

Three Self-Organizing Systems

A Classification Exercise Using the Seven Invariants

AMUL BHAM

Independent Researcher, Corona, CA, USA

amul.bham@gmail.com · linkedin.com/in/amul-bham · orcid.org/0009-0009-7660-4031

Paper · Licensed CC BY-NC 4.0

Aug 31, 2026

*Standalone companion · Cognitive Physics Series · Companion to Paper A —
The Invariants of Self-Organizing Systems*

Abstract

The seven invariants established in Paper A make self-organization testable rather than descriptive. This document applies the classification to three systems at different scales and substrates — an ant colony, a financial market, and the immune system. No substrate assumptions are carried in. The same seven conditions are applied to each. All three satisfy the classification. The conditions apply with equal force across biochemistry, human decision aggregation, and distributed biological defense. That generality is the point.

1. Introduction

Paper A in the Cognitive Physics Series identifies seven structural conditions jointly necessary for any self-organizing system — each established independently in its home discipline, each present across six canonical classes of systems that share no physical substrate. The classification is substrate-neutral by construction. A Bénard convection cell, a biological cell, and a financial market share nothing physically. Any property they all have must be a structural requirement, not a physical one.

This document is a classification exercise. Three systems. Seven conditions each. A verdict at the end of each section. The purpose is not to argue that these systems are self-organizing — that is established in the literature for each of them. The purpose is to show the seven invariants in operation across substrates, and to identify exactly which condition maps to which observable behavior in each system.

Two notes stated upfront. First: Paper A is the primary theoretical source throughout. The seven conditions, their necessity arguments, and their indepen

dent convergence evidence are fully developed there. This document applies them. Second: for each system, specific behavioral claims are grounded in the primary literature for that system. Citations appear at the point of each claim rather than clustered at the end of each section.

One result worth noting before beginning. The three systems share no substrate. An ant colony is biochemistry and distributed insect behavior. A financial market is human decision aggregation. The immune system is hierarchical biological defense. Finding the same seven structural conditions present in all three is evidence that the conditions are structural requirements — not domain artifacts, not biological properties, not physical constraints specific to any one class.

Condition	What It Requires
1. Conservation	Outputs must account to inputs. The system cannot produce more than it consumes.
2. Continuity	Organized structure evolves without discontinuous jumps. State connects to prior state through a path.
3. Quantization	Stable states are discrete. Small perturbations damp rather than amplify.
4. Coherence	Components cannot simultaneously pursue contradictory goals.
5. Attractor Dynamics	Motion converges toward stable organized states rather than expanding indefinitely.
6. Symmetry Protection	Stable configurations resist arbitrary change. Prior organized state is actively maintained.
7. Hierarchy	Stable complex organization builds from stable simpler layers.

Full derivation of each condition, with independent convergence evidence, appears in Paper A — The Invariants of Self-Organizing Systems.

2. System One — The Ant Colony

A mature ant colony of several hundred thousand individuals builds complex architecture, allocates labor across castes, defends territory, and maintains a continuous food supply — all without any individual ant having access to the global picture. No ant directs the others. The colony is coordinated entirely through local chemical signals following simple rules. Bonabeau, Dorigo and Theraulaz (1999) establish the ant colony as the canonical model organism for studying self-organization in biological systems. Wilson (1971) provides the foundational natural history of

insect social organization. Camazine et al. (2001) treat the ant colony as a working example of self-organization in biological systems with formal structural analysis.

The question here is not whether the colony is self-organizing. That is established. The question is which of the seven conditions it satisfies, and precisely how.

Conservation [*Wilson, 1971; Bonabeau et al., 1999*]

Pheromone trail intensity encodes a continuous cost-benefit ratio — proportional to food quality and inversely proportional to distance. Foraging yield minus trail maintenance cost is continuously expressed in pheromone concentration across the network. This is distributed energy accounting without a central accountant. Wilson (1971) documents the precision of this foraging efficiency across species: colonies consistently allocate forager numbers to sources in proportion to source value, with no individual ant computing the colony-level budget. The accounting is structural, not deliberate.

