Disciplines and Systems as Genetically Exhausted Lineages

The Habsburg dynasty and a closed scientific discipline share a structural logic. They differ in substrate, not in mechanism. The three components of inbreeding depression — drift load, lost heterozygosity, masked burden — describe anything that ages in isolation.

JAN VYTŘÍSAL

APRIL 5, 2026 21 MIN READ

Epistemology · Innovation · Disciplines · Genetics

I. THE EXHAUSTED LINEAGE

In 1700 the last Habsburg king, Charles II, died in Madrid without leaving an heir. Charles II was the terminal product of a process of consanguineous marriage that had run in his lineage for more than two hundred years. His state of health, documented by historical medicine, was so severe that the diplomacy of the European courts had been calculating his death while he was still alive — the inbreeding coefficient in his generation reached 0.254, higher than that of full-sibling pairs[1]. The Habsburg lineage, which in the sixteenth century had held half of Europe and the New World, died out in a single incapable generation.

A story about a system, not about a family.

Twentieth-century genetics described the mechanism behind the fall of the Habsburg lineage with mathematical precision. Inbreeding depression — the gradual decay of vitality due to a narrow gene pool — has three recognizable components. *Drift load* is the accumulation of mildly harmful alleles that, in a diverse population, would never reach homozygous form. *Lost heterozygosity* is the depletion of genetic diversity that would otherwise provide flexibility against new challenges. *Masked load* is the share of recessive harmful variants that have always been present in the population but only manifest once isolation has risen enough that two identical copies meet[2].

The same three components describe anything that ages in isolation. A scientific discipline that does not speak with other disciplines accumulates drift load in the form of conventional assumptions that no outsider questions. It loses heterozygosity in the form of a diversity of approaches that would give it flexibility on a new problem. And its masked load — recessive defects of method that, in a diverse environment, never had a chance to surface — emerges in full force the moment the discipline runs into a question its existing frame cannot hold.

The Habsburg lineage and the closed discipline share a structural logic; they differ only in substrate.

Why this parallel is more accurate than it appears, what the empirically documented ageing of systems looks like, and what it means for someone working inside such a system who would rather not become the Charles II of their field — that is the topic of what follows.

II. HETEROZYGOSITY AS RESILIENCE

For the biological parallel to be operatively usable, several concepts must be introduced — they have a precise mathematical sense in population genetics, but their structural logic carries across domains.

Effective population size (Ne). This is not the number of individuals in the population, but the number of those who in the given generation actually participate in reproduction and pass genetic material to the next generation. If a population has 1,000 members but only 50 reproduce (the rest are sterile, excluded, or non-participating), the effective population size is 50, not 1,000[3]. Drift — random shifts in allele frequencies — operates in proportion to 1/Ne, so a small effective population loses diversity rapidly even when it appears safely numerous.

In an epistemological context this concept has a direct parallel. A scientific discipline may at first sight have thousands of publishing authors, but if only several dozen of them form the research canon that is cited, taught, replicated and funded, the effective population of the discipline is those several dozen. Drift in such a discipline is a deterministic course, not a risk.

Hybrid vigor (heterosis). Crossing two genetically distant lineages produces offspring that are often more robust than either parental line. Mules are stronger than horses or donkeys. Hybrid maize outyields both parental lines by tens of percent. The reason is again statistical: in hybrids, two recessive harmful alleles meet less often, and traits that were hidden in one line combine with functioning dominant alleles in the other[4].

In the epistemological context, hybrid vigor manifests when two disciplines share a structural problem but use different tools and vocabularies. When they meet, part of the methodological weakness of each is cancelled: the problem now has multiple views, and each of them exposes what the other masks.

Drift load. In a small population, mildly harmful mutations may by chance spread and fix — selection in a small population is weak and chance wins. In a sufficiently large population, the same mutations would be removed by selection. The consequence is that small isolated populations slowly accumulate a genetic burden that a larger population with more diverse selection would never let into a permanent state[5].

