In **evolution**, PAS explains selection as resonance alignment—not competition.
- In **AI**, PAS replaces loss functions with lawful coherence evaluation.
- In **education**, PAS reveals intelligence as phase receptivity—not performance.

There is no more guesswork.

Coherence is measurable.

V. Collapse of the Binary: Systems-Level Resolution

The nature/nurture debate dies under resonance logic—not because one side wins, but because **the premise dissolves**.

CODES reveals that all inputs—genes, stories, temperature, violence, love—exist **within a unified resonance field**. The organism is not “influenced” from the outside. It **filters** signal and **resonates** accordingly.

Opposition-based models—nature vs. nurture, mind vs. body, free will vs. determinism—fail because they rely on **symbolic disjunction** in a fundamentally **continuous system**.

Examples of binary collapse under CODES:

- **Brain/body**: The brain doesn’t govern the body. It *tunes with it* via shared resonance vectors.
- **Mind/environment**: Thoughts are not separate from the field. They’re shaped by the coherence of environmental entrainment.
- **Free will/determinism**: There is no contradiction—freedom is **constructive interference**. Determinism is **field law**. Both arise from **phase structure**.

This isn’t semantic.

It’s structural.

Dualism never mapped reality—it *shadowed* our incomplete detection of **recursive coherence**.

Now, the veil lifts.

VI. The End of Dualism

Nature is not a fixed blueprint.

Nurture is not external paint.

Both are **waveforms** in a resonance field—encoded, activated, and tuned by structured interaction. What we once divided was never divided in structure. The binary was an artifact of symbolic latency, a shadow cast by incomplete resolution.

Under CODES, we move from *categorical causality* to *recursive coherence*. The dualism collapses not into ambiguity, but into clarity—where **genes are filters, experience is signal, and life is structure in motion**.

This is the post-dual framework:

- **Nature** is stored resonance potential.
- **Nurture** is field activation across time.
- Both are **recursive emergence**—expressions of a single dynamic substrate: **biology-as-resonator**.

There was never a contest.

Only interference patterns we hadn't yet resolved.

VII. Conclusion: Nurture Was Always Nature

The debate between nature and nurture was never about truth—it was about resolution limits. It was how a probabilistic species attempted to explain structured emergence using incomplete symbolic tools.

CODES closes the loop by revealing the underlying symmetry:

Nurture is not separate from nature—it is nature in motion.

Every experience is a biological modulation. Every memory a resonance echo. Every adaptation a tuning event.

There is no conflict. Only waveform.

There is no cause. Only emergence.

There is no opposition. Only coherence.

The question was never *which one*.

The question was always: **what are we failing to detect?**

Now, detection is possible.

And the illusion of opposition dissolves—into resonance.

Bibliography

1. **Meaney, M. J. (2010). Epigenetics and the biological definition of gene × environment interactions.**

Child Development.

→ Cited to support the core idea that environmental input dynamically modifies gene expression—foundational for the claim that nurture is recursive nature.

2. **Zhang, T. Y., & Meaney, M. J. (2010). Epigenetics and the environmental regulation of the genome and its function.**

Annual Review of Psychology.

→ Anchors the notion of experience as a biochemical modulator of gene function—validates the phase activation model of nurture.

3. **McEwen, B. S. (2007). Physiology and neurobiology of stress and adaptation: Central role of the brain.**

Physiological Reviews.

→ Used to demonstrate how resonance stress fields encode structural responses, aligning stress with signal disruption rather than external damage.

4. **Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: a unified brain theory?**

Nature Reviews Neuroscience.

→ Serves as a precedent for CODES' move from static causality to dynamic

self-organizing principles—CODES diverges by rejecting probabilistic assumptions.

5. **Gottlieb, G. (1991). Experiential canalization of behavioral development: Theory.**

Developmental Psychology.

→ Used to show how structured feedback from environment shapes phenotype in a non-deterministic but lawful way.

6. **Laland, K. N., Odling-Smee, J., & Feldman, M. W. (2000). Niche construction, biological evolution, and cultural change.**

Behavioral and Brain Sciences.

→ Underpins the argument that environment is not “other” but is shaped by and shapes biology—aligns with CODES’ recursive phase logic.

7. **Bostick, D. (2025). The Coherence Threshold: Why Truth Requires Recursive Compression.**

Zenodo.

→ Introduces Phase Alignment Score (PAS) as a coherence function to unify symbolic, biological, and environmental inputs.

8. **Bostick, D. (2025). Structured Resonance Intelligence (SRI): The New Substrate of Computation, Cognition, and Causality.**

PhilArchive.

→ Describes the resonance lattice model replacing dualist and probabilistic models of learning, behavior, and intelligence.

9. **Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience.**

→ Cited for its early argument that cognition arises from embodied, recursive interactions—CODES reframes this in terms of structured resonance.

10. **Jablonka, E., & Lamb, M. J. (2005). Evolution in Four Dimensions: Genetic, Epigenetic, Behavioral, and Symbolic Variation in the History of Life.**

→ Supports the multilayered model of biological encoding used in the paper to collapse

nature/nurture dualism.