Continuity [*Bonabeau et al., 1999; Camazine et al., 2001*]

Colony state evolves continuously through gradual pheromone dynamics and population birth and death rates. The colony at year three is causally connected to the colony at year one through an unbroken state trajectory — prior organizational state has causal force on present state through persistent chemical memory. Caste transitions and colony fission, which might appear discontinuous at the individual level, are continuous processes at the colony level involving gradual population shifts and overlap periods. Colony death is the genuinely discontinuous event — and Continuity predicts exactly this: discontinuous state transitions are the destabilizing events, not normal operation.

Quantization [*Camazine et al., 2001; Bonabeau et al., 1999*]

Individual ants produce discrete behavioral outputs from continuous chemical inputs. Below the recruitment threshold, no response fires. Above it, full recruitment behavior activates. The threshold is the discretization mechanism — continuous chemical concentration is converted into discrete behavioral state at the decision point. Camazine et al. (2001) document this threshold response system across colonial insects as the biological implementation of reliable discrete state production: it prevents perpetual partial responses that would dissipate foraging effort without coordinating it.

Coherence [*Bonabeau et al., 1999; Wilson, 1971*]

Alarm pheromone and foraging recruitment are chemically incompatible responses at the colony level. The colony cannot simultaneously execute maximum foraging recruitment and full alarm response — the chemical regulatory system enforces this constraint automatically. It is worth being precise about what Coherence requires: it prohibits simultaneously contradictory goals, not simultaneous parallel

operations. Multi-caste colonies do run parallel operations — foraging, building, and nursing simultaneously. These are complementary, not contradictory. Coherence operates at the strategic decision layer: the colony cannot simultaneously recruit to food and flee a threat as if both were optimal responses to the same conditions.

Attractor Dynamics [*Bonabeau et al., 1999; Camazine et al., 2001*]

Nest architecture converges to species-typical configurations regardless of starting conditions. Foraging trail networks self-optimize toward efficient geometries through positive feedback on successful paths and decay on unsuccessful ones. Pheromone dynamics function as an attractor mechanism — trail networks move toward stable efficient configurations rather than expanding indefinitely through the environment. Recent formal analysis of ant foraging confirms this: pheromone acts as an attractor rather than event-based signaling in biological colonies, with trail systems converging to stable near-optimal geometries from varied starting configurations.

Symmetry Protection [*Wilson, 1971*] **Honest note required**

Queen pheromone actively suppresses the development of reproductive competitors, maintaining colony identity against challenge. Established trail networks resist disruption through reinforcement dynamics — prior organized state exerts active causal force against arbitrary revision. At the behavioral and organizational layer, Symmetry Protection is clearly present.

One honest acknowledgment: Symmetry Protection is stronger at the behavioral layer than at the reproductive governance layer. Queen replacement, when it occurs, is a genuine organized state transition — prior reproductive organization is overwritten. This is not evidence against the classification. It is evidence of a gradient: Symmetry Protection operates fully at some layers and partially at others. The claim is not that ant colonies are perfectly symmetry-protected — it is that they demonstrably exhibit the property. They do, with this documented limitation.

Hierarchy [*Bonabeau et al., 1999; Camazine et al., 2001; Simon, 1962 via Paper A*]

Individual ant behavior (layer 1) produces trail networks (layer 2), which produce foraging patterns (layer 3), which produce colony-level resource management (layer 4). Each layer is stable independently. Each depends on the stability of the layer below. No individual ant has access to the resource management layer. Resource management depends on trail stability. Trail stability depends on individual threshold behavior. This is Simon’s hierarchical architecture implemented through stigmergy — indirect coordination through environmental modification — without any level having access to the global picture.

NOTE

Classification: Self-Organizing System — all seven conditions satisfied. The colony satisfies the conditions without any individual ant satisfying them. Class membership is a property of the system, not its components.

3. System Two — The Financial Market

A financial market produces coherent price signals from millions of uncoordinated individual decisions. No price-setter computes the right number. No central coordinator allocates resources. Local decisions aggregate into global signals through a mechanism no individual participant designed or controls. Hayek (1945) establishes markets as the canonical case of self-organizing knowledge coordination — the price system as the mechanism through which dispersed information is aggregated without centralization. Fama (1970) formalizes market equilibrium as the attractor state toward which price continuously moves.

The financial market is the most substrate-independent of the three systems in this document. It has no biology, no chemistry, no physical substrate beyond the humans making decisions and the infrastructure recording them. If the seven conditions appear here, they are structural requirements in the strictest sense.

