WHITE PAPER

Relational Systems Theory (RST)Tm

A Formal Framework for Proportion-Based Coherence in Complex Systems

Author

M.C.M. van Kroonenburgh, MSc

Heerlen, The Netherlands

Version 1.0

Date

November 18, 2025

.

Abstract

Relational systems theory (RST) proposes that coherence in complex systems arises from the proportional structure of relations rather than from the intrinsic properties of system components. The theory defines relation as the smallest functional unit of coherence and introduces proportional invariance as the structural mechanism that preserves relational integrity under transformation. A relational field is formalized to describe the abstract space in which these relations acquire and maintain structure.

RST identifies three primary expressions of relational coherence: spatial proportion, temporal proportion, and cognitive proportion. Spatial proportion governs the stability of form across spatial transformations; temporal proportion governs the intelligibility of change across states; and cognitive proportion governs the emergence of meaning through relational alignment between internal structure and external signals. These dimensions are treated as specific regions of a broader relational field governed by the same invariance principles.

The contribution of RST is conceptual rather than predictive. It provides a structural explanation for why systems across disparate domains remain coherent, offering a unifying framework that complements existing theories in complexity science, systems theory, cognitive science, and control theory. Limitations remain in formalization, measurement, and empirical validation, but the theory establishes a foundation for analyzing and constructing coherent systems by specifying the structural conditions under which coherence becomes possible.

Index

1. Introduction

Coherent behavior in complex systems has long been a central problem across scientific disciplines. Systems as different as physical structures, biological organisms, economic environments, and computational architectures appear to operate according to distinct principles, yet they often display remarkably similar stability patterns. Traditional theories explain these systems through the properties of their components, the dynamics of their interactions, or the information they exchange. What remains less examined is the structural condition that makes coherence possible in the first place.

Relational systems theory (RST) begins at this deeper level. It proposes that the smallest functional unit of a coherent system is not the component, but the relationship that binds components into a structured whole. According to this view, coherence emerges when the relationships inside a system follow a consistent proportional structure. Proportion acts as a stabilizing mechanism: when it holds, systems maintain their identity even under transformation; when it breaks, systems drift into noise, volatility, or semantic ambiguity.

The impetus for RST comes from a pattern observed across multiple domains. Coherence appears not as a product of scale or computational force, but as a consequence of proportional alignment within a relational field. Despite their differences, systems in space, time, and cognition rely on proportional constraints to remain intelligible. This convergence suggests that proportion is not an incidental feature of specific domains, but a general structural principle that governs coherence.

The purpose of this whitepaper is to articulate this principle formally. RST does not attempt to replace existing models of complexity, dynamics, or cognition. Instead, it provides a foundational layer beneath them by identifying the relational conditions under which coherent behavior can arise. The theory aims to define the basic assumptions of relational coherence, formalize the structure of the relational field, and describe how proportion governs stability across different types of systems. By clarifying these underlying mechanisms, RST offers a unified framework for understanding why coherent behavior appears in disparate contexts and how it can be analyzed or constructed in a principled way.

The sections that follow develop the theory in three steps. The first establishes the conceptual foundations of relational structure. The second formalizes the axioms and relational field that support proportion based coherence. The third outlines how spatial, temporal, and cognitive proportion emerge as specific expressions of a more general relational logic. The models that instantiate these ideas in practice are included in the appendices, allowing the theoretical core to stand on its own.

2. Conceptual foundations

Relational systems theory begins with a shift in how systems are understood. Most scientific frameworks explain complex behavior by examining the properties of individual components, or by modeling the interactions that occur between them. This approach has been valuable, but it leaves an essential question unanswered: what determines whether these interactions produce coherence rather than disorder? RST argues that coherence is not a product of the components themselves, but of the relational structure that binds them together.

