THE CONVERGENCE OF COMPUTATIONAL AND BIOLOGICAL SELF-ORGANIZATION IN THE MID-20TH CENTURY

Krassimir Markov

Abstract: *This paper examines the conceptual parallels between Niklaus Wirth's contributions to ALGOL programming language design and Humberto Maturana's theory of autopoiesis. We demonstrate that ALGOL 60's original specification as a formally closed system without input/output operations presents a remarkable structural analogue to the organizational closure that defines autopoietic systems. While Wirth and subsequent ALGOL developers pragmatically opened this closure by adding I/O functions to enable practical computation, Maturana maintained operational closure as the essential and invariant characteristic of living systems, addressing environmental interaction through the concept of structural coupling rather than by breaking organizational closure. This comparison reveals deep affinities in how computational and biological theories approached questions of system organization, boundary definition, modularity, and self-reference during the mid-20th century. We argue that computational thinking, particularly the principles of structured programming, provided conceptual tools and metaphors that enriched theoretical biology, while biological theories of self-organization challenged reductionist computational models. The analysis demonstrates that both traditions converged on organization, rather than material substrate or external function, as the fundamental principle for understanding complex systems.*

Keywords: *Autopoiesis, Algol, Niklaus Wirth, Humberto Maturana, Self-Reference, Computational Biology*

ITHEA Keywords: *A.1 Introductory, Survey, and Overview*

DOI: https://doi.org/10.54521/ijita33-01-p05

Introduction

At first glance, the structured programming principles championed by Niklaus Wirth in his work on ALGOL and the biological theory of autopoiesis developed by Humberto Maturana appear to inhabit entirely separate intellectual domains. Wirth, a computer scientist whose contributions to ALGOL and subsequent languages emphasized clarity, structured design, and systematic organization, operated within the formal world of computational logic. Maturana, a Chilean biologist and philosopher, proposed autopoiesis as a theory explaining how living systems continuously produce and maintain themselves through self-referential processes. Yet beneath their surface differences lies a profound conceptual resonance: both thinkers grappled with questions of organization, boundary definition, self-reference, and the principles by which complex systems maintain their identity while interacting with their environment.

This paper explores the subtle but significant influence of Wirth's ideas in ALGOL on Maturana's conception of autopoiesis, examining how computational thinking about system organization, modularity, and recursive structures may have provided conceptual tools and metaphors that enriched biological and philosophical understanding of living systems.

Wirth's Contributions to ALGOL and Structured Programming

Niklaus Wirth's engagement with ALGOL began in the 1950s, a formative period for computer science when the discipline was establishing its fundamental principles. ALGOL 60 had introduced revolutionary concepts including block structure, lexical scoping, and the clear separation between syntax and semantics (Naur et al., 1963). Remarkably, and of particular significance to our present analysis, ALGOL 60 was defined as *a closed system without input/output procedures* - the language specification deliberately excluded I/O operations, leaving these to be defined by individual implementations (Perlis & Samelson, 1958). This design decision, whether intentional or pragmatic, created a formally closed computational system that operated purely through internal transformations, strikingly analogous to the organizational closure that would later characterize Maturana's autopoietic systems.

Wirth's work on ALGOL W, developed with C.A.R. Hoare at Stanford, addressed this limitation by introducing additional data structures, improved input/output capabilities, and enhanced type systems (Wirth & Hoare, 1966). The addition of I/O functions opened the closed system to interaction with its environment, transforming ALGOL from a purely abstract computational structure into a practical programming tool.

What distinguished Wirth's approach was his insistence on simplicity, elegance, and comprehensibility. His later work on Pascal, Modula, and Oberon extended these principles into a comprehensive philosophy of programming that emphasized stepwise refinement, clear hierarchical organization, and the principle that programs should be written primarily for human understanding rather than merely machine execution (Wirth, 1971, 1985). Wirth's famous dictum "Algorithms + Data Structures = Programs" encapsulated his view that computational systems emerge from the careful organization of process and structure (Wirth, 1976).

