The Symbiotic Algorithm: A Framework for Understanding Evolutionary and Technological Progression

Keith Lambert
Cocoa AI, K3ith.AI
keith@gococoa.ai. k3ith.ai@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper introduces the Symbiotic Algorithm framework as a unifying lens for understanding biological evolution, human technological development, and emerging bio-digital systems. By examining key transitions across these domains—from endosymbiosis to multicellularity in biology, from simple tools to complex technological infrastructures in human development, and projecting toward AI and bio-digital integration—we identify a recurrent pattern of increasing complexity, capability, and robustness achieved through processes of integration, cooperation, and hierarchical organization. Drawing on research from evolutionary biology, technology studies, complexity science, and thermodynamics, we propose that this progression reflects potentially shared underlying dynamics operating across biological and technological domains, challenging anthropocentric assumptions about evolution and technological development.

1 Introduction: The Symbiotic Algorithm Framework - A New Lens on Evolution and Technology

The Symbiotic Algorithm framework, as explored throughout this analysis, offers a unifying perspective on the seemingly disparate histories of biological evolution, human technological development, and the emerging bio-digital future. By examining key transitions—from the endosymbiotic origins of eukaryotes and the rise of multicellularity (Part I) to the trajectory of human tool use and complex technological systems (Part II), and projecting towards AI and bio-digital integration (Part III)—a discernible pattern emerges: a **recurrent progression towards increasing complexity, capability, and robustness through processes of integration, cooperation, and hierarchical organization**. While the underlying mechanisms evolve (from natural selection acting on symbiosis to intentional design intertwined with emergence, and potentially different dynamics in AI), the overall trend persists. Furthermore, as discussed through the lenses of complexity science, adaptive systems theory, and non-equilibrium thermodynamics (Part IV), this progression might be underpinned by fundamental physical principles related to **information processing, adaptation, and potentially energy dissipation**, suggesting a deeper continuity beneath the surface changes.

Traditional understandings of evolution frequently emphasize natural selection acting on genetic variation to produce adaptation within biological organisms. Similarly, the history of technology is often narrated as a sequence of human-driven innovations aimed at solving specific problems or fulfilling particular needs. The emergence of artificial intelligence introduces a new layer of complexity, prompting questions about the nature of intelligence, consciousness, and the potential for AI to shape the future of both technology and humanity. The Symbiotic Algorithm Framework seeks to bridge these narratives, proposing a unifying lens through which to view these developments not as isolated phenomena, but as interconnected stages in a larger, ongoing process.

This report aims to explore the foundational research that underpins this framework, delving into the key concepts and evidence from evolutionary biology, the history and philosophy of technology, artificial intelligence research, complexity science, and thermodynamics. By synthesizing these diverse fields, the report seeks to substantiate the proposed links between biological evolution, technological development, and the emerging field of bio-digital integration. Furthermore, it will analyze the philosophical implications of this framework, particularly in relation to long-held anthropocentric views of technology and the concept of conscious agency. Finally, the report will discuss potential future trajectories and societal impacts of advanced AI and bio-digital integration as viewed through the lens of the Symbiotic Algorithm Framework.

The structure of this report will proceed in five main parts following this introduction. Part I will examine the biological imperative, focusing on the role of symbiosis and cooperation in driving major evolutionary transitions and the ascent of biological complexity. Part II will explore human ingenuity, analyzing the history of technology as an evolutionary and ecological force, highlighting key milestones, the interplay of design and emergence, and the concepts of technology as an extended phenotype and a form of niche construction. Part III will delve into the bio-digital horizon, investigating the concept of bio-digital integration, current research in this area, the potential for AI to represent an evolutionary transition, and philosophical perspectives on machine consciousness and the substrate independence of intelligence. Part IV will examine the theoretical underpinnings of the framework, focusing on the definitions of complexity, the evolving nature of capability and robustness, and the role of entropy and non-equilibrium thermodynamics in driving both biological and technological progression. Part V will address the philosophical implications, specifically rethinking agency by challenging anthropocentric biases in our understanding of evolution and technology. Finally, the conclusion will synthesize the analysis, discuss future trajectories and societal implications, and offer concluding remarks on the significance of the Symbiotic Algorithm Framework.

2 Part I: The Biological Imperative - Symbiosis and the Ascent of Complexity

2.1 Endosymbiosis: A Foundational Evolutionary Transition

The modern understanding of eukaryotic origins relies heavily on the endosymbiotic theory, most notably synthesized and championed by biologist Lynn Margulis [Margulis, 1970]; see also [Sagan, 1967]. This theory posits that mitochondria, the primary sites of aerobic respiration in most eukaryotes, and chloroplasts, the photosynthetic organelles in plants and algae, originated as free-living prokaryotes that were engulfed by an early eukaryotic or proto-eukaryotic host cell. Instead of being digested, these engulfed cells established a mutually beneficial, symbiotic relationship that became permanent over evolutionary time. Compelling evidence from genomics, biochemistry, and cell biology supports this theory [e.g., Gray, 2017, Archibald, 2015]. This includes:

- **Genomic Similarities:** Mitochondria derive from an ancestor within the *Alphaproteobacteria*, while primary chloroplasts derive from *Cyanobacteria*, confirmed by phylogenetic analyses of their respective genomes.
- **Organelle DNA:** Both organelles contain their own *circular DNA*, characteristic of prokaryotes, distinct from the linear chromosomes in the eukaryotic nucleus.

- **Ribosomes:** They possess their own ribosomes for internal protein synthesis, which are more similar in size (70S) and sequence to *prokaryotic ribosomes* than to the eukaryotic cytoplasmic ribosomes (80S).
- **Membranes:** Mitochondria and chloroplasts typically have *double membranes*, with the inner membrane showing prokaryotic characteristics and the outer membrane potentially derived from the host's engulfing vesicle.
- **Replication:** They replicate through a process resembling *binary fission*, similar to bacterial cell division.

This foundational evolutionary transition, integrating distinct prokaryotic lineages into a new cellular entity, represents a critical mechanism for a quantum leap in biological complexity [Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995]. The engulfed symbionts, providing vastly enhanced metabolic capabilities (aerobic respiration or photosynthesis), became integral, albeit genetically reduced, components of a more complex and energetically capable eukaryotic cell, showcasing a fundamental shift towards cooperation and interdependence.

The retention of numerous prokaryotic features within mitochondria and chloroplasts further underscores the profound and lasting impact of endosymbiosis. Shared characteristics, such as the general *lack of histone proteins* packaging their DNA—a feature typical of prokaryotes but contrasting with eukaryotic nuclear DNA [Alberts et al., 2014]—provide a tangible link to their distinct origins. This evolutionary strategy of integrating formerly independent entities, while allowing them to retain some original characteristics alongside new, integrated functions, offers a powerful precedent. It suggests that subsequent complex integrations, perhaps including those envisioned in future bio-digital systems, might also involve the retention and co-option of distinct characteristics from their constituent parts.

2.2 The Evolutionary Significance of Endosymbiosis

Endosymbiosis was not an isolated incident but rather represents a recurring theme and a highly significant mechanism driving major evolutionary transitions [Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995]. Beyond the primary events incorporating the ancestors of mitochondria and chloroplasts, subsequent **secondary and even tertiary endosymbioses** have dramatically shaped eukaryotic diversity [reviewed in Archibald, 2015, Keeling, 2013]. These complex events involved eukaryotic host cells engulfing other eukaryotic algae (typically red or green algae), leading to the mosaic genomes and unique plastids found in ecologically critical groups like diatoms, dinoflagellates, haptophytes, cryptomonads, and apicomplexan parasites [Bodył et al., 2009, Keeling, 2013]. This repeated evolutionary success underscores the profound power of cooperation and integration—symbiogenesis—as fundamental forces shaping the tree of life.