A relation, in the context of RST, is not simply a connection or an interaction. It is the structural bond that determines how elements constrain and influence one another. A relation carries direction, proportion, and the conditions under which a system can reorganize without losing its identity. When we view a system through its relational structure rather than its components, coherence becomes a property of the pattern as a whole, not of the individual parts that participate in it.

Proportion is central to this perspective. A relation maintains coherence only when its structure remains proportionally stable under transformation. Proportion describes how forces, signals, or patterns stay aligned relative to one another as the system evolves. In this sense, proportion is not a numerical ratio, but a structural constraint: it governs how a system preserves continuity while undergoing change. When proportional relationships hold, the system behaves intelligibly; when they distort, coherence degrades.

This relational view also reframes the concept of identity. In a component based framework, identity is tied to the properties of the parts. Within RST, identity is tied to the stability of relations. A system remains itself not because each component persists, but because the proportional structure of its relational field is maintained. This allows systems to evolve, regenerate, or reorganize while still preserving coherence. Identity becomes a relational pattern rather than a static configuration.

Finally, RST introduces the idea of a relational field, the abstract space in which relations exist and acquire structure. The relational field is not tied to any specific domain. It is the medium through which proportion operates, and the context that determines whether relational patterns can remain stable under transformation. Spatial, temporal, and cognitive systems occupy different regions of this field, but they follow the same structural logic. Their coherence arises from relational proportion, not from the physical or informational nature of their elements.

These conceptual foundations prepare the ground for a more formal articulation of RST. The next section introduces the axioms that define the theory and establish proportion as the mechanism that governs coherence across systems.

3. Axioms of relational systems theory

A formal theory requires a minimal set of assumptions from which its structure follows. In relational systems theory, these assumptions define how coherence arises, how systems maintain identity under transformation, and what conditions must be present for relational structure to remain stable. The axioms presented here are not empirical claims but conceptual foundations: they describe the structural principles that make proportion based coherence possible across different domains.

Axiom 1: Relation is the smallest functional unit of coherence

A system becomes coherent not because of the intrinsic properties of its components, but because of the relational structure that binds those components into a whole. A relation determines how elements constrain, influence, and interpret one another. The relation, rather than the element it connects, is therefore the fundamental unit through which coherence emerges.

Axiom 2: Proportion governs relational integrity

A relation maintains coherence only when the proportional structure between elements remains stable under transformation. Proportion determines how forces, signals, or patterns stay aligned as the system evolves. When proportional alignment is preserved, relational structures remain intelligible; when it fails, coherence degrades into noise or instability. Proportion is thus the mechanism that maintains the integrity of relations.

Axiom 3: Coherence arises when relational proportion remains invariant across scale or state

A system retains its identity when the proportional configuration of its relational field remains consistent, even as components change or as the system moves through different states. Coherence is not defined by specific values or configurations, but by the invariance of proportional relationships across transformations. A system is coherent to the extent that its relational proportions remain stable.

Axiom 4: Transformation is interpretable only through relational proportion

Changes in a system become meaningful when they preserve or systematically modify relational proportion. Without proportion as a reference, transformation appears as noise. This axiom sets the condition under which temporal, spatial, or cognitive transitions can be analyzed coherently.

Axiom 5: A relational field exists as the abstract structure that constrains and organizes relations

Relations do not operate in isolation. They exist within a field that shapes how they interact, stabilize, or reorganize. The relational field provides the context that determines whether proportional structures can remain stable under pressure or disturbance. This field is not domain specific; it is the structural space through which proportion governs coherence.

Positioning of the axioms

These five axioms establish the logical foundation of RST:

- **Axiom 1** identifies the ontological unit (relation, not component).
- **Axiom 2** defines the mechanism (proportion).
- **Axiom 3** defines the criterion for coherence (invariance of proportional structure).
- **Axiom 4** defines how change becomes interpretable (through proportional reference).

- **Axiom 5** provides the structural context (relational field).