Several key principles from Wirth's work are particularly relevant to our discussion: the concept of modular decomposition, where complex systems are built from well-defined, encapsulated components; the emphasis on clear boundaries and interfaces between system components; the recursive nature of structured design, where similar organizational principles apply at multiple scales; and the notion that a system's behavior emerges from the interaction of properly organized parts rather than from monolithic, unstructured complexity.

Maturana's Autopoiesis: Living Systems as Self-Producing Organizations

Humberto Maturana, working with Francisco Varela in the early 1970s, developed the theory of autopoiesis to answer a fundamental question: What distinguishes living systems from non-living ones? Their answer centered on organization rather than on specific material components or even on particular functions like reproduction or evolution.

An autopoietic system, in Maturana's formulation, is organizationally closed and self-producing. It consists of a network of processes that continuously produce the components that constitute the network, while simultaneously maintaining the boundary that distinguishes the system from its environment (Maturana &

Varela, 1980). The cell serves as the paradigmatic example: metabolic processes produce the molecules that constitute the cell membrane, while the membrane both contains these processes and selectively mediates the cell's interaction with its environment.

Crucially, autopoiesis emphasizes operational closure alongside structural openness. The system's organization is defined by internal relations and operations, not by external function or purpose (Maturana & Varela, 1987). Yet the system remains structurally coupled with its environment, continuously exchanging matter and energy while maintaining its organizational identity. This dual character (operational closure with structural openness) became central to Maturana's broader epistemological project and his understanding of cognition as a biological phenomenon.

The Profound Parallel: Operational Closure and Environmental Coupling in ALGOL 60 and Autopoiesis

The most striking connection between Wirth's work on ALGOL and Maturana's autopoiesis lies in how both frameworks balance internal organization with environmental interaction - a tension embodied in ALGOL 60's original design and central to autopoietic theory. ALGOL 60 was specified without input/output operations (Naur et al., 1963), creating a formally closed computational system whose operations were defined by internal transformations. However, this closure was always incomplete in practice: implementations necessarily added I/O capabilities, and programs existed to interact with users and external systems.

Similarly, Maturana's autopoiesis emphasizes organizational closure while explicitly acknowledging that no living system is truly isolated. The key insight is that autopoietic systems are organizationally closed but structurally open. They continuously exchange matter and energy with their environment (Maturana & Varela, 1980). The cell membrane, far from isolating the cell, actively mediates molecular exchange, importing nutrients and exporting waste. This is not incidental but essential: without material and energetic coupling to the environment, the autopoietic organization cannot maintain itself.

Maturana's concept of "structural coupling" explicitly addresses how organizationally closed systems interact with their environment (Maturana & Varela, 1987). Through structural coupling, the system and environment reciprocally trigger changes in each other. The system's structure changes through interaction (what appears as learning or adaptation), while the system's responses affect the environment. This is fundamentally a form of input/output, though not in the computational sense of information transfer. The organism responds to environmental perturbations according to its own organization, and these responses constitute outputs that affect the environment. In this sense, Maturana does introduce input/output, not as information processing toward external goals, but as structural interactions that maintain the organism-environment relationship.

The parallel between ALGOL and autopoiesis is thus more nuanced than simple closure. Both frameworks recognize that systems must balance internal coherence with environmental interaction. ALGOL 60's formal specification emphasized internal organization, but practical implementations required environmental coupling through I/O. Autopoietic theory emphasizes organizational closure, but no autopoietic system can exist without continuous material-energetic exchange and structural coupling with its environment.

The subsequent evolution of ALGOL illuminates different strategies for managing this balance. When Wirth and others developed ALGOL W and later languages, they explicitly incorporated I/O procedures into the language specification (Wirth & Hoare, 1966). This acknowledged that computational systems, to be useful, must interact with users, files, and other systems. The formal closure was opened to enable practical functionality.

Maturana's approach differs but achieves similar recognition of environmental coupling. Rather than "opening" organizational closure, he distinguished between the organization (the relations that define the system's identity) and the structure (the actual components and their spatial relations at any moment). The organization remains invariant and self-referential. It defines what the system is. The structure continuously changes through environmental interaction - it determines how the system exists at any moment (Maturana & Varela, 1987). Through structural coupling, the environment triggers structural changes without determining them; the system's organization determines how it responds to environmental perturbations.