In an intellectual system, drift load is what gets called the „obvious truth" of the discipline — what no one questions because no one outside has the standing to question it. In a small academic community, drift load accumulates rapidly: convention gradually takes the standing of knowledge, citation the standing of argument, terminology the standing of theory. In a diverse environment, much of this load would be tested by contact with other methodologies and either accepted or rejected. In isolation, it is never tested and becomes *de facto* dogma.

These three concepts — effective population size, hybrid vigor, drift load — form a diagnostic vocabulary by which the health of any knowledge-accumulating system can be described. Human genetics, cultural evolution, scientific discipline, corporation, legal system, artistic movement — all have a recognizable effective population, a capacity for hybrid vigor, and an accumulated drift load. The claim is structural: culture and biology share a formal logic describable in a common vocabulary, without culture being identified with biology. Diagnosis is possible in each of these areas with the same metrics.

III. LESSONS FROM ANTHROPOLOGY

For the parallel not to end at the academic shift from „actually chromosomes" to „actually ideas", an empirically documented intermediate stage must be named: cultural evolution.

Joseph Henrich and colleagues described a phenomenon that, in evolutionary anthropology, came to be called the *Tasmanian effect*[6]. When Tasmania was severed from Australia by rising sea levels around 10,000 years ago, the population on the island was relatively small and entirely cut off from continental populations. Archaeological records show that, over the following millennia, cultural complexity in Tasmania gradually decreased — some technologies known before the isolation (bone tools, fur clothing for cold periods, certain fishing techniques) were lost. The cause was not cognitive degeneration but a structural limit of the small population, which could not maintain the full cultural set the prior, larger population had accumulated. When a skill dies with its bearer before being transmitted, and there are not enough alternative bearers in the population, the technology is lost.

The Tasmanian effect holds universally, not just for isolated islands. Henrich showed that the size and connectedness of a population directly predict cultural complexity and the pace of innovation. Societies with a larger effective population (counted by the number of active innovators and the density of their contacts) generate more technological moves and maintain a wider repertoire. Societies with a smaller, less connected population stagnate or regress. A structural statement about the system in which knowledge reproduces, not a moral statement about the people in it.

Jared Diamond[7] formulated a macroscopic version of the same principle for entire continents. Eurasia had a powerful structural advantage over America and Africa — its east-west orientation. East-west spread meant a similar climatic belt and therefore the transferability of agricultural technologies, crops and domesticated animals over long distances. The north-south orientation of America (and, to a lesser extent, Africa) impeded that transfer. Diamond showed that continents with greater connectedness between populations accumulate innovations faster. The principle is again population genetics in a different substrate: the effective population of Eurasian agriculture spanned millions of farmers from the Atlantic to the Pacific who shared crops and procedures across a wide belt. The effective population of Mesoamerican or Andean agriculture was smaller and less well connected.

A third empirical anchor: the civilizational crossroads. Baghdad in the ninth century, Córdoba under the Umayyads, Florence in the quattrocento, *fin-de-siècle* Vienna, post-war Manhattan, Silicon Valley in the 1980s–2000s — these are points where, in a short time and small space, populations with distinct intellectual gene pools met. Baghdad linked Greek, Persian, Indian and Arabic traditions; Florence linked north Italian commercial know-how with recovered classical learning; Vienna linked Habsburg bureaucracy, Jewish intellectual life, Slavic emigrants and the remnants of German classicism. Each of these places experienced a hybrid-vigor improvement that none of the original lines had reached on its own[8].

If anyone insists that these historical bursts were chance or coincidence of genius, population genetics has an objection: they are exactly what a population model would predict at the moment when previously separated gene pools open. Not every opening produced a burst (some ended in conflict or in loss of identity), but the structural condition was, in each case, satisfied.