4. The formal structure of the relational field

The relational field provides the structural basis through which proportion governs coherence. While the previous sections described its conceptual role, a formal framework is needed to clarify how relations acquire structure, how proportion constrains system behavior, and how coherence can be evaluated independently of any particular domain. The goal of this section is not to produce a complete mathematical theory, but to define a minimal formal language that allows RST to be expressed with precision and evaluated in a principled way.

4.1 Relations as structural mappings

At the most basic level, a system can be represented as a set of elements $E = \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n\}$. RST does not treat these elements as primary. Instead, it focuses on the set of relations Rthat connect them. Each relation can be expressed as a mapping

$$r: (e_i, e_j) \to s_{ij},$$

where s_{ij}describes the structural state of the relation. This state may include direction, strength, dependency, or other domain specific properties. The key assumption of RST is that the behavior of the system is determined not by the values of the elements, but by the structure of s_{ij}across the full relational network.

4.2 Proportional invariants

Proportion is formalized as an invariant property of relations. For any pair of relations $r_{ij}$and r_{kl}, the proportional structure Pexpresses how these relations remain aligned under transformation:

$$P(r_{ij}, r_{kl}) = \frac{s_{ij}}{s_{kl}}.$$

This expression is not tied to any numerical meaning; it states only that the ratio of relational states is preserved when coherence is present. Proportion becomes a property of the relational network as a whole when a set of proportional invariants remains stable across transformations.

A system is said to maintain proportional structure when the set

$$\mathcal{P} = \{P(r_{ij}, r_{kl})\}$$

remains invariant under the transformations that the system undergoes.

4.3 Transformations and relational continuity

Let Tdenote a transformation that modifies the system, such as movement, rotation, reconfiguration, learning, or adaptation. A transformation acts on the relational network as:

$$T: R \to R',$$

producing a new relational configuration. The system preserves coherence under transformation $T$when:

$$P(r_{ij}, r_{kl}) = P(T(r_{ij}), T(r_{kl})).$$

In other words, coherence is defined by the continuity of proportion across transformations, not by the preservation of individual states.

This principle formalizes Axiom 3: a system remains intelligible when the proportional structure of its relations remains invariant even as the system changes in state or scale.

4.4 The coherence criterion

The coherence criterion provides a formal test for whether a system maintains relational integrity. A system is coherent if:

$$\forall (r_{ij}, r_{kl}) \in R, P(r_{ij}, r_{kl}) \approx P(T(r_{ij}), T(r_{kl})),$$

within a tolerance range defined by the system's domain. This tolerance acknowledges that perfect invariance is rarely achievable, but proportional stability within defined bounds is sufficient to preserve coherence.

The coherence criterion does not specify what the relational states must be. It specifies only how those states must **relate**. This abstraction allows RST to be applied across spatial, temporal, and cognitive domains without modification.

4.5 Structure of the relational field

The relational field $F$is defined as the space of all possible relational configurations compatible with a system's identity. Formally:

$$F = \{R \mid R \text{ satisfies the coherence criterion}\}.$$

The relational field is not a physical space and does not depend on the domain from which the system originates. Instead, it is the structural container that determines:

- which transformations preserve identity,
- which relational distortions break coherence,
- and how proportional constraints propagate through the system.

A system occupies a region of this field as long as its relational structure satisfies the coherence criterion. When relational proportions fall outside the tolerance of F, the system exits that region and loses coherence.

4.6 Interpretation

This minimal formalism allows RST to make several precise claims:

1. Systems are defined by structural invariants, not by their components.
2. Coherence is an invariant property of relational proportion, not of state values.
3. Transformation is interpretable only when proportional relationships remain continuous.
4. The relational field provides a domain independent structure for coherence.

These statements form the mathematical and conceptual backbone of RST.
With this foundation in place, the next sections can describe spatial, temporal, and cognitive proportion as specific regions of the relational field, each governed by the same underlying principle of proportional invariance.