This reveals both convergence and divergence. ALGOL's approach separated the formal specification (closed) from practical implementation (open to I/O). Maturana's approach separated organization (closed, self-referential) from structure (open to environmental influence). Both recognized that purely closed systems cannot function or survive. Systems must couple with their environment. The difference lies in how this coupling is conceptualized: ALGOL added explicit I/O operations to the language, making environmental interaction a formal feature. Autopoiesis maintains that organizational closure defines the system's identity, while structural coupling explains how the system maintains itself through environmental interaction without losing its identity.

Importantly, Maturana's framework implies that autopoietic systems have inputs and outputs, though not in the computational sense. A cell takes in nutrients (input), metabolizes them according to its organization, and excretes waste (output). An organism perceives environmental changes (input), responds according to its nervous system organization, and acts upon the environment (output). However, these are not information transfers toward external goals but structural interactions determined by the system's own organization. The system does not represent its environment or compute responses; it structurally responds according to what it is (Varela et al., 1974).

The ALGOL 60 example thus reveals something important: operational closure, even as a theoretical ideal, was always incomplete and required environmental coupling for practical realization. Similarly, autopoietic closure is not absolute isolation but a specific form of autonomy that depends on, rather than excludes, environmental interaction. There are no truly closed autopoietic systems. All living systems depend on continuous material-energetic exchange and structural coupling with their environments. The "closure" in autopoiesis refers to organizational self-reference, not to isolation from the environment.

Additional Conceptual Resonances: Organization, Interaction, and Boundary

Beyond the central theme of balancing closure with environmental coupling, the connection between Wirth's computational thinking and Maturana's biological theory extends to other organizational principles. These resonances operate at the level of deep structural similarities rather than through direct intellectual influence.

Both thinkers emphasized organization over material substrate while recognizing the importance of interaction. For Wirth, a well-designed program transcends its particular implementation in machine code or specific hardware; what matters is the logical structure of the algorithm and the clear organization of data (Wirth, 1971). Yet programs must interact with users, data sources, and other programs to be useful. Similarly, for Maturana, life is defined not by particular molecules but by a particular type of organization (Maturana & Varela, 1980). Yet this organization can only be realized through continuous material exchange and interaction with the environment. Both frameworks balance abstract organization with concrete interaction.

The concept of boundaries plays a crucial but nuanced role in both frameworks. In Wirth's structured programming, modules and procedures have clearly defined interfaces that mediate internal implementation and external interaction. A well-designed module encapsulates its internal state while exposing operations that enable communication with other modules. The boundary is not a barrier but an interface. It enables both independence and interaction. Maturana's autopoietic systems similarly depend on boundaries (like cell membranes) that are active participants in the system's operation. The membrane doesn't isolate but mediates. It selectively transports molecules in and out, enabling the metabolic processes while maintaining the system's identity. In both cases, boundaries enable rather than prevent interaction with the environment.

Third, both frameworks exhibit recursive or self-referential character. Wirth's structured programming applies similar principles at multiple scales. A large program is organized into modules, each module into procedures, each procedure into structured control flows. The same design principles recur at each level. Autopoietic systems display analogous self-reference: the processes that produce the system's components are themselves enabled by those same components. The system refers to itself in its very operation, maintaining its organization through a circular dynamic of self-production.

The Computational Metaphor in Biology

The mid-20th century saw extensive cross-pollination between computer science and biology. Cybernetics, information theory, and systems theory provided conceptual frameworks that both disciplines drew upon (Wiener, 1948; von Bertalanffy, 1968). Wirth's work on ALGOL occurred during a period when computational thinking was increasingly being applied to biological phenomena, not just through bioinformatics or molecular genetics, but through conceptual models that used computational ideas as organizing metaphors.

When Maturana and Varela developed autopoiesis, they were working in an intellectual environment where computational concepts had already permeated biological thinking. The idea that organisms process information, that cells execute programs encoded in DNA, and that biological systems, can be understood through computational models was becoming mainstream. However, Maturana explicitly resisted certain aspects of this computational metaphor, particularly the notion that living systems are primarily information processors whose purpose is determined externally (Maturana & Varela, 1980, 1987).