Conservation [Hayek, 1945; Fama, 1970]

Market value must account to underlying claims. Derivative chains that produce apparent value without underlying accounting are Conservation violations — the system produces without accounting. The 2008 financial crisis is the predicted failure mode in operation: apparent value built on chains of unaccounted claims collapsed when Conservation reasserted itself. The losses were not created in 2008 — they were revealed. The output-input gap had always been there. Conservation had been violated before the crisis, not during it.

Continuity [Fama, 1970]  **Honest note required**

Price evolution is continuous in normal operation. Each price at time $t+\delta$ is connected to price at t through a path of trades and information updates. This is Continuity satisfied under normal conditions.

Flash crashes are genuine Continuity violations — discontinuous price jumps that disconnect present state from prior state without a corresponding path. The framework predicts these as destabilizing events, not normal operation. Markets have circuit breakers specifically to contain flash crashes — external infrastructure compensating for a Continuity violation, exactly as rate limits compensate for absent internal closure conditions in AI systems. The classification holds: Continuity is satisfied in normal operation and violated under stress, with external mechanisms patching the violation.

Quantization [*Fama, 1970*]

Transaction clearing is the discrete state. The bid-ask spread is the discretization mechanism — continuous price discovery is converted into a discrete cleared transaction at a specific price. A trade executes or it does not. The price discovery process is continuous; the organizational output — a cleared trade — is discrete. This prevents perpetual partial execution that would dissipate coordination without achieving it.

Coherence [*Hayek, 1945*]

The market cannot simultaneously clear at two different prices for the same asset. Contradictory bids and asks — buyers and sellers with opposing views — are not a Coherence violation. They are what produces the price mechanism. Coherence at the system level means the resolution of contradiction into a single clearing price, not the absence of contradiction among participants. The market resolves contradictory information into a single organizational output. That resolution is Coherence operating.

Attractor Dynamics [*Fama, 1970; Hayek, 1945*]

Market equilibria are attractors even when the system never rests exactly on them. Price moves continuously toward the clearing level that balances supply and demand — the attractor state — and deviations from it create forces that push it back. Fama (1970) formalizes this as market efficiency: price continuously incorporates available information, moving toward equilibrium as the attractor. The market is never at rest on the attractor, but it is always moving toward it. That directional convergence is attractor dynamics.

Symmetry Protection [*Fama, 1970*]

Prior price levels exert documented causal force on subsequent price behavior. Support and resistance levels — prior organizational states — influence future price trajectories. Market memory is real and structural, not merely psychological: prior organized states resist arbitrary revision through the accumulated positions and expectations built around them. This is weaker than biological symmetry protection — prior price levels can be broken — but the resistance is present and empirically measurable.

Hierarchy [*Hayek, 1945; Fama, 1970*]

Tick-level transactions (layer 1) produce intraday price patterns (layer 2), which produce daily and weekly structures (layer 3), which produce macro cycles and regimes (layer 4). Each timeframe has its own dynamics and stability properties. A single tick fluctuation does not collapse the daily structure. A daily move does not necessarily break the cycle. The stability of lower layers is what allows higher-layer

organizational structure to operate. This is Simon’s hierarchical architecture implemented through price aggregation across timescales.

NOTE

Classification: Self-Organizing System — all seven conditions satisfied. No biology. No chemistry. No physical substrate beyond human decisions. Same structural class as the ant colony.

4. System Three — The Immune System

The immune system maintains a precise boundary between self and non-self across billions of distributed cells with no central coordinator and no single cell with global information. It responds to novel threats it has never encountered, maintains memory of past responses for decades, and returns to baseline homeostasis after each challenge. Abbas and Van Parijs (1998) establish immune homeostasis — the return to organized baseline state after antigen clearance — as the regulatory organizing principle. Perelson and Weisbuch (1997) provide the formal physics of immune system organization.

The immune system is included here for a specific reason beyond demonstrating the framework’s generality. Its self/non-self discrimination mechanism is the clearest analog to a verification gate of any system in this document — a discrete activation decision based on verified pattern matching that maps directly to the V term in the General Law of Cognition. Readers of the companion papers will recognize the structural parallel immediately.