4.7 Minimal formal properties of relational proportion

The formal framework presented in the previous sections defines proportion as an invariant property of relations under transformation. To illustrate the internal logic of this framework, this section introduces two basic relational rules, one lemma that follows from these rules, and a domain-independent example that demonstrates proportional invariance in practice. The goal is not to provide a complete algebra, but to clarify the minimal structure required for coherence in the relational field.

Rule 1: Relational symmetry under transformation

For any relation r_{ij} and any admissible transformation T,

$$P(r_{ij}, r_{kl}) = P(T(r_{ij}), T(r_{kl}))$$

if and only if the transformation preserves relational coherence.
This rule expresses that proportion is the criterion that distinguishes coherent transformations from incoherent ones.

Rule 2: Proportional compatibility of composite relations

For any pair of relations r_{ij} and r_{jk}, and their composite r_{ik},

$$P(r_{ij}, r_{jk}) \approx P(T(r_{ij}), T(r_{jk})) \Rightarrow P(r_{ik}, T(r_{ik}))$$

within the system's proportional tolerance.
This rule states that proportional invariance between two relations implies proportional invariance of the composite relation, ensuring coherence propagates through the relational network.

Lemma 1: Invariance of relational structure across scale

If a transformation T preserves proportion between all adjacent relations in a network, then it preserves the proportional structure of the entire relational field.

Proof (sketch):
Assume proportional invariance holds for all adjacent relational pairs (r_{ij}, r_{jk}).
By Rule 2, proportional invariance holds for all composite relations r_{ik}.
By induction over the connectivity of the relational network, proportional invariance extends to all pairs (r_{mn}, r_{pq}).
By Rule 1, the transformation preserves all proportional invariants in the field.
Therefore, the relational field remains coherent under transformation.

■

Example (domain-agnostic): Coherence under uniform structural deformation

Consider a system composed of three elements e_1, e_2, e_3, with relations:

$$r_{12} = a, r_{23} = b, r_{13} = c$$

Let a transformation T modify all relations by a uniform but unknown factor k, such that:

$$T(r_{12}) = ka, T(r_{23}) = kb, T(r_{13}) = kc$$

The proportional structure is:

$$P(r_{12}, r_{23}) = \frac{a}{b}, P(r_{23}, r_{13}) = \frac{b}{c}$$

Under transformation:

$$P(T(r_{12}), T(r_{23})) = \frac{ka}{kb} = \frac{a}{b}$$
$$P(T(r_{23}), T(r_{13})) = \frac{kb}{kc} = \frac{b}{c}$$

Since all proportional relationships remain invariant, the system remains coherent according to the coherence criterion.

This example demonstrates that coherence is determined not by absolute relational values, but by proportional invariance across the relational field. The example applies equally to spatial configurations, dynamic transitions, cognitive mappings, or any system in which relations can be transformed while maintaining their proportional structure.

5. Spatial proportion

Spatial proportion is the first major expression of relational coherence within the relational field. It describes how structures maintain identity across spatial transformations through the stability of their proportional relations. In traditional geometry, spatial form is defined by measurement: lengths, angles, areas, and coordinate values. Within RST, spatial form is defined instead by relational invariants that govern how elements in a spatial configuration relate to one another. These invariants determine whether a shape remains recognizable when it scales, rotates, or undergoes deformation.

Spatial proportion does not refer to absolute distances or magnitudes. It concerns the stability of relational ratios between spatial elements. When the spatial relations that define a structure remain proportionally aligned, the structure retains coherence even as its physical representation changes. For example, whether a shape is enlarged, compressed uniformly, or repositioned, the relational proportions that constitute its identity remain intact. This allows spatial structures to be recognized or reconstructed even when their absolute measurements vary widely.

From the perspective of the relational field, spatial proportion is a specific region characterized by invariance under spatial transformations. Such transformations include scaling, translation, rotation, and more complex deformations. A spatial configuration remains coherent when these transformations preserve proportional relationships between its elements. This invariance reflects Axiom 3: identity is maintained when relational proportion remains stable across transformations.