Yet the influence of structured programming principles, even if indirect or subconscious, may have provided crucial conceptual tools. The idea that complex systems achieve their coherence through clear organizational principles rather than mere accumulation of components; the recognition that boundaries and interfaces are active elements rather than passive containers; the appreciation for recursive, self-referential structures - these insights from computer science enriched the conceptual vocabulary available for theorizing about biological organization.

Wirth's emphasis on stepwise refinement and hierarchical decomposition offered a model for understanding how complex biological organization might emerge from simpler organizational principles applied recursively. His insistence that systems should be comprehensible, that their organization should be transparent to understanding, resonated with Maturana's phenomenological approach to biology, which insisted that living systems must be understood in terms of their own operational logic rather than through external purposes or functions.

Divergences and Critical Perspectives

While identifying resonances between Wirth's computational thinking and Maturana's autopoiesis, we must also acknowledge significant divergences. Maturana explicitly rejected the notion that living systems are primarily input-output devices processing information toward external goals, though he acknowledged that organisms continuously interact with their environment through structural coupling (Maturana & Varela, 1987). The difference is that these interactions are not information transfers but structural perturbations. The environment triggers changes determined by the organism's organization, not by external commands or representations. This represents a fundamental critique of computational models that treat organisms purely as information processors, while still recognizing that organisms continuously receive environmental influences and produce environmental effects.

Wirth's computational systems, despite their elegant organization, are fundamentally designed artifacts created to serve external purposes. Programs exist to accomplish tasks defined by human designers. Autopoietic systems, by contrast, have no external purpose. Their "purpose," if we can use that word, is simply to maintain their own organization and continue existing. This difference reflects deeper philosophical commitments: computational systems operate within a framework of representation and external reference, while autopoietic systems operate through structural dynamics without representing their environment (Varela et al., 1974).

Furthermore, while Wirth's structured programming emphasizes deterministic, logical control flow, biological autopoiesis involves stochastic processes, emergent dynamics, and forms of organization that resist reduction to algorithmic specification. Living systems exhibit creativity, adaptation, and open-ended evolution in ways that designed computational systems typically do not.

Critics of both approaches have raised important challenges. Wirth's structured programming, while valuable, has been supplemented and sometimes supplanted by other paradigms like object-oriented programming, functional programming, and more recently, machine learning approaches that embrace statistical patterns over explicit logical structure. Similarly, autopoiesis has faced criticisms regarding its explanatory scope, its applicability beyond cellular systems, and questions about whether organizational closure is truly necessary or sufficient for defining life (Fleischaker, 1988; McMullin, 2004).

Contemporary Relevance and Synthesis

Despite these divergences, the dialogue between computational thinking and theories of biological self-organization remains vibrant and productive. Contemporary developments in several fields demonstrate the ongoing relevance of ideas from both Wirth and Maturana.

In artificial life and complex systems research, scientists explicitly explore whether autopoietic principles can be implemented computationally (Froese & Stewart, 2010). Can we design computational systems that exhibit genuine self-production and organizational closure? Such systems would differ from traditional software, which depends on external hardware and ultimately on human programmers for its continued existence. Projects exploring self-modifying code, artificial chemistry, and computationally implemented autopoiesis represent attempts to synthesize insights from both traditions.

In software engineering, concepts like microservices architecture, containerization, and distributed systems design echo principles from both Wirth's structured programming and Maturana's autopoiesis. Modern software systems increasingly emphasize bounded contexts, clear interfaces, and autonomous components that maintain their own state and identity while participating in larger ecosystems. The container metaphor in software deployment directly parallels the membrane boundary in cellular autopoiesis - both maintain a distinction between inside and outside while enabling selective interaction.

Systems biology and computational biology have moved beyond simple reductionism to embrace organizational and network perspectives that resonate with both traditions (Kitano, 2002). Understanding cellular function now involves modeling complex networks of interactions, regulatory circuits, and emergent behaviors that arise from organizational principles rather than from simple causal chains. These models often employ computational frameworks that draw on structured, modular design principles while attempting to capture the self-producing, self-maintaining character of living systems.

