From Description to Direction: Edge Theory and the Normative Turn in Systems Science

OXQ Editorial III/III - January 2026

Abstract: Previous essays in this series argued that the twentieth-century "systems turn" made dynamic symmetry theory and the Dynamic Symmetry Index (DSI) an intelligible development of cybernetics, information theory, general system theory and complexity research, and showed that Edge theory can be understood as a refinement of second-order, substrate-independent thinking about open, feedback-rich systems. This paper examines a further implication: that Edge theory may function as a bridge between predominantly descriptive work on complex systems and more explicit, but still technically grounded, normative judgements about which regimes are worth sustaining. Systems theory, cybernetics and information theory provide powerful tools—feedback diagrams, entropy measures, order parameters—that explain how systems behave, yet are largely agnostic about whether a given configuration is good or bad except in narrow senses such as stability or efficiency. Dynamic symmetry, by contrast, is implicitly evaluative: a high DSI is not merely different from a low DSI, but is proposed as marking a superior position for many practical purposes, associated with resilience, adaptability and systemic "health". The central claim advanced here is that Edge theory can be read as an attempt to naturalise such normative judgements within the established vocabulary of systems science, by identifying a family of structural and dynamical properties that reliably distinguish regimes that tend to support continued functioning from those that tend towards collapse, brittleness or pathological volatility. If this project succeeds, the Edge framework would not only draw on systems methods but also offer systems science a way to speak coherently about why certain configurations ought to be maintained or avoided, without recourse to hand-waving or purely external ethical add-ons.

The first two essays in this sequence set out the historical and conceptual background. "From Feedback to the Edge" traced how cybernetics, Shannon's information theory, von Bertalanffy's general system theory and later complexity science shifted attention from linear chains of causation to recurrent interaction, feedback and organisation. "From Systems to Self-Measurement" then argued that this shift not only made it plausible to model systems as self-observing and self-modifying, but also prepared the way for indices such as the DSI that purport to track how well a system maintains a balance between structural coherence and adaptive variability. The present essay asks a different, though related, question: given that systems science now offers sophisticated descriptions of complex behaviour, how might Edge theory help it to articulate, in a disciplined way, which of the many regimes it can describe are worth promoting or protecting?

The descriptive power of systems science is beyond dispute. Cybernetics gave us feedback diagrams and control architectures that explain how systems stabilise around set points, oscillate, or diverge. Information theory gave us entropy measures that quantify uncertainty, redundancy and capacity. General system theory and later complexity research gave us concepts such as open systems, non-linearity, attractors, phase transitions and order parameters. These tools allow precise statements about what a system is doing: whether it is stable or unstable, near equilibrium or far from it, highly ordered or highly disordered, tightly coupled or modular. (1)

What they do not, by themselves, specify is whether any of those states is desirable beyond narrowly technical criteria. Stability, for example, is often treated as intrinsically good. Yet as von Bertalanffy noted, a closed system in thermodynamic equilibrium is maximally stable in one sense and maximally "dead" in another. An ecosystem can stabilise in a degraded state; an authoritarian regime can achieve impressive robustness; a brittle financial arrangement can be locally efficient until it fails catastrophically. The same applies to efficiency: minimising energy use or maximising throughput can undermine redundancy and resilience, leaving systems vulnerable to shocks. Descriptive categories thus underdetermine normative assessment. (2)

Dynamic symmetry enters this picture by making an explicitly comparative claim: that, for a wide class of complex systems, there exists a range of configurations—neither too rigid nor too volatile—within which the system's capacity for continued adaptation and functioning is maximised, and that this range can be identified and monitored. A high DSI is proposed to indicate that a system is operating within such a range, while a low DSI indicates drift towards pathological over-order or pathological disorder. The distinction is not merely taxonomic; it carries evaluative weight. Systems in high-DSI regimes are said to be more resilient, more capable of learning, and more likely to sustain their functions under perturbation than those in low-DSI regimes.

This evaluative aspect becomes clearer when we examine how Edge theory uses familiar systems-science constructs. The DSI, as previously sketched, depends on two broad components: a characterisation of a system's symmetry structure—patterns of organisation, invariances and constraints—and a characterisation of its adaptive behaviour, such as diversity of states, responsiveness to perturbation and recovery dynamics. Both components are built from existing descriptive tools. Symmetry structure can be analysed using network topology, groupings of equivalent states or modules, and invariants under transformation. Adaptive behaviour can be quantified using entropy-like measures, return times, variability statistics, and order parameters extracted from observed dynamics. (3)

Edge theory does not introduce fundamentally new mathematics at this level; it recombines and re-interprets elements already present in systems science. The novelty lies in the way these elements are assembled into a composite index that is explicitly tied to an evaluative narrative: systems that sustain a particular balance between structure and variability are labelled "healthy" or "resilient", while those that drift outside that balance are labelled "unhealthy" or "at risk". The proposal is that this narrative can be grounded, not by importing external ethical doctrines wholesale, but by showing that, across many domains, such a balance correlates strongly with outcomes that practitioners already care about: preventing collapse, preserving diversity of function, maintaining the possibility of learning and reform. (2)

In this sense, dynamic symmetry offers a strategy for naturalising certain normative judgements. Rather than treating "health" as a metaphor or as a domain-specific construct, Edge theory suggests that there may be structural and dynamical signatures of health that recur in many systems, and that these signatures can be captured by a family of DSI-like measures. The normative claim—that systems ought, where possible, to be kept within such regimes—would then be anchored in empirical regularities about survival, performance and adaptability, much as ideas about "homeostasis" in physiology are anchored in observed consequences of deviations from certain ranges. (4)

This approach does not eliminate ethical choice. It does, however, relocate part of the work. Instead of starting from abstract principles and then searching for ways to implement them in complex systems, one can start from empirical patterns of systemic flourishing and failure, identify the structural features that distinguish them, and then articulate normative guidance in terms of those features. For example, in an institutional context, a DSI-based analysis might reveal that bodies with highly centralised decision-making and narrow information channels are less able to respond to novel challenges than those with more distributed authority and richer feedback. The normative recommendation—design institutions with sufficient decentralisation, redundancy and feedback—is then framed in terms of empirically grounded conditions for adaptive functioning, rather than as a free-floating preference.