Spatial proportion also clarifies the distinction between geometric structure and geometric appearance. Appearance is tied to measurement; structure is tied to relational proportion. Two shapes may differ in size or orientation but share the same structural identity if their proportional invariants are equivalent. Conversely, shapes that appear visually similar may differ structurally if their internal relational proportions diverge. This distinction is crucial for understanding how spatial coherence can be evaluated independently of scale.

Within RST, spatial proportion provides the foundation for analyzing spatial systems as relational fields rather than collections of points or coordinates. It allows spatial coherence to be understood as an emergent property of relational invariants rather than as a consequence of measurement-based definitions. This perspective aligns spatial reasoning with the general relational framework described in earlier sections: coherence is determined by stable proportional relationships, not by the intrinsic characteristics of any single component.

Finally, spatial proportion serves as the conceptual basis for more complex forms of relational coherence. Temporal and cognitive proportion expand the same principle into different dimensions, but both rely on the spatial case to illustrate how relational invariants operate. By establishing spatial proportion as a fundamental property of the relational field, RST provides a unified explanation for how structures persist and remain intelligible across transformations that alter their physical manifestation but preserve their relational integrity.

6. Temporal proportion

Temporal proportion describes how systems maintain coherence as they evolve through time. While spatial proportion governs identity across spatial transformations, temporal proportion governs identity across sequences, phases, and transitions. In relational systems theory, time is not treated as an external dimension in which events unfold, but as a structural domain in which relational proportions must remain stable for change to be intelligible.

Traditional temporal models often describe dynamics in terms of state variables and the rules that govern their evolution. These approaches can capture patterns and predict trajectories, but they do not explain why certain dynamic behaviors appear stable or meaningful across different timescales. RST addresses this gap by proposing that temporal coherence arises when the proportional relationships between different layers or forces within a system remain aligned as the system transitions from one state to another.

Temporal proportion is therefore not defined by duration, frequency, or magnitude. It is defined by the relational ratios between the processes that unfold within a system. These ratios determine how pressure accumulates and releases, how cycles begin and end, and how transitions occur in a way that preserves the system’s identity. When temporal relations maintain their proportional structure, the system behaves coherently. When these proportions are disrupted, the system becomes volatile, unpredictable, or chaotic.

From the perspective of the relational field, temporal proportion occupies a region characterized by invariance under time-based transformations. Such transformations include shifts in regime, changes in rhythm, fluctuations in force, or transitions between states. A system maintains temporal coherence when the proportional relationships governing these transitions remain stable despite variations in speed, amplitude, or external conditions. This corresponds directly to the coherence criterion defined earlier: a system’s behavior through time is intelligible when relational proportions remain invariant within the tolerance of the relational field.

Temporal proportion also reframes the concept of cycles. In many domains, cycles are described through statistical recurrence or periodic repetition. RST treats cycles instead as expressions of proportional relational structure. A cycle exists when the proportional relationships between phases remain stable, not when the exact timing or magnitude repeats. This perspective explains why systems can exhibit coherent cyclic behavior even when the details of each cycle differ. The stability lies not in the data points, but in the relational proportions that connect phases.

Another implication of temporal proportion is that meaning in dynamic behavior does not arise from single transitions, but from the proportional context in which transitions occur. A state change is interpretable only when its relational position within a broader pattern is maintained. Without a proportional reference, changes appear arbitrary, and the underlying structure becomes obscured. Temporal proportion thus provides the frame through which dynamic systems can be understood as coherent rather than merely complex.

Finally, temporal proportion serves as the conceptual bridge between spatial and cognitive forms of coherence. Like spatial proportion, it depends on relational invariance. Like cognitive proportion, it deals with the interpretation of structure across change. It shows how systems can evolve without losing identity and how patterns can be recognized even when their specific manifestations vary. By establishing temporal proportion as a fundamental dimension of the relational field, RST provides a unified explanation for coherence in systems that change, adapt, or oscillate over time.