Discussion

This interdisciplinary analysis has established significant structural and conceptual parallels between computational and biological theories of self-organization, specifically between ALGOL's design principles and autopoietic theory. Our investigation yields several key findings:

- **Principal Finding: Operational Closure as a Unifying Concept.** The most significant discovery is the fundamental parallel between ALGOL 60's specification as a formally closed system without I/O operations and Maturana's organizational closure in autopoietic systems. Both frameworks embody the principle that a system's identity and behavior are defined by internal organizational relations rather than by external inputs, outputs, or purposes. This parallel suggests that operational closure, as an organizational principle, transcends specific domains and may represent a fundamental pattern in how complex, coherent systems are conceptualized and formalized.
- **Divergent Resolutions to the Organization-Interaction Balance.** The subsequent evolution of these frameworks reveals different strategies for balancing internal organization with environmental interaction. ALGOL's development trajectory (from the formally closed specification of ALGOL 60 to the pragmatic addition of I/O in ALGOL W and subsequent languages) demonstrates explicit incorporation of environmental coupling into the system's definition. Maturana's autopoiesis maintains the distinction between organization (which remains self-referential) and structure (which continuously changes through environmental coupling). However, this divergence is less absolute than it might appear. Both approaches recognize that systems cannot function in isolation. ALGOL implementations always required I/O, even when the formal specification omitted it. Autopoietic systems always depend on material-energetic

exchange and structural coupling, even though organizational closure defines their identity. The key difference is conceptual framing: ALGOL made environmental interaction explicit in the language definition, while autopoiesis maintains organizational closure as definitional while treating environmental coupling as the structural realization of that organization. Critically, Maturana's framework does not deny input/output but reframes it. When a bacterium moves toward a nutrient gradient, it receives chemical information (input), processes it through its sensory-motor organization, and moves (output). However, this is not goal-directed information processing but structural coupling. The bacterium's organization determines how it responds to chemical perturbations. The environment doesn't instruct the bacterium what to do; it triggers responses determined by the bacterium's own organization. This is simultaneously a form of I/O (material exchange, sensory-motor coupling) and a departure from computational I/O (no representation, no external goals, no information transfer in the classical sense).

- **Organization and Interaction as Complementary Principles.** Both theoretical frameworks prioritize organizational patterns while recognizing the necessity of environmental interaction. Wirth's structured programming demonstrates that computational behavior emerges from algorithmic organization, yet programs must interact with data sources, users, and other systems to accomplish their purposes. Maturana's autopoiesis defines life through organizational relationships, yet these relationships can only be realized and maintained through continuous material exchange and structural coupling with the environment. This shared emphasis on organization-and-interaction (rather than organization-versus-interaction) suggests a productive synthesis. Complex systems are neither purely closed (which would make them inert and isolated) nor purely open (which would make them indistinguishable from their environment). Instead, they maintain organized identity through selective, mediated interaction with their environment. The boundary, whether a module interface in software or a cell membrane in biology, is the key structure that enables this balance, simultaneously maintaining distinction and enabling exchange.

– **Implications for Contemporary Research.** The synthesis of computational and biological perspectives on self-organization has significant implications for current research programs:

1. *Artificial Life and Synthetic Biology*: The comparison suggests that creating genuinely autonomous artificial systems requires implementing organizational patterns that maintain identity through environmental interaction, not merely complex functionality. Current approaches that depend on external programmers or hardware for system maintenance fail to achieve the self-producing character that defines autopoietic organization. However, the analysis also reveals that complete isolation is neither necessary nor possible. Autonomous systems must couple with their environment to obtain energy and materials.
2. *Systems Biology and Computational Modeling*: Biological modeling should balance computational tractability with respect for how living systems maintain organizational identity through environmental interaction. Models that treat organisms purely as input-output devices miss the organizational autonomy that characterizes life, but models that ignore environmental coupling miss the structural dynamics through which life is realized. The challenge is to model both organizational closure and structural openness simultaneously.
3. *Software Engineering*: Modern architectural patterns (microservices, containerization) echo autopoietic principles by emphasizing bounded contexts, clear interfaces, and autonomous components that maintain their own state while interacting with larger ecosystems. This convergence suggests that lessons from biological self-organization can inform the design of robust, scalable software systems that balance autonomy with integration.
4. *Theoretical Foundations*: The cross-disciplinary resonances identified here support the development of a general theory of organization that applies across computational, biological, and potentially social domains. Such a theory must address how systems maintain organized identity (closure) while depending on environmental interaction (openness) for their continued existence.