IV. WHEN A DISCIPLINE AGES

Twentieth-century philosophy of science described, with surprising precision, how a discipline ages in isolation. The terms it used differ from those in population genetics, but the mechanism they describe is the same.

Thomas Kuhn[9], in *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962), introduced the notion of *normal science* — the phase in which a discipline works within a settled paradigm, fine-tunes detail, solves admitted puzzles and gradually develops its canonical vocabulary. Kuhn did not describe normal science as something bad; it is how science functions most of the time. But he also described what happens when normal science meets anomalies that the paradigm cannot, in principle, accommodate. In the first phase, anomalies are ignored. In the second, they are explained by *ad hoc* additions. In the third they accumulate enough that the discipline enters a crisis. And in this crisis the discipline either opens to outside influence — taking in methodological or conceptual input from other disciplines, and the paradigm shifts — or remains stuck in an autoreferential cycle in which each new publication cites the prior, and new empirics are interpreted through the interpreted interpreted canon.

Imre Lakatos[10] in the 1970s extended this structure with the distinction between *progressive* and *degenerative* research programmes. A progressive programme produces new empirical predictions that get confirmed. A degenerative programme produces only *ad hoc* additions that explain failures but no longer formulate new predictions. Lakatos showed that the difference between progressive and degenerative lies in dynamics — and that a discipline can slip from the first into the second at any moment, without its participants noticing, because their criterion of success has shifted from empirical prediction to internal consistency.

Donald Campbell[11] formulated yet another important insight: the *fish-scale model of omniscience*. No single discipline covers all of reality; each covers only a narrow strip, like a fish's scale. The field as a whole is covered only by the scales overlapping. If, at any time, disciplines withdraw into their own scales and stop overlapping with their neighbours, holes appear in the field — areas where no discipline holds responsibility and where reality remains invisible. Campbell formulated the model in the 1960s as a warning; fifty years later, his diagnosis has become more description than warning.

Empirical evidence from the past decade confirms the diagnosis. A study by Brian Uzzi and colleagues, published in *Science* in 2013[12], analysed 17.9 million scientific papers across all disciplines and looked for the relation between the *atypicality of the combination of knowledge in citations* and the impact of the paper. The result: papers with a balanced atypical combination (citing standard sources *plus* some unexpected ones) had nearly double the probability of joining the top 5% most-cited papers in their field.

Papers with purely conventional combinations of citations performed at the average. Papers with purely atypical combinations performed below average. The optimum sits at the boundary — inside a discipline with a conventional core, but with a willingness to reach for relevant input outside.

This study is the empirical equivalent of the population-genetics model: hybrid vigor is produced by combinations, not by pure isolation or by complete dissolution. Just as in genetics extreme outbreeding (crossing very distant species) usually produces sterile offspring, extreme interdisciplinarity unanchored in any discipline produces shallow work that no one reads. The optimum is calibrated — sufficient depth in one discipline for understanding, sufficient openness to others for generative enrichment.

What separates a discipline aged in isolation from one that is merely specialized? Three recognizable signs.

First: *an autoreferential citation network*. The discipline cites mostly itself, and the influential papers within it are those that cite previous influential papers. External citations decline as a share.

Second: *loss of predictive capacity*. The discipline produces publications, but those publications no longer formulate new empirical predictions that could be tested. Instead, its output is dominated by interpretations, reinterpretations, taxonomies, categorizations.

Third: *a shift of the success criterion from outcome to process*. Methodology is judged, not outcome; respect for tradition, not the precision of prediction; the author's standing in the network, not the quality of argument. This shift is usually unreflected — participants would claim they are judging outcome, but their operative criteria are different.

These three signs can, at any moment, be measured in any discipline, without having to resolve its value. A discipline with high autoreference, declining predictive capacity, and a process-based success criterion has the structural profile of a late Habsburg lineage. What happens to it next is a question of a genetically exhausted system, not of the talent of its members.