7. Cognitive proportion

Cognitive proportion describes how systems generate coherent meaning by maintaining stable relational structure within patterns of information. While spatial proportion governs form and temporal proportion governs change, cognitive proportion governs interpretation. It establishes the conditions under which a system can identify, integrate, or transform information without losing coherence in its internal structure. In this sense, cognition is not viewed as a computation over symbols or as a statistical process operating on data, but as an emergent property of relational proportion within a cognitive field.

Traditional models of cognition often rely on representations encoded in discrete symbols, patterns of activation in networks, or probabilistic estimates derived from observed data. These approaches explain how information is processed, but they do not explain why certain patterns become meaningful and others do not. RST addresses this by proposing that meaning arises when incoming information can be mapped onto an existing relational field without distorting the proportional structure of that field. Interpretation is therefore a relational alignment problem rather than a computational or statistical one.

In this view, a cognitive system does not recognize a pattern because it matches a stored template or because it minimizes prediction error. It recognizes a pattern because the relational proportions that define the pattern correspond to the proportional invariants within its relational field. When such alignment occurs, the system produces a stable and coherent interpretation. When alignment fails, interpretation becomes ambiguous or incoherent. Cognitive proportion therefore determines not *what* a system perceives, but *whether* perception becomes meaningful at all.

Cognitive proportion also explains how systems integrate new information. Learning does not require adding more representations or adjusting parameters in isolation. Instead, learning involves reorganizing the relational field so that new patterns can be incorporated without violating its proportional structure. A system expands its understanding by maintaining coherence while broadening the range of relational configurations it can accommodate. If the introduction of new information forces relational proportions outside the system's tolerance range, the cognitive field becomes unstable, leading to confusion or misinterpretation.

From the perspective of the relational field, cognitive proportion occupies a region where coherence is measured not by spatial invariance or temporal regularity, but by the stability of meaning across transformations in context, perspective, or abstraction. A cognitive structure is coherent when its proportional relationships remain invariant under such transformations. This enables a system to recognize a concept across variations in scale, detail, or modality, and to integrate new contexts without losing grip on the underlying relational invariants that define the concept.

Cognitive proportion also highlights the continuity between perception, reasoning, and understanding. All three processes rely on the ability to maintain proportional relational alignment between internal structure and external input. Perception identifies relational patterns, reasoning manipulates those patterns while preserving their proportional structure, and understanding arises when transformed patterns remain coherent within the relational field. These processes are different expressions of the same underlying mechanism.

Finally, cognitive proportion completes the triad of relational coherence. Spatial proportion defines structural identity, temporal proportion defines dynamic identity, and cognitive proportion defines interpretive identity. Together, they describe how systems maintain coherence across space, time, and meaning. By recognizing cognitive proportion as a fundamental dimension of the relational field, RST provides a unified explanation for why systems can interpret, learn, and reason coherently even when their components or states change.

8. Comparison with existing theories

Relational systems theory enters a landscape shaped by decades of attempts to understand coherence in complex systems. Although many established frameworks analyze structure, dynamics, or meaning, none place proportional relational invariance at the center of coherence. The purpose of this section is not to replace or diminish existing approaches, but to clarify how RST complements, diverges from, or extends them. By positioning RST alongside these traditions, the conceptual contribution of proportion becomes clearer.

General systems theory

General systems theory argues that systems cannot be understood by analyzing their parts alone. RST shares this foundational insight but moves one level deeper. Instead of defining the system as the core analytical unit, RST identifies the relational structure that gives a system its coherence. Systems theory describes emergent behavior; RST formalizes the relational conditions under which emergence becomes stable and intelligible.

Complexity theory

Complexity theory explains how nonlinear interactions generate emergent patterns. RST aligns with this view but introduces proportion as the mechanism that determines whether emergent patterns remain coherent across scales. Complexity theory addresses *how* patterns form; RST addresses *when* those patterns maintain identity rather than devolve into noise.