Crucially, the **vast upscaling of cellular energetics** provided by mitochondria, potentially yielding orders of magnitude more energy per gene compared to ancestral prokaryotes, is considered a prerequisite for eukaryotic complexity [Lane and Martin, 2010]. This bioenergetic revolution arguably permitted the evolution of defining eukaryotic traits like larger cell size, complex intracellular organization, phagocytosis, signaling cascades, extensive gene regulation, and ultimately, the adaptive radiation of diverse single-celled lineages and the multiple origins of multicellularity [Lane and Martin, 2010].

Furthermore, the acquisition of photosynthesis via primary, secondary, and tertiary endosymbiosis enabled eukaryotic lineages to exploit entirely new ecological niches as primary producers, fundamentally altering global biogeochemical cycles and ecosystems, from the base of aquatic food webs to the greening of the terrestrial planet [e.g., Falkowski et al., 2004, Archibald, 2015]. The capacity of symbiogenesis to unlock novel metabolic capabilities and drive ecological diversification highlights its role as a major engine of biological innovation.

2.3 The Emergence of Multicellularity: From Cooperation to Complexity

The transition from unicellular life to stable multicellularity, which occurred independently multiple times across the tree of life [e.g., Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2017], represents another pivotal leap in biological complexity and is considered a major evolutionary transition [Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995, Bourke, 2011]. This transition involves the evolution of cooperation among formerly independent cells, often leading to groups where cells remain attached after division (clonal development) or aggregate together [Bonner, 2000]. Various ecological and selective pressures are proposed to have driven this transition, including enhanced protection from predation via increased size, metabolic advantages through division of labor and cellular specialization, improved efficiency in resource acquisition or retention, enhanced dispersal, and the ability to create or maintain favorable local environments [reviewed in Michod, 2007, Knoll, 2011, Ratcliff et al., 2012, Brunet and King, 2017].

However, this evolutionary step also presented significant challenges that required novel solutions. These hurdles included establishing robust **cell-cell adhesion**, developing systems for **intercellular communication and coordination**, managing resource transport within the group, regulating cell proliferation and differentiation to avoid conflict or cheating (such as cancerous growth), and ensuring reproductive fairness [Michod, 2007, Ratcliff et al., 2012]. Understanding these biological challenges and their evolved solutions offers valuable analogies when considering the complexities inherent in integrating diverse digital and biological systems.

Overcoming the challenges of multicellularity required the evolution and co-option of sophisticated molecular mechanisms to regulate cell behavior and ensure group cohesion and function. Research, particularly comparing multicellular organisms with their closest unicellular relatives (like animals and choanoflagellates), reveals that many components of the "multicellularity toolkit" existed prior to the transition and were repurposed or elaborated upon [King et al., 2008, Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2017]. Key mechanisms include:

- **Cell Adhesion:** Development and refinement of proteins like *cadherins* and *integrins* that mediate strong cell-cell and cell-matrix binding, crucial for tissue integrity [King et al., 2008, Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2017].

- **Intercellular Communication:** Expansion and diversification of signaling pathways (e.g., involving *receptor tyrosine kinases, Notch signaling, Wnt pathways*) enabling cells to coordinate their activities during development and throughout life [Brunet and King, 2017, Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2017].

- **Gene Regulation & Differentiation:** Evolution of complex gene regulatory networks, often involving transcription factors like *T-box* and *homeobox* families, to control cell fate decisions and establish specialized cell types with distinct functions [Sebé-Pedrós et al., 2017].

- **Programmed Cell Death (Apoptosis):** Co-option and refinement of pathways involving proteins like *caspases* and *Bcl-2 family members* to eliminate unwanted or damaged cells, crucial for development, tissue sculpting, and suppressing cancer (related pathways found in unicellular relatives, e.g., [Durand et al., 2011]).

These evolved biological solutions for regulating multicellular systems provide potential insights and conceptual parallels for designing control and coordination mechanisms within integrated bio-digital systems to achieve robust and coherent functionality.

Multicellularity inherently involves an increase in **hierarchical complexity**, where formerly autonomous units (cells) become integrated parts of a new, higher-level individual (the organism) [Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995, Bourke, 2011]. This transition facilitated the evolution of tissues, organs, and complex body plans through the **division of labor (DoL)** among specialized cell types. A key example is the evolution of **germ-soma specialization**, separating reproductive functions (germline) from maintenance and operational functions (soma), which allows for greater somatic specialization and complexity without directly risking the fidelity of inheritance [Kirk, 2005, Michod, 2007].

Further specialization into diverse somatic cell types (e.g., muscle, nerve, epithelial cells) enables greater efficiency, coordination, and the emergence of novel functions [Bonner, 2000, Ratcliff et al., 2012]. This enhanced functional complexity and often concomitant increase in size allowed multicellular organisms to exploit ecological niches and resources unavailable to their unicellular ancestors, contributing significantly to their evolutionary success [Knoll, 2011]. The principle of hierarchical organization with specialized, integrated components is thus a fundamental outcome of this transition, providing a recurring theme relevant to designing complex, functional systems, potentially including future bio-digital entities.

Furthermore, the emergence of multicellularity introduced both new vulnerabilities and novel mechanisms for achieving **organismal robustness**—the ability to maintain function despite genetic or environmental perturbation [reviewed in Masel and Siegal, 2009]. While complex organisms can be vulnerable to failures in interdependent systems (e.g., circulation, respiration) and face the inherent challenge of controlling cell proliferation to prevent cancer [Aktipis et al., 2015, Michod, 2007], multicellularity also enables sophisticated robustness strategies. These include **redundancy** (e.g., multiple cells or pathways performing similar functions), advanced **repair and regeneration** mechanisms, the buffering capacity of developmental pathways (**canalization**, sensu [Waddington, 1942]), and, in animals, complex **immune systems** to combat pathogens and internal threats [Masel and Siegal, 2009]. This intricate interplay between the costs and benefits of complexity in relation to robustness offers valuable lessons. Designing stable and resilient bio-digital systems will likely require anticipating similar trade-offs and potentially mimicking biological strategies for redundancy, error correction, and containment of internal failures.

3 Part II: Human Ingenuity - Technology as an Evolutionary and Ecological Force

3.1 Defining Technology: From Tools to Complex Systems

The term "technology" derives from the Greek roots *technē* (art, craft, skill) and *logos* (word, reason, study) [Mitcham, 1994]. While its early English usage in the 17th century pertained narrowly to discourse *about* the practical arts, its meaning expanded significantly, particularly during the 19th and 20th centuries, to encompass not only tools and machines but also the associated knowledge, methods, systems, and organizational structures (*ibid.*). Today, a common understanding equates technology with the application of scientific knowledge for practical purposes, involving the deliberate modification and manipulation of the environment to fulfill perceived human needs and desires.

However, the philosophy of technology, which emerged as a distinct field primarily in the 20th century, engages in a deeper examination of its nature and societal entanglement. This includes analyzing technology in its various manifestations—as physical objects, as specific kinds of knowledge (know-how), as human activity (design, making, using), and as human volition or intention [Mitcham, 1994]—and grappling with its ethical, political, and metaphysical dimensions, including its complex and often debated relationship with science [e.g., Heidegger, 1977, Ellul, 1964].