V. STRUCTURAL ISOMORPHISM AS GENETIC TRANSFER

If disciplines in isolation are at risk of stagnation and hybridization with other disciplines is the way out, the question arises: *how* should such hybridization be carried out so that it produces a generative outcome rather than a compromised or shallow one? The key concept is *structural isomorphism*.

Structural isomorphism is the situation in which two disciplines are solving formally the same problem in different substrates, without being aware of it. When it appears, the solution can be transferred from one to the other as a mathematical or structural translation — a tighter relation than analogy or metaphor. The recipient does not need to take over the donor's vocabulary; it only has to recognize that the problem has the same formal shape and apply the solution in the local substrate.

This conception was formulated in modern form by Ludwig von Bertalanffy[13] in *General System Theory* (1968), and its more influential reformulation came in Hofstadter's *Gödel, Escher, Bach* (1979)[14]. Hofstadter showed that strange loops and self-reference appear independently in mathematics (Gödel), the visual arts (Escher) and music (Bach), and that understanding one illuminates the others — because all three are instances of the same formal structure.

Empirically documented cases of structural isomorphism that produced an actual shift can be counted in the dozens.

Genetic algorithms — solving optimization problems in computer science by using selection principles from population biology. John Holland[15] showed that the same structure (variation, selection, inheritance) solves optimization in the gene pool and in parameter space alike. Structural isomorphism between biological evolution and search in parameter space.

Neural networks — a computational architecture inspired by the structure of the nervous system. Structural isomorphism between distributed neuronal activation and layered feed-forward processing of inputs.

Network theory — the same mathematical structure (graph, nodes, edges, degree distribution) was shown to describe the internet, social networks, protein interactions, citation networks, and infectious spread. Albert-László Barabási[16] documented that scale-free distributions appear across these domains, and that their structural properties (robustness against random attack, vulnerability to targeted attack) hold in all of them.

Power laws — Geoffrey West and colleagues at the Santa Fe Institute[17] documented that the same power-law relations describe the metabolism of organisms, the growth of cities and the life cycle of corporations. A corporation with 10× the employees consumes about 8× the energy — the same scaling exponent as for mammals with 10× the body mass. Structural isomorphism between biological and social allometry.

Information theory — Shannon's concept of entropy and channel capacity, originally formulated for telecommunications, turned out to be applicable in genetics (the information content of DNA), thermodynamics (Boltzmann entropy), statistics (Kullback–Leibler divergence) and machine learning (cross-entropy loss). Structural isomorphism between signal transmission, biological information and statistical uncertainty.

None of these cases was reached by anyone *translating the vocabulary* of one discipline into another. They were reached by recognizing that a problem in discipline A had the same formal structure as a solved problem in discipline B, and performing a structural translation. The vocabulary stayed local in each discipline. What was carried over was the schema — model, equation, algorithm.

This distinction matters operationally. Most attempts at interdisciplinarity stop at the first step — borrowing terminology. Economics talks about „ecosystems", management about „company DNA", art about „algorithms of creativity". These borrowings substitute metaphor for isomorphism and generate the illusion of enrichment without substantive shift. Structural isomorphism, by contrast, requires that what is taken from the donor discipline is the formal structure that, in the recipient discipline, produces *new predictions*, *new testable hypotheses*, *new solutions to previously unsolved problems*. Without that criterion, the meeting of disciplines remains in the realm of terminological cosplay.

VI. CARGO-CULT VERSUS GENUINE ENRICHMENT

If structural isomorphism produces real enrichment and terminological borrowing only its parody, the question is how to tell them apart in practice. Three criteria that work as diagnostics.

First criterion: did a new prediction arise? This is Lakatos's criterion applied to the transfer event. When a schema from discipline B is taken into discipline A, it should yield in A an empirically testable prediction that, without the transfer, would not have been formulated. Genetic algorithms predict how fast an optimization problem will converge depending on population size, mutation rate and selective pressure — a prediction that gets tested and that, without the biological parallel, would not be formulated. When „company DNA" produces an equally rhetorically attractive text irrespective of whether the company is Apple, Walmart or IBM, there is no prediction; there is an analogy that predicts nothing.