Conservation [*Abbas & Van Parijs, 1998*]

Every immune response is metabolically accounted through cytokine signaling calibrated to threat magnitude. The immune system cannot mount a response without corresponding metabolic input — severe immune responses are metabolically costly, which is why fever and fatigue accompany serious infections. The accounting is continuous and precise: response magnitude tracks threat magnitude through regulatory cytokine circuits. Abbas and Van Parijs (1998) establish this calibration as a core regulatory mechanism of immune homeostasis.

Continuity [*Mayer et al., 2019; Abbas & Van Parijs, 1998*]

Immunological memory is the clearest Continuity implementation across all three systems in this document. Prior immune states are causally connected to present response through memory B and T cells that persist for decades. The immune system at age 40 is causally connected to the immune system at age 5 through an unbroken memory trajectory. Mayer et al. (2019) establish that the memory repertoire compartment governs its own homeostasis, separate from naive cells — prior

immune states are actively maintained as a distinct organized layer that shapes all future responses.

Quantization — Strongest Mapping [*Perelson & Weisbuch, 1997; Abbas & Van Parijs, 1998*]

Self/non-self discrimination is a discrete activation decision. Below the activation threshold, no immune response fires. Above it, a full response program activates. The continuous chemical signal from antigen-receptor binding is converted into a discrete binary output: respond or do not respond. This is not a graded response — it is a threshold-gated discrete state transition. Perelson and Weisbuch (1997) formalize this as the fundamental organizational property of adaptive immunity. It is the closest analog to a verification gate — a discrete confirmed transition from one state to another — of any system in this document.

Coherence [*Abbas & Van Parijs, 1998*]

The healthy immune system cannot simultaneously mount a tolerant response and an attack response to the same antigen. Autoimmune disease is the Coherence failure mode — the system running contradictory programs simultaneously, attacking self-tissue as if it were foreign. The pathology of autoimmunity confirms the condition: organized biological function requires coherence, and the specific failure that follows its violation is precisely what the framework predicts. Abbas and Van Parijs (1998) identify self-tolerance maintenance as the mechanism that enforces Coherence in the immune system.

Attractor Dynamics [*Mayer et al., 2019; Abbas & Van Parijs, 1998*]

The immune system converges to stable baseline homeostasis after each perturbation. Post-infection immune activation is followed by regulated contraction back to the homeostatic attractor state — the baseline lymphocyte composition and activation level that represents organized immune equilibrium. The system does not remain permanently activated after clearing a threat. It returns. That return is attractor convergence. Mayer et al. (2019) model this explicitly: the immune system continuously balances trust in new observations against prior memory, converging to an adapted homeostatic state.

Symmetry Protection — Strongest Mapping [*Mayer et al., 2019*]

Memory cells actively protect prior immune states through renewal programs that maintain immunological memory across decades. Once a pathogen is successfully neutralized and memory formed, that organizational state is not passively retained — it is actively maintained through memory cell homeostasis, a separate regulated process from naive cell maintenance. Mayer et al. (2019) establish that this memory compartment governs its own homeostasis: prior organized immune state

resists arbitrary revision through continuous active protection. This is the strongest Symmetry Protection implementation of the three systems in this document.

Hierarchy [Perelson & Weisbuch, 1997]

Innate immunity (layer 1) provides immediate non-specific defense and buys time for adaptive response. Adaptive immunity (layer 2) mounts antigen-specific responses. Immunological memory (layer 3) records successful responses for future use. Systemic immune regulation (layer 4) coordinates across all layers through cytokine networks. Each layer depends on the stability of the layer below — adaptive immunity depends on innate immune infrastructure, memory depends on successful adaptive response, systemic regulation depends on all layers operating. Perelson and Weisbuch (1997) formally establish the hierarchical organization of the immune system as a multi-scale physical network.

NOTE

Classification: Self-Organizing System — all seven conditions satisfied. Strongest Symmetry Protection and Quantization mappings of the three systems. Self/non-self discrimination is a working verification gate.

5. What the Three Classifications Show

Three systems. Biochemistry. Human decision aggregation. Distributed biological defense. No shared substrate. No shared components. No shared evolutionary history. All satisfying the same seven structural conditions.