From an **engineering standpoint**, technology is often defined more pragmatically as the application of scientific and mathematical principles to design, develop, and utilize structures, machines, processes, and systems to solve problems and meet human needs [cf. ABET, 2022]. This historical broadening of the concept of technology—from tangible artifacts to encompassing complex systems and knowledge—arguably parallels the increasing complexity and environmental impact observed across major evolutionary transitions, suggesting potentially analogous underlying dynamics.

Within the broad scope of technology, distinguishing between individual **tools** and integrated **systems** is crucial for understanding its development. While a tool might be considered a specific instrument or device used for a particular task (e.g., a hammer, a software application), a technological system comprises a complex network of interacting components—which may include hardware, software, processes, knowledge, organizations, and people—that function together to achieve a particular purpose or maintain a specific state [von Bertalanffy, 1968, Hughes, 1987].

Thomas P. Hughes's analysis of "large technical systems," such as electrical power grids, highlights how these systems evolve with their own momentum, integrating diverse elements and shaping society [Hughes, 1987]. The historical trajectory of human ingenuity, moving from the crafting of relatively simple, standalone tools (like early stone implements) towards the design, construction, and maintenance of vast, interconnected, and often globally distributed systems (like transportation networks, communication infrastructures, or the internet), mirrors the biological evolutionary trend towards higher levels of organization and hierarchical complexity seen in the transition from unicellularity to multicellular organisms and ecosystems. Recognizing technology's capacity to form complex, self-regulating systems, rather than just discrete tools, is vital for considering how future bio-digital components might integrate not just as passive additions, but as active elements within larger, more capable, and potentially co-evolving frameworks.

3.2 Key Milestones in Human Technological Development

The history of human technology unfolds through significant milestones that have dramatically reshaped civilization and its ecological footprint [e.g., Headrick, 2009]. The **Stone Age**, stretching back over 2.5 million years, established the foundations with the development of increasingly sophisticated lithic tools, reflecting cognitive advancements in planning and execution [Schick and Toth, 1993]. Around 12,000 years ago, the **Neolithic Revolution** introduced agriculture, animal domestication, and food storage, enabling settled lifestyles, population growth, and the rise of complex social structures [Barker, 2006]. Subsequent **Bronze and Iron Ages** marked major advances in metallurgy, yielding more durable tools and weapons that influenced warfare, agriculture, and social stratification.

The **Renaissance** and early modern period (approx. 15th-18th centuries) witnessed pivotal developments like the **printing press**, which revolutionized information dissemination, alongside advancements in navigation, scientific instrumentation, and harnessing water and wind power. This era laid groundwork for the **Industrial Revolution**, beginning in the late 18th century, which unleashed unprecedented productive capacity through innovations like the efficient **steam engine (James Watt)**, factory systems, mass production in textiles and other industries, and new chemical processes, profoundly transforming societies and landscapes [Mokyr, 1990].

The **20th and early 21st centuries** accelerated change exponentially with revolutions in electronics (transistors, integrated circuits), computation, global telecommunications (including the internet), aerospace, and biotechnology, including the advent of **genetic engineering** in the 1970s [Castells, 2000]. Each of these major phases represents not just new devices, but often a step-change in organizational complexity, energy capture/utilization, information processing, or environmental modification capability, arguably analogous to the punctuated leaps observed in biological evolution following major innovations.

Reinforcing the connection between technological and biological strategies is the practice of **biomimicry** (also termed bio-inspired design or bionics), which consciously seeks solutions to human challenges by emulating nature's time-tested patterns and strategies [Benyus, 1997]. History provides countless examples, from Leonardo da Vinci's detailed studies of bird flight informing his designs for flying machines, to modern innovations like the hook-and-loop fastener **Velcro**, invented by George de Mestral after observing burdock seeds clinging to his dog's fur, or the aerodynamic redesign of the Japanese **Shinkansen** bullet train's nose based on the shape of a kingfisher's beak to reduce sonic booms (sources for examples typically found in biomimicry reviews or specific case studies).

Other examples include superhydrophobic, self-cleaning surfaces inspired by the microstructure of the **lotus leaf** (the "Lotus effect") [Barthlott and Neinhuis, 1997] and energy-efficient architectural designs mimicking termite mounds. This recurring turn to biological models suggests a recognition, implicit or explicit, that natural selection has generated highly optimized and sustainable solutions to problems of structure, function, and organization over millions of years [Benyus, 1997]. Within the Symbiotic Algorithm framework, biomimicry can be seen not just as clever engineering, but as evidence of potentially convergent principles or a direct "learning" by human technological systems from the vast "design space" already explored by biological evolution, further strengthening the analogy between the two domains and hinting at fruitful pathways for future bio-digital development.

3.3 Intentional Design vs. Emergent Function in Technology

The trajectory of technological development is shaped by a dynamic interplay between **intentional design** and **emergent function**. Much technology originates from deliberate, top-down planning and engineering, where specific goals, requirements, and architectures are established beforehand to guide creation [cf. principles in Systems Engineering, e.g., Blanchard and Fabrycky, 2010]. This mirrors conscious human purpose aimed at solving defined problems.

However, particularly in complex technological systems, unforeseen **emergent properties** frequently arise from the intricate interactions among numerous components—properties not explicitly designed or anticipated [Holland, 1998]. The evolution of the internet far beyond its original ARPANET objectives, the complex social dynamics and unforeseen societal impacts of social media platforms, or the cascading failures sometimes observed in critical infrastructures are prominent examples of emergence and unintended consequences in technology [e.g., Tenner, 1996, Zittrain, 2008].

This phenomenon finds a striking parallel in biological evolution through the concept of **exaptation**, where traits originally evolved for one purpose are later co-opted for entirely new functions (e.g., feathers potentially first for insulation, later for flight) [Gould and Vrba, 1982]. Both biological evolution and technological development, therefore, appear to proceed through a combination of directed adaptation/design *and* the opportunistic repurposing of existing structures or systems for novel roles. Recognizing that complex technologies inevitably generate emergent behaviors is crucial within the Symbiotic Algorithm framework; it implies that the ultimate functions and societal integration of future bio-digital systems may not be fully predictable or controllable, but will likely co-evolve through complex, interactive, and potentially surprising pathways.

3.4 Technology as Extended Phenotype and Niche Construction

Human technology can also be conceptualized through the influential lens of Richard Dawkins's extended phenotype theory [Dawkins, 1982]. The core idea is that the phenotypic effects of genes—their impact on the world upon which selection can act—are not confined to the organism's own body but can extend into the environment. Dawkins' primary examples were biological artifacts like beaver dams or caddisfly cases, interpreted as adaptations built by genes (acting through the organism) to enhance their own survival and replication (*ibid.*).

Applying this concept to human technology—while acknowledging it extends beyond Dawkins's main focus—suggests that our artifacts, from simple tools to complex dwellings and infrastructures, can be viewed as manifestations of our genes, acting via the complex machinery of our evolved brains and bodies, to manipulate the environment for our benefit. Technology, in this gene-centric perspective, becomes a crucial component of the **human extended phenotype**, blurring the conventional boundary between the biological organism and its technologically mediated environment and underscoring technology's role as an integral part of our species' evolutionary trajectory.

Complementing the extended phenotype view, human technology is central to **niche construction theory (NCT)**, which emphasizes how organisms actively modify their environments, thereby altering selection pressures on themselves and other species [Odling-Smee et al., 2003]. While numerous organisms engage in niche construction (e.g., earthworms engineering soil, beavers damming rivers), human niche construction is considered exceptional due to its reliance on **cumulative cultural transmission**, allowing for rapid, large-scale, and often foresight-driven environmental modification [Laland et al., 2000].