Second criterion: does the transfer carry the risk of falsification? A real structural isomorphism presupposes that the same formal structure holds in both substrates — and this claim is falsifiable. If empirics in A appear that do not match the model from B, the isomorphism is refuted or restricted to a narrower range. A cargo-cult metaphor, by contrast, has nothing to falsify; by definition it is unbreakable, because it commits to no concrete content. When an economic model collapses, no one thinks to claim that the ecosystem metaphor of the economy has been refuted — because the metaphor never claimed anything.

Third criterion: does the transfer produce solutions to previously unsolved problems? This is the hardest criterion and at the same time the most reliable. Structural isomorphism has practical value only if it solves something the discipline could not solve on its own. Genetic algorithms solve optimization problems of nonlinear, high-dimensional kind on which classical gradient-descent methods fail. Network theory explained the spread of epidemics in a way that classical epidemiology, based on homogeneous mixing, did not — and the predictions of network theory were empirically verified by the 2009 and 2020 pandemics. When the transfer of a schema does not produce a new solution, it is decoration, not a tool.

These three criteria are in fact three aspects of the same thing: the difference between the *generative* and the *decorative* meeting of disciplines. The generative meeting yields new predictions, falsifiable claims and solutions to unsolved problems. The decorative meeting yields rhetoric, terminology and a managerial conception of innovation.

In academic environments today, interdisciplinarity is in fashion, and that fashion means much of what is presented as cross-disciplinary is in fact decorative. Grants for interdisciplinary research are often awarded to projects with team members from different disciplines whose output meets none of the criteria above. Real structural isomorphism is rare, because it requires two demanding conditions to be met at once: deep competence in at least one discipline and the openness to recognize formal accord with another.

These two conditions test each other. Deep competence without openness leads to autoreferential stagnation, as described in Section IV. Openness without depth produces the shallow analogies described here. The optimum sits in their combination, which is structurally demanding — and therefore rare.

VII. PRACTICAL DIAGNOSIS

If the principles are described, the question is how to apply them in practice. Three questions that serve as a frame for self-reflection in any discipline, organization or system.

First question: how high is the effective population of my system? That is, how many of them actively contribute new ideas, how many have the standing to challenge convention, how many are in contact with anything outside — beyond a mere head count. An effective population of 10 in a discipline of 10,000 members is a sign of advanced ageing. An effective population of 100 in a startup of 200 is structurally strong. A question of genetic diversity, not of the system's morality.

Second question: what is unquestionable in my system? Drift load is accumulated in the form of silent assumptions. To identify them requires a step outside — contact with people who are not inside the system. The outside eye sees drift load better than the inside one, because it is not invested in maintaining it. A working rule: if no outsider has ever questioned a basic assumption of the discipline, read it as a signal. Either the assumption is trivially true (rare), or it is so deeply embedded in the discipline's identity that the natives cannot see it.

Third question: which other disciplines are solving formally the same problem in another substrate? This question is the hardest and at the same time the most important. It demands imagination and structural attention. If you are solving a problem of coordinating asymmetric agents — economics is solving it (mechanism design), biology is solving it (signalling theory), law is solving it (contract law), computer science is solving it (distributed systems), anthropology is solving it (rituals of reciprocity). If you are solving a spread-in-network problem — epidemiology is solving it, marketing, network sociology, cybernetics, ecology, neuroscience. If you are solving a problem of allocation of limited resources — economics, ecology, statistics, computer science, evolutionary biology.

Structural isomorphism exists almost everywhere a problem can be formulated in abstract form. Failing to reach it means failing to ask the question, even though the question could be asked. Failure to ask is usually a manifestation of disciplinary isolation, which does not even see the question — not a deliberate decision.