This bridging role becomes especially important when systems science is applied to policy. Technical models can show that a given configuration is stable or that a particular intervention will reduce variance in some indicator. They cannot, on their own, tell us whether the resulting regime is acceptable. In practice, this gap is often filled by importing external values in an ad hoc way, or by relying on the tacit preferences of model builders and clients. Edge theory offers an alternative: embed certain evaluative distinctions directly into the modelling framework by treating them as hypotheses about structural conditions for long-term viability. A policy that pushes a system towards a low-DSI regime can then be criticised, not only because it offends external values, but because it can be shown to increase the probability of systemic failure irrespective of specific preferences.

Of course, this integration is not straightforward. One risk is that the DSI, or any similar index, is reified as an unquestionable standard of "health", ignoring the plurality of values and the possibility that some systems may need to pass through low-DSI regimes to reach more desirable configurations. Another risk is that the evaluative vocabulary of Edge theory becomes a vehicle for smuggling in contested priorities under the appearance of technical necessity. A genuinely naturalised normative framework must therefore be transparent about its empirical basis and explicit about the limits of its claims. It can say: "Across these classes of systems, configurations with these properties tend, with high probability, to support continued functioning under perturbation", but it cannot, by itself, settle questions about whose flourishing matters or which functions are worth preserving.

Historical context helps here. Von Bertalanffy already noted that systems theory had "vast implications… for the humanistic fields", but was cautious about overextending its reach. Contemporary overviews of systems, cybernetics and complexity likewise stress that while these approaches offer powerful descriptive and diagnostic tools, they do not automatically supply a comprehensive ethics. Edge theory can be placed in this tradition: it does not claim to replace moral reasoning, but to inform it by clarifying how different structural choices affect the long-term behaviour of systems on which moral projects depend. (5)

The potential payoff is twofold. Within systems science, dynamic symmetry could provide a structured way to talk about why certain regimes are valued, namely because they support resilience, adaptability and continued function in environments characterised by uncertainty and change. Beyond systems science, it could offer ethicists, policymakers and institutional designers a vocabulary in which normative aims and technical descriptions meet: one can specify, in formally tractable terms, what it would mean for a health system, an energy grid or an educational network to be kept near its adaptive "edge". (4)

Whether Edge theory will ultimately fulfil this bridging role depends on future work. Empirically, DSI-style measures must be tested across diverse systems to see whether they reliably track meaningful differences in resilience and adaptability. Conceptually, the relation between structural signatures of "health" and the plural ethical commitments of human societies must be clarified, so that the former are not mistaken for the latter. Methodologically, the integration of feedback analysis, information measures, network structure and order-parameter dynamics must be refined to avoid oversimplification. (6)

What can be said at this stage is that Edge theory occupies a distinctive position in the evolving history of systems thinking. It inherits descriptive tools from cybernetics, information theory and general system theory; it shares with complexity science an interest in critical regimes and emergent behaviour; and it extends these traditions by proposing that the balance it emphasises between order and variability is not only a feature of how systems happen to behave, but also a key to understanding which configurations are worth cultivating. If that proposal proves robust, dynamic symmetry will not merely be another entry in the catalogue of systems concepts; it will be one of the ways in which systems science learns to speak, in its own language, about what ought to endure. (2)

References and Further Reading

(1) *Cybernetics*, Wikipedia. Summary of cybernetics as the study of circular causal processes, including the central role of feedback.

(2) Ludwig von Bertalanffy, *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications* (1968). Classic statement of general system theory, with extensive discussion of open systems, equifinality and the aim of a "science of wholeness".

(3) Zhigang Zheng et al. *Order parameter dynamics in complex systems: From models to data*. *Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear Science*. 34, 022101 (2024)

(4) *The Dynamic Symmetry Index (DSI)* OXQ: The Oxford Quarterly Journal of Symmetry & Asymmetry.

(5) Alvarez, J. T., and Ramírez-Correa, P. *Complexity: A Brief Review of Systems, Cybernetics, and Complexity* (2023)

(6) Brinsmead, T.S., and Hooker, C. *Philosophy of Complex Systems*. North Holland, 2011.

(7) *From Cybernetics to AI: the pioneering work of Norbert Wiener*, Max Planck Neuroscience (2024). Accessible overview of Wiener's recognition of feedback loops of information as drivers of complex systems.

(8) Shannon, Claude E. *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Bell System Technical Journal 27, no. 3 (July 1948): 379–423; and 27, no. 4 (October 1948): 623–656. Foundational paper introducing entropy, channel capacity and the probabilistic theory of communication.

(9) *A Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Wikipedia entry providing an overview of Shannon's article.

(10) *Return of cybernetics*, Nature Machine Intelligence 1, 418–419 (2019). Brief account of Wiener's emphasis on feedback loops as the basis of intelligent behaviour.

(11) Hlaváč, Václav. *Feedback, core of cybernetics*. Czech Technical University in Prague Czech Institute of Informatics, Robotics and Cybernetics.

(12) Norbert Wiener, *Cybernetics: Or Control and Communication in the Animal and the Machine*. (For an overview of feedback and circular causality in control and communication systems.)