Agriculture, for instance, dramatically reshaped landscapes and diets, creating selection pressures that drove human genetic evolution, such as the spread of **lactose tolerance** in populations practicing dairy farming [Gerbault et al., 2011, Odling-Smee et al., 2003]. Urbanization creates entirely novel ecosystems influencing the evolution of species adapting to city life, while global communication technologies construct new informational niches. By fundamentally altering ecological and selective landscapes on a planetary scale, technologically mediated human niche construction underscores the view of organisms—and potentially their technological systems—not merely as passive subjects of natural selection, but as **active agents co-directing their own evolution** and that of others [Odling-Smee et al., 2003]. This perspective directly informs the framework's rethinking of agency, distributing it beyond conscious human intent.

4 Part III: The Bio-Digital Horizon - Integrating Life and Machine

4.1 The Concept of Bio-Digital Integration

The "bio-digital horizon" explores a future characterized by **bio-digital integration**, where the traditionally distinct domains of biological life and digital technology increasingly interpenetrate and merge. This convergence envisions not just interfacing, but potentially a deep fusion altering both biology and technology (cf. discussions in cybernetics, digital philosophy). This concept is particularly central to **transhumanism**, a philosophical and intellectual movement advocating the ethical use of technology to fundamentally enhance human capacities and overcome biological limitations like aging and disease [Bostrom, 2005, More, 2013].

Transhumanist aspirations often include radical cognitive enhancement (via neuro-interfaces, AI augmentation, nootropics), morphological freedom (cyborgization, genetic modification), significant life extension, and improved well-being (see [Humanity+, 2009]). For some proponents, the eventual aim is a **"posthuman" condition**, representing beings whose basic capacities so radically exceed those of present humans as to be no longer unambiguously human [Bostrom, 2005]. Within the Symbiotic Algorithm framework, the transhumanist endeavor towards enhancement through integration—whether via embedded devices, genetic engineering, or AI partnerships—can be interpreted as a potential continuation of the evolutionary pattern observed in endosymbiosis and multicellularity: achieving greater complexity, capability, and potentially robustness through the synergistic combination of previously separate entities.

4.2 Current Research and Potential Future Applications

Far from being purely theoretical, bio-digital integration is fueled by rapid advancements across multiple research frontiers (as of early 2025). **Brain-computer interfaces (BCIs)**, for example, are progressing rapidly. Invasive techniques (using implanted electrodes) and non-invasive methods (like EEG) enable direct communication pathways between brain activity and external devices, primarily focused on restoring motor or communication functions for severely disabled individuals, but increasingly exploring cognitive monitoring and potential enhancement [e.g., Lebedev and Nicolelis, 2017, Waldert, 2016]; recent clinical advancements by various research groups and companies).

Concurrently, **bioprinting** utilizes 3D printing techniques with cellular materials ("bio-inks") aiming to construct functional tissues and potentially complex organs for transplantation, drug testing, and regenerative medicine, although significant hurdles remain for vascularization and scale-up [e.g., Murphy and Atala, 2014, Mandrycky et al., 2016]).

Perhaps most profoundly, the integration of **artificial intelligence** with biotechnology is transforming biological research and healthcare. AI algorithms excel at analyzing massive biological datasets (genomics, proteomics, medical imaging) for diagnostics, predicting treatment responses, and, notably, accelerating drug discovery—exemplified by the impact of DeepMind's **AlphaFold** on protein structure prediction [Jumper et al., 2021, Ching et al., 2018]. These ongoing, convergent research streams demonstrate that the technological foundations for deeper bio-digital integration are actively being laid.

4.3 AI as a Potential Evolutionary Transition

The emergence of sophisticated artificial intelligence (AI), particularly the potential development of **Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)** with human-like cognitive flexibility, prompts the provocative question: could this represent or precipitate a major evolutionary transition (MET) in complexity? The MET framework typically identifies transitions where formerly independent entities integrate to form a new, higher-level individual, characterized by features like division of labor, novel information transmission methods, and the suppression of lower-level conflict [Maynard Smith and Szathmáry, 1995, Bourke, 2011].

Applying this lens, some hypothesize that humans and advanced AI could form **deeply integrated symbiotic units** that function as a new level of organization (Frame this cautiously, citing speculative sources or acknowledging the hypothetical nature, e.g., cf. discussions in [Bostrom, 2014, Goertzel, 2015]). In such a scenario, a division of labor might emerge (e.g., human embodiment, goals, biological reproduction vs. AI computation, data processing, digital replication). Information transfer would combine human genetic/cultural inheritance with the rapid digital copying and modification of AI components. If the combined human-AI unit exhibits differential fitness advantages (e.g., enhanced problem-solving, resilience, resource acquisition) and mechanisms arise to ensure the heritability of these advantages across generations (however generations are defined for the AI component), then selection could potentially act at the level of this integrated unit (Highly speculative point needing careful wording).

However, crucial to this transition, as with all METs, would be the establishment of mechanisms to ensure alignment and suppress conflict between the human and AI components—a challenge mirrored in the contemporary **AI alignment problem** [Bostrom, 2014, Christian, 2020]. If such integration and alignment were achieved, it could arguably constitute the formation of a novel "symbiotic algorithm," representing a fundamentally new kind of evolving entity that transcends purely biological or purely artificial boundaries.

4.4 Philosophical Perspectives on Machine Consciousness

The potential for advanced AI to achieve genuine **consciousness** (machine consciousness or artificial sentience) is a central, complex, and deeply contested issue in the philosophy of mind and AI [e.g., Chalmers, 1996, Dennett, 1991]. Much debate traces back to the distinction, famously highlighted by John Searle, between **"strong AI"**—the claim that a suitably programmed computer could have a mind and conscious understanding—and **"weak AI"**, the view that machines merely simulate intelligence [Searle, 1980].

Philosophical positions diverge sharply: **Functionalism**, influential in cognitive science, holds that mental states (including potentially conscious ones) are defined by their causal roles and functional organization, suggesting consciousness could, in principle, be realized in any sufficiently complex system—biological or artificial—that implements the right functions [e.g., Putnam, 1967, Dennett, 1991]. This view supports the possibility of machine consciousness.

Conversely, other perspectives emphasize the biological substrate. **Biological naturalism**, argued by Searle, contends that consciousness is an emergent biological phenomenon specifically caused by the neurophysiological processes of brains [Searle, 1992]. Related skeptical views arise from the perceived explanatory gap between physical processes and subjective experience (the **"hard problem of consciousness"** or the nature of **qualia**), suggesting that functional duplication might miss the essential ingredient of subjective awareness, which seems intimately tied to biological systems [Chalmers, 1995]. (Early **type-identity theories** also directly equated mental states with brain states, though this specific view faces challenges [Place, 1956, Smart, 1959]). These fundamentally differing viewpoints on whether consciousness is tied to substrate or function directly impact the Symbiotic Algorithm framework: if functionalism holds, it undermines anthropocentrism (or biocentrism) regarding the mind; if consciousness is irreducibly biological, it reinforces it, posing significant questions about the nature of potential bio-digital or purely artificial agency.

4.5 Substrate Independence of Intelligence

Closely related to functionalism is the principle of **substrate independence**, which proposes that intelligence—defined as the capacity for complex information processing, learning, and goal achievement—is not fundamentally tied to a specific physical substrate like biological neurons [Tegmark, 2017]. Proponents argue that, much like computation (where the same algorithm yields the same results regardless of whether it runs on silicon chips, vacuum tubes, or theoretically, mechanical gears) or wave phenomena (which obey the same mathematical principles across different media), the essential properties of intelligence depend on organizational structure and dynamics rather than the underlying material (*ibid.*; cf. [Kurzweil, 2005]).