The practical procedure for finding an isomorphism has three steps. *First*, formulate your problem in abstract form, without the vocabulary of the discipline. „Optimization of a non-linear function with many local maxima" is more abstract than „calibration of a machine-learning model". „An asymmetric game with repetition and reputational capital" is more abstract than „competitive dynamics of two firms in a B2B SaaS segment". *Second*, look for a discipline that has been studying that abstract structure longer and more deeply than you have. *Third*, do not just borrow its vocabulary — adopt *its model* and test it on your substrate. The output will be either a functional isomorphism with predictive power, or the discovery that the substrates differ in a substantial detail — which is itself valuable information, because it reveals exactly how problems that look isomorphic in fact differ.

Separating empirical from inferential: disciplines, organizations and systems that are structurally isolated and autoreferential exhibit empirically measurable signs of stagnation (declining share of external citations, declining predictive capacity, a shift of success criterion to process). *Inferential claim:* this stagnation has a structural cause analogous to inbreeding depression in population genetics (operatively supported by the parallel, but the formal mathematical bridge between population genetics and cultural/epistemic evolution is worked out only in a few partial models). *Speculative claim:* the regular search for structural isomorphisms with neighbouring disciplines is a universally effective strategy of revitalization (anecdotally supported by historical cases, but systematically controlled data on the success of this strategy are missing).

What is, however, empirically beyond dispute: isolation costs. Opening has a price. The difference between them shows up over the long term, not in a single test — which means that whoever wants to close a system has to do it before the price shows, and whoever wants to open it has to do so before the system is even aware that it bears the cost of isolation.

VIII. THE SECOND CUT

Charles II of Habsburg died at 38 without an heir. The Habsburg dynasty, which had united Europe through reasonable marriages, fell because the marriages stopped being reasonable — they became too narrow, too self-confirming, too closed to foreign blood. The Habsburgs had organizational capacity, dynastic discipline, educational networks and financial resources unmatched by any other dynastic formation in Europe. What they did not have was genetic refreshment. And none of the other strengths saved them.

This history is not an exotic extreme. It is the usual trajectory of a system that has stopped admitting inputs from outside. The same trajectory can be observed across domains. A scientific discipline with high autoreference. A corporation with a tradition that does not include self-questioning. A political movement whose activists communicate only among themselves. An academic school that has been citing the same authors for thirty years. An artistic movement whose critics and creators have become interchangeable. A nation-state that has stopped admitting immigrants — not for the sake of prosperity, but for the sake of identity. All these systems share one property: they look short-term stable, often powerful, often imposing. Their exhaustion does not show on the outside. It shows on the inside, the moment a question must be answered that the existing frame cannot hold — and they realize they no longer have anything to draw on from within.

The closing question is not „how do I avoid isolation". Isolation is a structural state that cannot be avoided by wishing; it can only be actively interrupted. The closing question is: *who in my system have I not yet let in?*

The question has three faces in practice. Who are the people from other disciplines who are solving formally the same problems and whom I do not yet know? Who are the critics whose criticism I have so far rejected as unwarranted because they do not use my vocabulary? Who are those for whom my system has closed the door because they do not belong to its inner line — and what should I do to let them back in?

The answers are uncomfortable because the entry of a new gene pool means the loss of part of the existing line's identity. The Habsburg model was historically right in that controlled marriages preserved dynastic continuity; it was historically wrong in that the control could not interrupt itself even when it began producing sterile heirs. A scientific discipline needs an identity, a vocabulary and a canon. It also needs the capacity to admit what is formally close but substrate-foreign, because only substrate-foreignness brings in fresh blood. The Habsburg lineage lost that capacity before noticing the loss; a discipline that is losing it now differs from its analogue in one decisive respect — its outcome is not yet decided.