	Ant Colony	Financial Market	Immune System
Conservation	Satisfied — energy accounting through pheromone trail intensity	Satisfied — value must account to underlying claims	Satisfied — metabolic accounting through cytokine calibration
Continuity	Satisfied — continuous pheromone dynamics and population rates	Satisfied with a gradient — normal operation continuous; flash crashes are violations	Satisfied — immunological memory gives causal continuity across decades
Quantization	Satisfied — threshold response: discrete behavior from continuous signal	Satisfied — transaction clearing: discrete output from continuous price discovery	Strongest mapping — self/non-self discrimination is a verification gate

	Ant Colony	Financial Market	Immune System
Coherence	Satisfied — alarm and foraging chemically incompatible at strategic layer	Satisfied — single clearing price resolves contradictory bids and asks	Satisfied — cannot simultaneously tolerate and attack same antigen
Attractor Dynamics	Satisfied — nest architecture and trail networks converge to stable configurations	Satisfied — price continuously moves toward market equilibrium attractor	Satisfied — post-activation return to homeostatic baseline
Symmetry Protection	Satisfied with a gradient — strong at behavioral layer, gradient at reproductive layer	Satisfied — prior price levels resist arbitrary revision	Strongest mapping — memory cell renewal actively protects prior immune states
Hierarchy	Satisfied — individual → trail → foraging → resource management	Satisfied — tick → intraday → daily → cycle → regime	Satisfied — innate → adaptive → memory → systemic regulation

The framework is diagnostic. It does not describe these systems — it classifies them. The classification is testable: point the seven conditions at any system claiming to be self-organizing. Either it satisfies them or it does not. If it does not, the specific condition violated identifies the specific structural weakness.

Two conditions deserve note across all three systems. Quantization maps most cleanly to the immune system’s self/non-self discrimination — a discrete verification gate with no partial activation. Symmetry Protection maps most strongly to the immune system’s memory maintenance — active protection of prior organized state through a dedicated renewal mechanism. These are not better implementations of the conditions than in the other systems. They are the most structurally explicit implementations, which is why the immune system serves as a natural bridge to the cognitive physics series, where V (verification) and Symmetry Protection are central field laws.

The conditions are not new. Their joint necessity — and their applicability as a unified diagnostic across any substrate — is.

The same structural requirements appear in every organized system that maintains itself against disorder — from an ant following a chemical trail to an immune cell discriminating self from non-self. The substrate changes. The conditions don’t.

References

1. Bham, A. (2026). *The Invariants of Self-Organizing Systems*. Paper A. Cognitive Physics Series. doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20531589

2. Bonabeau, E., Dorigo, M. & Theraulaz, G. (1999). *Swarm Intelligence: From Natural to Artificial Systems*. Oxford University Press.
doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195131581.001.0001
3. Camazine, S., Deneubourg, J.-L., Franks, N.R., Sneyd, J., Theraulaz, G. & Bonabeau, E. (2001). *Self-Organization in Biological Systems*. Princeton University Press.
doi.org/10.1515/9780691212920
4. Wilson, E.O. (1971). *The Insect Societies*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
hup.harvard.edu/books/9780674454903
5. Hayek, F.A. (1945). The Use of Knowledge in Society. *American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519–530. jstor.org/stable/1809376
6. Fama, E.F. (1970). Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work. *Journal of Finance*, 25(2), 383–417. doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1970.tb00518.x
7. Abbas, A.K. & Van Parijs, L. (1998). Homeostasis and Self-Tolerance in the Immune System: Turning Lymphocytes off. *Science*, 280(5361), 243–248.
doi.org/10.1126/science.280.5361.243
8. Mayer, A., Balasubramanian, V., Mora, T. & Walczak, A.M. (2019). How a well-adapting immune system remembers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(18), 8815–8823. doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1812810116
9. Perelson, A.S. & Weisbuch, G. (1997). Immunology for physicists. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 69, 1219–1268. doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.69.1219
10. Simon, H.A. (1962). The Architecture of Complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106(6), 467–482. jstor.org/stable/985254

Declarations

Author Contributions: The author confirms sole responsibility for conceptualization, methodology, formal analysis, investigation, writing — original draft preparation, and writing — review and editing.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: No new data were created in this study. All source materials are cited in the references.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Amul Bham is an independent AI systems architect. His work develops the Cognitive Physics framework and the Mission Brief Protocol (MBP) — first-principles research into the structural conditions under which a reasoning system produces knowledge rather than prediction — and applies that same structural lens to adjacent domains, from self-organizing systems to public policy.

orcid.org/0009-0009-7660-4031