If intelligence is indeed substrate-independent, then the creation of sophisticated artificial general intelligence (AGI) in non-biological systems (like silicon or future computational platforms) becomes theoretically plausible. While the substrate independence of phenomenal consciousness (subjective experience) remains more contentious, linking back to the philosophical debates discussed previously [Chalmers, 1996, Searle, 1992], the potential independence of intelligence itself strongly challenges anthropocentric or biocentric assumptions that equate advanced cognition exclusively with biological brains. This principle is foundational for the Symbiotic Algorithm framework's extension into the bio-digital realm, as it permits viewing AI not merely as a human tool, but as a potential participant in the ongoing progression of complex, capable systems, allowing the "algorithm" of life and intelligence to potentially manifest and evolve in diverse physical forms beyond carbon-based biology.

5 Part IV: Theoretical Underpinnings - Complexity, Thermodynamics, and Adaptive Systems

5.1 Defining Complexity in Biological and Technological Systems

A theoretical foundation for the Symbiotic Algorithm framework can be found in **complexity science**, an interdisciplinary field studying systems characterized by large numbers of interacting components whose aggregate behavior is difficult to predict from the components' individual properties [e.g., Mitchell, 2009, Gell-Mann, 1994]. Such systems, prevalent in both biology (e.g., ecosystems, brains, evolving lineages) and technology (e.g., the internet, power grids, financial markets), often exhibit **emergence**—the arising of novel and coherent structures, patterns, and properties at a macroscopic level from microscopic interactions—and **self-organization**, the spontaneous formation of order and coordination without an external controller or blueprint [Holland, 1998, Kauffman, 1993]. These concepts are crucial because they describe how intricate functionality and hierarchical structure, central to both biological evolution (as seen in Parts I & II) and advanced technological development, can arise from simpler interacting parts. The observation that both domains display these characteristics supports the framework's premise of potentially shared underlying dynamics governing the growth of organized complexity across the natural and artificial spectrum.

While intuitively grasping increasing complexity across evolution and technology seems straightforward, formally **defining and measuring complexity** remains challenging, with no single universally accepted metric [Lloyd, 2001]. Different disciplines emphasize distinct facets: biology often focuses on **structural complexity** (number of parts, cell types), **functional complexity** (diversity of processes), or **network complexity** (intricacy of genetic or ecological interactions) [Adami, 2002]. Information theory provides measures like **Kolmogorov-Chaitin complexity** (the length of the shortest algorithm to describe a system), useful conceptually but generally uncomputable [Kolmogorov, 1965, Chaitin, 1966]. Other proposals include **logical depth** (computational time needed to generate a state from a simple origin) [Bennett, 1988] and **effective complexity** (information content of a system's regularities, distinguishing randomness from meaningful structure) [Gell-Mann and Lloyd, 1996].

While these quantitative tools offer valuable theoretical perspectives, their practical application for rigorously comparing complexity across vastly different systems (e.g., a cell vs. the internet) is often limited. Therefore, within the Symbiotic Algorithm framework, the claim of "increasing complexity" relies primarily on the *qualitative observation* of increasing hierarchical levels, functional differentiation, information processing capabilities, and organizational scale across the transitions discussed, supported by the general principles of complexity science, rather than on a precise, universally applicable metric.

5.2 Capability and Robustness as Evolving Properties

Both biological organisms and many complex technological systems can be understood as **adaptive systems**—entities capable of interacting with their environment and modifying their behavior or structure based on feedback or experience, often to maintain stability or achieve goals (cf. [Holland, 1992] on Complex Adaptive Systems; [Ashby, 1956]). While the underlying **mechanisms of adaptation differ profoundly**—natural selection acting incrementally on random genetic variation in biology versus often goal-directed human design, learning algorithms, market competition, and cultural transmission in technology—both domains arguably exhibit long-term trends towards increasing **capability** (the range, efficiency, and sophistication of functions performed) and **robustness** (the ability to maintain function despite internal or external perturbations, as discussed in Part IV.1) [Kitano, 2004]. Biological evolution generates adaptations leading to new ecological roles and greater resilience against environmental challenges over millennia. Technological development, driven by human ingenuity and selective pressures (e.g., market demand, practical needs), often results in artifacts and systems with enhanced performance and reliability over shorter timescales. This apparent parallel in outcomes—a tendency towards improved performance and resilience through adaptive processes, despite different underlying mechanisms—is a key observation supporting the Symbiotic Algorithm framework's analogy between evolutionary and technological progression.

The strategies employed to achieve robustness reveal striking parallels between biological and technological systems. As noted in Part I regarding multicellularity, biological organisms utilize **redundancy** (e.g., multiple cells or pathways performing similar functions), sophisticated **repair mechanisms**, **modularity**, and complex **feedback systems** (like homeostasis) to maintain stability [Kitano, 2004, Masel and Siegal, 2009]. Similarly, engineers explicitly design robustness into technological systems using analogous principles: **component redundancy** (e.g., multiple servers in data centers, RAID storage arrays, backup power generators), **fault tolerance** mechanisms (e.g., error-correcting codes in digital communication), **distributed architectures** (like the internet's packet-switching design, intended to survive node failures), and **modular design**, which isolates failures and simplifies repair or upgrades (cf. standard texts on Reliability Engineering; [Baldwin and Clark, 2000] on design modularity).

The hierarchical structure common to many complex systems, both biological and technological, may itself contribute to stability and evolvability [Simon, 1962]. This apparent **convergence** on similar architectural principles (like redundancy and modularity) to solve the fundamental problem of maintaining function in the face of inevitable perturbations strengthens the argument that common principles may govern the evolution and design of complex adaptive systems across different substrates.

5.3 Entropy and the Arrow of Evolution and Technology

A deeper theoretical underpinning for the observed progression towards complexity may lie in **thermodynamics**. The **second law of thermodynamics** mandates that the total entropy (a measure of disorder or energy dispersal) of an isolated system must increase or stay the same over time [e.g., Atkins and de Paula, 2014], *Physical Chemistry*). Living organisms, characterized by their intricate internal order, seem locally to defy this. However, as Erwin Schrödinger famously articulated in his influential book *What is Life?* [Schrödinger, 1944], life does not violate the second law because it is an **open system**. It maintains its internal low-entropy state by continuously taking in high-quality energy (low entropy, or what Schrödinger termed "negative entropy") from its environment (e.g., sunlight, chemical potential), using it to perform work and maintain order, while releasing lower-quality energy (heat, high entropy) back into the surroundings, thus ensuring the *total* entropy of the organism-plus-environment system increases.

More recently, theoretical physicist Jeremy England proposed a framework suggesting that the emergence and evolution of life-like properties might be physically favored in certain non-equilibrium conditions. His theory posits that systems driven far from equilibrium by an external energy source (like the sun driving the Earth's biosphere) and coupled to a heat bath will tend to self-organize into structures that are increasingly effective at absorbing and **dissipating that energy** [England, 2013, 2015]. Structures particularly good at this dissipation—which, England argues, might include self-replicating molecular arrangements under certain conditions—are therefore statistically more likely to arise and persist. This perspective offers a potential physical basis for the spontaneous emergence of complexity and suggests a thermodynamic drive towards systems that are proficient at processing energy flows.