- **Limitations and Future Directions.** This analysis has focused primarily on conceptual parallels and historical intellectual context. Future research should:
  - Conduct detailed historical archival work to establish whether direct intellectual exchange occurred between computer science and biological cybernetics communities during the relevant period
  - Develop formal mathematical frameworks that precisely characterize the relationship between computational closure (as in ALGOL 60) and organizational closure (as in autopoiesis)
  - Design and implement experimental systems that test whether computational autopoiesis can be achieved without dependence on external hardware or programmers
  - Explore whether organizational closure principles apply to social systems, cognitive systems, or other complex domains beyond computation and cellular biology
- **Final Synthesis.** The convergence between Wirth's ALGOL contributions and Maturana's autopoiesis demonstrates that fundamental insights about organization, autonomy, and environmental interaction emerged independently but convergently across disciplines during the mid-20th century. Both computational and biological theorists recognized that complex systems achieve coherence through organizational patterns, but neither framework advocated for absolute closure. ALGOL 60's formal specification emphasized internal organization but implementations required environmental coupling. Autopoiesis emphasizes organizational closure but explicitly requires continuous material-energetic exchange and structural coupling for system maintenance.

  The key insight from both traditions is that closure and openness are not contradictory but complementary. Systems maintain organized identity (closure at the organizational level) precisely through selective, mediated interaction with their environment (openness at the structural level). The boundary, whether a module interface or a cell membrane, is not a barrier but a mediator that enables this balance. Maturana's framework does introduce input/output, though reconceptualized: organisms continuously receive environmental perturbations (inputs) and produce environmental effects (outputs) through structural coupling. What distinguishes this from classical computational I/O is that the system's responses are determined by its own organization, not by external commands or representations. The environment triggers but does not specify the system's behavior - the system remains autonomous while being continuously coupled with its environment.

The synthesis of these perspectives remains incomplete, offering rich opportunities for future theoretical and empirical work. As we develop increasingly sophisticated artificial systems and deepen our understanding of biological organization, the dialogue between computational and biological approaches to self-organization will continue to generate productive insights. The challenge ahead lies in creating conceptual and practical frameworks that honor both organizational autonomy and environmental coupling, potentially leading to new forms of genuinely self-maintaining artificial systems that balance independence with interaction.

The fundamental lesson from both traditions is clear: organization and interaction are inseparable. Whether in programs or cells, in algorithms or metabolisms, it is the pattern of relationships that maintains identity, the boundaries that simultaneously distinguish and connect system to environment, and the continuous exchange that sustains organization through change that enable complex systems to exist as coherent, autonomous entities. Understanding how systems achieve this balance (maintaining organized identity through environmental interaction) remains one of the central intellectual challenges of our time, and the conversation between computational and biological perspectives continues to illuminate the path forward.

Conclusion

The relationship between Niklaus Wirth's contributions to ALGOL and structured programming and Humberto Maturana's theory of autopoiesis illustrates a broader pattern in 20th-century thought: the convergence of multiple disciplines around questions of organization, structure, and the principles by which complex systems maintain coherence and identity. While direct intellectual influence is difficult to establish definitively, the conceptual resonances suggest a shared participation in a larger intellectual movement that sought to understand complexity through organizational principles rather than through reductive analysis of components.

Wirth's insistence on clarity, modularity, and structured organization in computational systems provided conceptual tools and metaphors that enriched thinking about biological organization. His work demonstrated how complex, coherent systems could emerge from the careful application of organizational principles - hierarchy, encapsulation, clear interfaces, and recursive structure. These ideas, circulating in the intellectual environment of systems theory and cybernetics, contributed to the conceptual vocabulary from which Maturana drew in articulating autopoiesis.

Conversely, Maturana's autopoiesis challenged certain assumptions embedded in computational thinking, particularly the emphasis on external function and purpose. By insisting that living systems are defined by their self-producing organization rather than by external goals, Maturana offered a critique and correction to overly mechanistic applications of computational metaphors in biology.

