

**Juarrero-Rubino Introduction to *Emergence, Complexity and Self-Organization: Precursors and Prototypes* (2008)**

**Deacon-Cashman, "Complexity, Emergence, and Eliminativism" (2011)**

**Both essays begin** with a description of what might be called the Scholastic to Modern world view, which denies the possibility of emergence for fundamental or substantive properties, things or events. All change is only of superficial or secondary qualities - unless it is divine intervention - because all essential traits have been in existence ab initio. One reason for the hegemony of this view was the standard understanding of efficient causality that dates to Aristotle and was uniquely deployed in the Modern age (1600 on), and which rests on the notion that there can be no more in the effect than in the cause (hence need for divine intervention for real, substantial change). **Both essays include** each of these points, and in the same sequence.

**The second step** in each essay consists in an overview of the concept of emergence as first coined by Lewes and discussed by J.S. Mill in response to advances in the field of chemistry, in particular the compositional integrity that characterizes chemical phenomena. **Both essays highlight** the concomitant problem of part-whole and whole-part relations (of a chemical compound) **that** are particularly intractable to understanding in terms of efficient causality. **Each essay includes each of these points, and, once again, in the same order.**

**The third step in each essay** consists in highlighting the revolution in nonlinear far from equilibrium revolution brought about by Ilya Prigogine's research. In particular, each essay points out the potential that this science has for accounting for those mereological (part-whole) relationships and in providing the scientific grounding for real emergence, where the future is not just implied in the present and waiting to be unfurled but is the result of the operations of constraint. **Each essay includes each of these points, once again in the same sequence.**

**The fourth step in each essay** consists in a brief summary of Immanuel Kant's suspicion that the difference between organisms and machines is their possession of formative (and not just motive) power, and which is due to a peculiar kind of reciprocal causality - not allowed in the modern world view described in paragraph 1 above. Formative power is due to the inherent or endogenous production of constraints. **Each essay includes a discussion of Kant, and both essays include each of these points, once again in exactly the same sequence.**

**The fifth step in each essay** consists in a summary of the ideas of British Emergentists. Each essay notes that Lewes coined the term, and continues with a discussion of C.D. Broad. The paragraphs on Broad are a particularly egregious part of the Deacon-Cashman essay, since the Rubino-Juarrero interpretation of Broad's account of the possibility of discontinuity in causal laws is nonstandard. **Each essay includes a discussion of CD Broad, and comes to the same, non-standard interpretation of Broad.**

**From here the Deacon-Cashman essay diverges in the source of its plagiarism**, going from the Juarrero-Rubino anthology to a paper by Juarrero published in the anthology compiled by Jesus Aguilar and Andrei Buckareff (*Causing Human Actions: New Perspectives on the Causal Theory of Action*, MIT 2010) that explains the new far-from-equilibrium thermodynamics's understanding of the inherent or endogenous generation of constraints, in particular the normative element these introduce. **Both essays concentrate** on the interpretive aspect of this normativity as captured in the representational potential of complex dynamical attractors. **Both of them speculate** that neural processes embody these self-organized attractors and conclude that emergence is embodied in the self-production of a hierarchy of constraints.

It is impossible to argue that the precise sequence and content of ideas described here occurred by chance or simply because all authors are "working in the same field." The likelihood that this would be the case is astronomical. What has taken place here can only be classified as appropriation of ideas or concept plagiarism.