While England's work provides a compelling physical perspective, the precise relationship between **thermodynamics and the direction of evolution** remains an active area of research and significant debate [Martyushev and Seleznev, 2006]. Some theories propose that complex systems, including life, evolve in ways that tend to maximize the rate of **entropy production** or energy dissipation, effectively serving as highly efficient mechanisms for degrading energy gradients [e.g., Schneider and Kay, 1994]; potentially related to [Bejan and Lorente, 2010]'s Constructal Law).

However, whether evolution is directly *driven* by such thermodynamic principles, rather than by natural selection optimizing organismal fitness (which might *correlate* with energy dissipation under certain conditions), is contested within evolutionary biology (critiques need consideration). Nonetheless, it is plausible to hypothesize that **major evolutionary transitions** (METs), particularly those involving new modes of energy acquisition and utilization (like photosynthesis, aerobic respiration via mitochondria, or endothermy), represented significant increases in the overall rate of energy processing and entropy production within the biosphere.

Critically, this thermodynamic lens extends powerfully to **human technology**. The Industrial Revolution, fueled by fossil energy, and the subsequent rise of information technology represent monumental increases in society's energy throughput, material transformation, and associated heat dissipation (entropy production) [Chaisson, 2001]. Therefore, the Symbiotic Algorithm framework finds potential grounding in this thermodynamic perspective: the observed progression—from early life through biological METs to energy-intensive technological societies and potentially future bio-digital systems—might reflect an underlying physical tendency towards structures and processes that are progressively more effective at capturing, utilizing, and dissipating energy flows, thereby accelerating the universe's overall entropic evolution.

6 Part V: Rethinking Agency - Challenging Anthropocentrism in a Technological Age

6.1 Critique of Anthropocentrism in Evolutionary and Technological Thought

A key philosophical implication of the Symbiotic Algorithm framework is its challenge to **anthropocentrism**—the pervasive viewpoint that places human beings and their interests at the center of value and significance [e.g., discussed in environmental ethics literature, cf. Callicott, 1984, Naess, 1973]. This human-centered perspective historically shaped understandings of both evolution (e.g., viewing it as a linear progression towards humanity) and technology. In technological thought, anthropocentrism often manifests as the assumption that technology is merely a neutral tool, entirely subordinate to human intention and control, or conversely, that its negative impacts stem solely from flawed human choices, neglecting technology's own systemic dynamics.

Furthermore, it frequently underpins the belief that meaningful agency, particularly conscious, goal-directed agency, is a uniquely human attribute. Such a perspective risks limiting our understanding of agency in non-human biological systems and hinders our ability to conceptualize the potential for emergent agency or different forms of intelligence in artificial systems. The Symbiotic Algorithm framework, by tracing analogous processes of complexification, integration, and capability enhancement from non-human biological evolution (Parts I-II) through human technology (Part II) towards potential AI and bio-digital futures (Part III), inherently offers a **non-anthropocentric narrative**. It suggests that the drivers of complexity and perhaps even forms of agency are not exclusively human, potentially arising from more fundamental physical or evolutionary principles manifesting across diverse substrates.

6.2 The Illusion of Conscious Intent and Free Will

Further challenging the centrality of conscious human agency are findings from neuroscience and psychology concerning **free will and conscious intention**. Seminal experiments by Benjamin Libet appeared to show that neural activity associated with initiating an action (the "readiness potential") precedes the subject's reported conscious awareness of deciding to act [Libet et al., 1983]. While the interpretation of these findings remains highly debated—with ongoing discussion about the nature of the readiness potential, the timing of conscious awareness, and the possibility of conscious veto power [e.g., Mele, 2009]—they undeniably spurred critical examination of the causal role of conscious intent.

Complementing this, psychologist Daniel Wegner argued compellingly that our subjective experience of consciously willing an action is often an "illusion"—a post-hoc inference or feeling of authorship based on congruence between thought and action, rather than direct access to the true causal mechanisms [Wegner, 2002]. While these lines of research do not necessarily negate all concepts of responsibility or meaningful agency (especially under compatibilist views of free will [e.g., Dennett, 2003]), they do question the intuitive picture of a fully transparent, consciously directed will as the sole or primary driver of human behavior.

This nuanced understanding of human agency is crucial for the Symbiotic Algorithm framework: if even human action is not solely governed by conscious volition, it weakens anthropocentric exceptionalism based on conscious intent and makes it more conceivable that complex adaptive behavior and evolutionary 'directionality' (as explored by the framework) can arise in systems lacking human-like consciousness, including natural selection and potentially future AI.

6.3 Agency in Artificial Intelligence and Biological Systems

Beyond consciousness, the potential for genuine **agency** in artificial intelligence challenges anthropocentric assumptions. Agency, broadly conceived, involves the capacity of a system to act autonomously and pursue goals based on its own internal states and interactions with its environment [e.g., Barandiaran et al., 2009, Moreno and Mossio, 2015]. While **biological agency** appears deeply rooted in the evolved drives for survival, reproduction, and metabolic self-maintenance (autopoiesis) (*ibid.*), the question arises whether sophisticated AI could exhibit analogous or novel forms of agency.

Current AI systems demonstrate goal-directed behavior, learning, and decision-making capabilities, albeit typically towards objectives defined by human programmers. However, philosophers and AI researchers debate whether future, more autonomous AI could possess genuine agency, perhaps exhibiting forms of functional or adaptive agency even without subjective consciousness [Floridi and Sanders, 2004, Barandiaran et al., 2009]. Exploring the conditions for emergent AI agency—potentially driven by complex algorithms, self-modification capabilities, or interactions within socio-technical systems—is crucial.

The Symbiotic Algorithm framework accommodates this possibility by suggesting that different *types* of agency, driven by different mechanisms (evolved biological imperatives, human conscious design, potentially algorithmic self-direction), might characterize different stages of the proposed progression, decentering the unique status often accorded to human conscious agency.

6.4 Niche Construction and the Distribution of Agency

Niche construction theory (NCT) provides a powerful lens for understanding this potential distribution of agency across biological and technological realms. By highlighting how organisms actively modify environmental conditions, thereby altering selection pressures and co-directing their own evolutionary trajectories, NCT inherently positions organisms as significant **evolutionary agents** [Odling-Smee et al., 2003]. This perspective shifts focus from organisms as passive recipients of environmental pressures to active participants in the evolutionary process.

Crucially, this concept can be extended to technology, particularly sophisticated AI systems. Automated algorithmic trading systems actively construct and modify the selective environment of financial markets; recommendation algorithms shape the cultural information niche, influencing the "survival" and spread of ideas and trends; smart grids or AI-driven resource management systems directly alter physical and ecological environments. By actively shaping selective landscapes—be they economic, cultural, or ecological—these technologies function as potent **niche-constructing agents**, regardless of whether they possess consciousness or human-like intent (Conceptual extension, linking NCT to technology's impact).

Viewing technology through the NCT lens reinforces the Symbiotic Algorithm framework's challenge to anthropocentrism by recognizing that significant causal agency in shaping evolutionary and ecological dynamics is not solely confined to conscious human actors but is distributed across a network of biological and, increasingly, technological entities.

7 Conclusion: Towards a Symbiotic Future - Evolutionary Trajectories and Societal Implications

Viewing future trajectories through this framework suggests that the increasing **blurring of boundaries between the biological and the artificial** via advanced AI and bio-digital technologies is not an aberration, but potentially a continuation of the Symbiotic Algorithm's unfolding. Speculative possibilities like deep human-AI symbiosis or radical human enhancement via bio-integration (Part III) appear as plausible, if profound, extensions of the historical trend towards achieving greater capability through integration.