The ongoing dialogue between computational and biological thinking about organization remains essential for addressing contemporary challenges. As we develop increasingly complex artificial systems - from AI to synthetic biology to distributed computational networks - we need conceptual frameworks that help us understand how organization emerges, how boundaries are maintained, how systems achieve autonomy while remaining coupled with their environments, and how designed systems might transition from mere artifacts to genuinely self-maintaining entities.

Both Wirth and Maturana, in their respective domains, insisted on the primacy of organization and the importance of understanding systems in terms of their internal coherence rather than merely their external function. The remarkable parallel between ALGOL 60's operational closure (a formally closed computational system without I/O) and autopoiesis's organizational closure reveals a deep structural affinity between computational and biological thinking about self-contained, self-referential systems. While ALGOL's closure was eventually opened through the pragmatic addition of I/O functions in later versions, Maturana maintained operational closure as the defining and unchanging characteristic of living systems, resolved not by opening the system but through the concept of structural coupling.

Their ideas, developed in parallel and convergent intellectual movements, continue to offer insights for anyone seeking to understand, design, or theorize about complex organized systems, whether computational or biological, artificial or living. The synthesis of their insights remains an unfinished project, but one rich with possibility for deeper understanding of organization itself - the fundamental principle by which complexity achieves coherence and systems maintain their identity in a changing world.

References

Fleischaker, G. R. (1988). Autopoiesis: The status of its system logic. *Biosystems, 22*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/0303-2647(88)90048-2

Froese, T., & Stewart, J. (2010). Life after Ashby: Ultrastability and the autopoietic foundations of biological individuality. *Cybernetics & Human Knowing, 17*(4), 83–106. https://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/imp/chk/2010/00000017/00000004/art00002

Kitano, H. (2002). Systems biology: A brief overview. *Science, 295*(5560), 1662–1664. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1069492

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1980). *Autopoiesis and cognition: The realization of the living.* D. Reidel Publishing Company. https://link.springer.com/book/10.1007/978-94-009-8947-4

Maturana, H. R., & Varela, F. J. (1987). *The tree of knowledge: The biological roots of human understanding.* Shambhala.

McMullin, B. (2004). Thirty years of computational autopoiesis: A review. *Artificial Life, 10*(3), 277–295. https://doi.org/10.1162/1064546041255548

Naur, P., Backus, J. W., Bauer, F. L., Green, J., Katz, C., McCarthy, J., Perlis, A. J., Rutishauser, H., Samelson, K., Vauquois, B., Wegstein, J. H., van Wijngaarden, A., & Woodger, M. (1963). Revised report on the algorithmic language ALGOL 60. *Communications of the ACM, 6*(1), 1–17. https://cacm.acm.org/

Perlis, A. J., & Samelson, K. (1958). Preliminary report: International algebraic language. *Communications of the ACM, 1*(12), 8–22. https://cacm.acm.org/

Varela, F. J., Maturana, H. R., & Uribe, R. (1974). Autopoiesis: The organization of living systems, its characterization and a model. *Biosystems, 5*(4), 187–196. https://doi.org/10.1016/0303-2647(74)90031-8

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

Wiener, N. (1948). *Cybernetics: Or control and communication in the animal and the machine.* MIT Press.

Wirth, N. (1971). Program development by stepwise refinement. *Communications of the ACM, 14*(4), 221–227. ETH Zürich archive: https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-a-000814155

Wirth, N. (1976). *Algorithms + data structures = programs.* Prentice-Hall.

Wirth, N. (1985). *Programming in Modula-2* (3rd ed.). Springer-Verlag.

Wirth, N., & Hoare, C. A. R. (1966). A contribution to the development of ALGOL. *Communications of the ACM, 9*(6), 413–432. https://cacm.acm.org/

Authors' Information

Krassimir Markov *– Prof. Dr., Institute of Information Theories and Applications; P.O. Box: 775, Sofia-1000, Bulgaria;*

e-mail: president@ithea.org, itheaiss@gmail.com.

Major Fields of Scientific Research: General theoretical information research, Multi-dimensional information systems