REFERENCES

1. Alvarez, G., Ceballos, F. C., Quinteiro, C. *The Role of Inbreeding in the Extinction of a European Royal Dynasty*. PLoS ONE, 4(4), e5174, 2009.
2. Charlesworth, D., Charlesworth, B. *Inbreeding Depression and Its Evolutionary Consequences*. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 18, 237–268, 1987. Lynch, M., Walsh, B. *Genetics and Analysis of Quantitative Traits*. Sinauer Associates, 1998.
3. Wright, S. *Evolution in Mendelian Populations*. Genetics, 16(2), 97–159, 1931. Crow, J. F., Kimura, M. *An Introduction to Population Genetics Theory*. Harper & Row, 1970.
4. Birchler, J. A., Yao, H., Chudalayandi, S., Vaiman, D., Veitia, R. A. *Heterosis*. The Plant Cell, 22(7), 2105–2112, 2010. Lippman, Z. B., Zamir, D. *Heterosis: Revisiting the Magic*. Trends in Genetics, 23(2), 60–66, 2007.
5. Lynch, M., Conery, J., Bürger, R. *Mutation Accumulation and the Extinction of Small Populations*. The American Naturalist, 146(4), 489–518, 1995.
6. Henrich, J. *Demography and Cultural Evolution: How Adaptive Cultural Processes Can Produce Maladaptive Losses — The Tasmanian Case*. American Antiquity, 69(2), 197–214, 2004. Henrich, J. *The*

Secret of Our Success. Princeton University Press, 2016.

7. Diamond, J. *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. W. W. Norton, 1997.
8. Mokyr, J. *A Culture of Growth: The Origins of the Modern Economy*. Princeton University Press, 2017. For the Vienna case: Janik, A., Toulmin, S. *Wittgenstein's Vienna*. Simon & Schuster, 1973.
9. Kuhn, T. S. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.
10. Lakatos, I. *Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes*. In: Lakatos, I., Musgrave, A. (eds.), *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*. Cambridge University Press, 1970.
11. Campbell, D. T. *Ethnocentrism of Disciplines and the Fish-Scale Model of Omniscience*. In: Sherif, M., Sherif, C. W. (eds.), *Interdisciplinary Relationships in the Social Sciences*. Aldine, 1969, pp. 328–348.
12. Uzzi, B., Mukherjee, S., Stringer, M., Jones, B. *Atypical Combinations and Scientific Impact*. Science, 342(6157), 468–472, 2013.
13. von Bertalanffy, L. *General System Theory: Foundations, Development, Applications*. George Braziller, 1968.
14. Hofstadter, D. R. *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. Basic Books, 1979.
15. Holland, J. H. *Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems*. University of Michigan Press, 1975.
16. Barabási, A.-L. *Linked: The New Science of Networks*. Perseus Publishing, 2002. Barabási, A.-L. *Network Science*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
17. West, G. *Scale: The Universal Laws of Growth, Innovation, Sustainability, and the Pace of Life in Organisms, Cities, Economies, and Companies*. Penguin Press, 2017. Bettencourt, L. M. A., Lobo, J., Helbing, D., Kühnert, C., West, G. B. *Growth, Innovation, Scaling, and the Pace of Life in Cities*. PNAS, 104(17), 7301–7306, 2007.

JAN VYTŘÍSAL

Disciplines and Systems as Genetically Exhausted Lineages

Topology of the Real · No. 4 / 2026

2026-04-05

janvytrisal.com/en/essays/disciplines-as-genetically-exhausted-lineages/

ABOUT THE SERIES

Texts in this series are written as authorial essays in dialog with large language models (primarily Claude), which serve as research partner and editorial sparring. Structural decisions, choice of questions, citation choices, and final editing are the author's.

CITE Vytřísal, J. (2026). *Disciplines and Systems as Genetically Exhausted Lineages*. Topology of the Real, No. 4/2026. https://janvytrisal.com/en/essays/disciplines-as-genetically-exhausted-lineages/