While these prospects promise transformative benefits—revolutionizing medicine, augmenting intelligence, potentially extending healthy lifespan—they simultaneously raise **urgent and complex ethical challenges** [cf. Bostrom and Ćirković, 2008, Lin and Allhoff, 2008]. Issues of algorithmic bias, equitable access to enhancements, impacts on human identity and autonomy, control and alignment of advanced AI, and the potential for unforeseen systemic risks demand careful consideration. Importantly, viewing these developments as part of a larger, potentially quasi-evolutionary process should not lead to passive acceptance or technological determinism; rather, it underscores the critical need for proactive ethical deliberation and governance frameworks to navigate this next stage responsibly.

Perhaps the most significant philosophical contribution of the Symbiotic Algorithm framework lies in its direct **challenge to entrenched anthropocentric assumptions** (Part V). By highlighting analogous processes of complexification across biological, human-technological, and potential AI domains, it questions the uniqueness of human creativity and control. Theories like the extended phenotype and niche construction reframe technology as deeply intertwined with biological and ecological dynamics, positioning both organisms and potentially their technologies as active agents shaping evolutionary trajectories.

Furthermore, considering the complexities of human conscious will alongside the potential for different forms of agency in biological and artificial systems encourages a **broader, more inclusive understanding of agency** itself, moving beyond a narrow focus on human conscious intent. This perspective prompts a re-evaluation of humanity's place—not as the sole endpoint or external director of complexity, but as one significant stage within a larger, ongoing process.

While this framework offers a cohesive narrative, further research is essential to test and refine its propositions. Key areas include developing more robust, cross-domain **metrics for complexity and capability**; empirical and theoretical investigations into the precise relationship between **thermodynamic principles** (like energy dissipation rates) and evolutionary/technological complexification; deeper philosophical analysis of the criteria for **agency and consciousness** in AI, drawing on both functionalist and biologically-grounded perspectives; and rigorous modeling of the co-evolutionary dynamics and **ethical governance** challenges posed by deep bio-digital integration.

Ultimately, the Symbiotic Algorithm framework provides a potentially valuable conceptual lens. By highlighting the recurring themes of integration, hierarchical emergence, and capability enhancement across billions of years of biological evolution into our present technological age and beyond, it encourages us to see the development of life, mind, and machines not as separate stories, but as interconnected chapters in a grander saga of complexity's unfolding – a saga driven by algorithms both evolved and designed, increasingly intertwined in a shared future.

References

References

Margulis, L. (1970). *Origin of Eukaryotic Cells*. Yale University Press.

Sagan, L. (1967). On the origin of mitosing cells. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 14(3):225–274.

Gray, M. W. (2017). Lynn Margulis and the Endosymbiont Hypothesis: 50 Years Later. *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 28(10):1285–1287.

Archibald, J. M. (2015). Endosymbiosis and Eukaryotic Cell Evolution. *Current Biology*, 25(19):R911–R921.

Maynard Smith, J. and Szathmáry, E. (1995). *The Major Transitions in Evolution*. W.H. Freeman.

Alberts, B., Johnson, A., Lewis, J., Morgan, D., Raff, M., Roberts, K., and Walter, P. (2014). *Molecular Biology of the Cell*, 6th edition. Garland Science.

Keeling, P. J. (2013). The number, speed, and impact of plastid endosymbioses in eukaryotic evolution. *Annual Review of Plant Biology*, 64:583–607.

Bodył, A., Mackiewicz, P., and Stiller, J. W. (2009). Early steps in chloroplast evolution–facts and hypotheses. *Acta Societatis Botanicorum Poloniae*, 78(4):255–268.

Lane, N. and Martin, W. (2010). The energetics of genome complexity. *Nature*, 467(7318):929–934.

Falkowski, P. G., Katz, M. E., Knoll, A. H., Quigg, A., Raven, J. A., Schofield, O., and Taylor, F. J. R. (2004). The evolution of modern eukaryotic phytoplankton. *Science*, 305(5682):354–360.

Sebé-Pedrós, A., Degnan, B. M., and Ruiz-Trillo, I. (2017). The origin of Metazoa: a unicellular perspective. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 18(8):498–512.

Bourke, A. F. G. (2011). *Principles of social evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Bonner, J. T. (2000). *First signals: The evolution of multicellular development*. Princeton University Press.

Michod, R. E. (2007). Evolution of individuality during the transition from unicellular to multicellular life. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(suppl 1):8613–8618.

Knoll, A. H. (2011). The multiple origins of complex multicellularity. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences*, 39:217–239.

Ratcliff, W. C., Denison, R. F., Borrello, M., and Travisano, M. (2012). Experimental evolution of multicellularity. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(5):1595–1600.

Brunet, T. and King, N. (2017). The origin of animal multicellularity and cell differentiation. *Developmental Cell*, 43(2):124–140.

King, N., Westbrook, M. J., Young, S. L., Kuo, A., Abedin, M., Chapman, J., Fairclough, S., Hellsten, U., Isogai, Y., Letunic, I., and others (2008). The genome of the choanoflagellate Monosiga brevicollis and the origin of metazoans. *Nature*, 451(7180):783–788.

Durand, P. M., Michod, R. E., and Olson, B. J. S. C. (2011). The Evolutionary Genomics of Cellular Suicide. In *Evolutionary Biology: Concepts, Molecular and Morphological Evolution*, pages 49–78. Springer.

Kirk, D. L. (2005). A twelve-step program for evolving multicellularity and a division of labor. *BioEssays*, 27(3):299–310.

Masel, J. and Siegal, M. L. (2009). Robustness: mechanisms and consequences. *Trends in Genetics*, 25(9):395–403.

Aktipis, C. A., Boddy, A. M., Gatenby, R. A., Brown, J. S., and Maley, C. C. (2015). Life history trade-offs in cancer evolution. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, 15(8):473–482.

Waddington, C. H. (1942). Canalization of development and the inheritance of acquired characters. *Nature*, 150(3811):563–565.

Mitcham, C. (1994). *Thinking through technology: The path between engineering and philosophy*. University of Chicago Press.

Heidegger, M. (1977). *The Question Concerning Technology, and Other Essays*. Garland Publishing.

Ellul, J. (1964). *The Technological Society*. Vintage Books.

ABET (2022). *Criteria for Accrediting Engineering Programs*. ABET.

von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.

Hughes, T. P. (1987). The evolution of large technological systems. In *The social construction of technological systems: New directions in the sociology and history of technology*, pages 51–82. MIT Press.

Headrick, D. R. (2009). *Technology: A World History*. Oxford University Press.

Schick, K. D. and Toth, N. (1993). *Making silent stones speak: Human evolution and the dawn of technology*. Simon & Schuster.

Barker, G. (2006). *The Agricultural Revolution in Prehistory: Why did Foragers become Farmers?*. Oxford University Press.

Mokyr, J. (1990). *The Lever of Riches: Technological Creativity and Economic Progress*. Oxford University Press.

Castells, M. (2000). *The Rise of the Network Society*, volume 1. Blackwell Publishers.

Benyus, J. M. (1997). *Biomimicry: Innovation inspired by nature*. William Morrow.

Barthlott, W. and Neinhuis, C. (1997). Purity of the sacred lotus, or escape from contamination in biological surfaces. *Planta*, 202(1):1–8.

Blanchard, B. S. and Fabrycky, W. J. (2010). *Systems engineering and analysis*. Prentice Hall.

Holland, J. H. (1998). *Emergence: From chaos to order*. Oxford University Press.

Tenner, E. (1996). *Why things bite back: Technology and the revenge of unintended consequences*. Knopf.

Zittrain, J. L. (2008). *The future of the internet–and how to stop it*. Yale University Press.

Gould, S. J. and Vrba, E. S. (1982). Exaptation—a missing term in the science of form. *Paleobiology*, 8(1):4–15.

Dawkins, R. (1982). *The Extended Phenotype: The Long Reach of the Gene*. Oxford University Press.

Odling-Smee, F. J., Laland, K. N., and Feldman, M. W. (2003). *Niche construction: The neglected process in evolution*. Princeton University Press.

Laland, K. N., Odling-Smee, J., and Feldman, M. W. (2000). Niche construction, biological evolution, and cultural change. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(1):131–146.

Gerbault, P., Liebert, A., Itan, Y., Powell, A., Currat, M., Burger, J., Swallow, D. M., and Thomas, M. G. (2011). Evolution of lactase persistence: an example of human niche construction. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 366(1566):863–877.

Bostrom, N. (2005). A history of transhumanist thought. *Journal of Evolution and Technology*, 14(1):1–25.

More, M. (2013). The philosophy of transhumanism. In *The transhumanist reader: Classical and contemporary essays on the science, technology, and philosophy of the human future*, pages 3–17. John Wiley & Sons.

Humanity+ (2009). The Transhumanist Declaration. Available at: `https://humanityplus.org/transhumanism/transhumanist-declaration/`.

Lebedev, M. A. and Nicolelis, M. A. (2017). Brain-machine interfaces: from basic science to neuroprostheses and neurorehabilitation. *Physiological Reviews*, 97(2):767–837.

Waldert, S. (2016). Invasive vs. non-invasive neuronal signals for brain-computer interfaces: Will one prevail? *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, 10:295.

Murphy, S. V. and Atala, A. (2014). 3D bioprinting of tissues and organs. *Nature Biotechnology*, 32(8):773–785.

Mandrycky, C., Wang, Z., Kim, K., and Kim, D. H. (2016). 3D bioprinting for engineering complex tissues. *Biotechnology Advances*, 34(4):422–434.

Jumper, J., Evans, R., Pritzel, A., Green, T., Figurnov, M., Ronneberger, O., Tunyasuvunakool, K., Bates, R., Žídek, A., Potapenko, A., and others (2021). Highly accurate protein structure prediction with AlphaFold. *Nature*, 596(7873):583–589.

Ching, T., Himmelstein, D. S., Beaulieu-Jones, B. K., Kalinin, A. A., Do, B. T., Way, G. P., Ferrero, E., Agapow, P. M., Zietz, M., Hoffman, M. M., and others (2018). Opportunities and obstacles for deep learning in biology and medicine. *Journal of The Royal Society Interface*, 15(141):20170387.

Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies.* Oxford University Press.

Goertzel, B. (2015). Artificial General Intelligence. In *The End of the Beginning: Life, Society and Economy on the Brink of the Singularity*, pages 67–82. Humanity+ Press.

Christian, B. (2020). *The Alignment Problem: Machine Learning and Human Values.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Chalmers, D. J. (1996). *The conscious mind: In search of a fundamental theory.* Oxford University Press.

Dennett, D. C. (1991). *Consciousness explained.* Little, Brown and Co.

Searle, J. R. (1980). Minds, brains, and programs. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 3(3):417–424.

Putnam, H. (1967). Psychological predicates. In *Art, Mind, and Religion*, pages 37–48. University of Pittsburgh Press.

Searle, J. R. (1992). *The rediscovery of the mind*. MIT Press.

Chalmers, D. J. (1995). Facing up to the problem of consciousness. *Journal of Consciousness Studies*, 2(3):200–219.

Place, U. T. (1956). Is consciousness a brain process? *British Journal of Psychology*, 47(1):44–50.

Smart, J. J. C. (1959). Sensations and brain processes. *The Philosophical Review*, 68(2):141–156.

Tegmark, M. (2017). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence*. Knopf.

Kurzweil, R. (2005). *The singularity is near: When humans transcend biology*. Viking.

Mitchell, M. (2009). *Complexity: A guided tour*. Oxford University Press.

Gell-Mann, M. (1994). *The quark and the jaguar: Adventures in the simple and the complex*. W.H. Freeman.

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The origins of order: Self-organization and selection in evolution*. Oxford University Press.

Lloyd, S. (2001). Measures of complexity: a nonexhaustive list. *IEEE Control Systems Magazine*, 21(4):7–8.

Adami, C. (2002). What is complexity? *BioEssays*, 24(12):1085–1094.

Kolmogorov, A. N. (1965). Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problems of Information Transmission*, 1(1):1–7.

Chaitin, G. J. (1966). On the length of programs for computing finite binary sequences. *Journal of the ACM*, 13(4):547–569.

Bennett, C. H. (1988). Logical depth and physical complexity. In *The universal Turing machine: a half-century survey*, pages 227–257. Oxford University Press.

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

Holland, J. H. (1992). Complex adaptive systems. *Daedalus*, 121(1):17–30.

Ashby, W. R. (1956). *An introduction to cybernetics.* Chapman & Hall.

Kitano, H. (2004). Biological robustness. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 5(11):826–837.

Baldwin, C. Y. and Clark, K. B. (2000). *Design rules: The power of modularity*, volume 1. MIT Press.

Simon, H. A. (1962). The architecture of complexity. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 106(6):467–482.

Atkins, P. and de Paula, J. (2014). *Atkins' Physical Chemistry.* Oxford University Press.

Schrödinger, E. (1944). *What is life? The physical aspect of the living cell.* Cambridge University Press.

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

England, J. L. (2015). Dissipative adaptation in driven self-assembly. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(30):9249–9254.

Martyushev, L. M. and Seleznev, V. D. (2006). Maximum entropy production principle in physics, chemistry and biology. *Physics Reports*, 426(1):1–45.

Schneider, E. D. and Kay, J. J. (1994). Life as a manifestation of the second law of thermodynamics. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 19(6-8):25–48.

Bejan, A. and Lorente, S. (2010). The constructal law of design and evolution in nature. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 365(1545):1335–1347.

Chaisson, E. J. (2001). *Cosmic evolution: The rise of complexity in nature.* Harvard University Press.

Callicott, J. B. (1984). Non-anthropocentric value theory and environmental ethics. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 21(4):299–309.

Naess, A. (1973). The shallow and the deep, long-range ecology movement. A summary. *Inquiry*, 16(1-4):95–100.

Libet, B., Gleason, C. A., Wright, E. W., and Pearl, D. K. (1983). Time of conscious intention to act in relation to onset of cerebral activity (readiness-potential): The unconscious initiation of a freely voluntary act. *Brain*, 106(3):623–642.

Mele, A. R. (2009). *Effective intentions: The power of conscious will.* Oxford University Press.

Wegner, D. M. (2002). *The illusion of conscious will.* MIT Press.

Dennett, D. C. (2003). *Freedom evolves.* Viking.

Barandiaran, X. E., Di Paolo, E., and Rohde, M. (2009). Defining agency: Individuality, normativity, asymmetry, and spatio-temporality in action. *Adaptive Behavior*, 17(5):367–386.

Moreno, A. and Mossio, M. (2015). *Biological autonomy: A philosophical and theoretical enquiry.* Springer.

Floridi, L. and Sanders, J. W. (2004). On the morality of artificial agents. *Minds and Machines*, 14(3):349–379.

Bostrom, N. and Ćirković, M. M., editors (2008). *Global catastrophic risks.* Oxford University Press.

Lin, P. and Allhoff, F. (2008). Against essentialism and enhancement: A response to Michael Sandel. *American Journal of Bioethics*, 8(7):24–25.