Cybernetics and control theory

Cybernetics focuses on regulation through feedback loops. RST incorporates feedback but argues that feedback alone does not guarantee stability. Feedback becomes meaningful only when relational proportions remain aligned. RST thus reframes stability not as correction around a target value, but as the preservation of proportional constraints within the relational field.

Network science and graph theory

Network science models systems as nodes and edges, and graph theory provides mathematical tools for describing connectivity. RST builds on this relational structure but introduces proportional invariants as the criterion for coherence. A highly connected network may still be incoherent if its relational proportions are unstable. RST shifts the emphasis from connectivity patterns to proportional alignment.

Information theory

Information theory analyzes communication through entropy and signal structure. While it quantifies uncertainty, it does not explain why certain structural configurations produce meaning. RST complements this by proposing that meaning arises when incoming information aligns proportionally with the relational invariants of a cognitive field. Coherence becomes a structural condition, not merely an informational one.

Dynamic systems theory

Dynamic systems theory models continuous evolution through differential equations. RST agrees with the importance of state transitions, but emphasizes that coherence in such transitions depends on the invariance of relational proportions rather than on specific trajectories. Temporal proportion reframes dynamics as relational continuity rather than numerical evolution.

Cognitive science: connectionism, predictive processing, enactivism

Connectionist models describe cognition as distributed patterns of activation, while predictive processing models cognition as error minimization. RST diverges by treating cognition as proportional resonance within a relational field. Coherence in interpretation arises from relational alignment, not from matching patterns or minimizing prediction error.

Enactive and embodied cognition emphasize that cognition emerges from interaction with the environment. RST does not dispute this, but specifies a structural mechanism: interactions become meaningful when they preserve relational proportion across contexts and transformations.

Ecological and resilience theory

Ecological systems theory and resilience theory describe how ecosystems maintain function through adaptive cycles and relational constraints. RST aligns with these principles but formalizes the role of proportion in maintaining identity across disturbances. Ecological resilience depends on threshold effects and phase transitions that can be reframed as proportional boundaries within a relational field.

Autopoiesis and systems of self-maintenance

Theories of autopoiesis describe how biological systems maintain themselves through self-producing relations. RST shares the focus on relational organization but distinguishes itself by identifying proportional invariants as the structural basis of self-maintenance. Autopoiesis describes the process; RST describes the structural condition that makes the process coherent.

Fractal and scale-invariant systems

Fractal geometry explains how structures repeat across scales through self-similarity. Although fractals involve proportion, they do so through geometric replication rather than relational invariance. RST distinguishes proportional invariance (the structure that enables coherence) from fractal self-similarity (a specific form of repetition). They intersect, but they are not equivalent.

Category theory and relational algebra

Category theory offers an abstract mathematical framework for modeling relationships. RST is compatible with relational formalism but serves a different purpose: it identifies proportion as the criterion for coherence within relational structures. Category theory defines relations; RST defines what makes relational structures stable across transformations.

Agent-based models and micro-level emergent frameworks

Agent-based modeling explains large-scale behavior from individual interactions. RST approaches emergence from the opposite direction: it explains coherence from structure rather than from agents. ABM models how behavior emerges; RST models how identity persists.

Summary of the distinction

Across all these traditions, RST's distinct contribution is conceptual rather than procedural:

- It treats relationships, not components, as the fundamental unit.
- It identifies **proportional invariance** as the mechanism that maintains coherence.
- It defines the **relational field** as the structural space where coherence arises.
- It explains coherence independently of the physical, biological, economic, or cognitive nature of a system.

RST does not replace existing theories; it operates underneath them, providing a structural logic that clarifies *when* and *why* systems remain coherent as they transform.

9. Empirical grounding

Although relational systems theory is a structural framework rather than an empirical model, it must remain open to empirical interpretation and, in principle, to falsification. RST does not seek validation through predictive accuracy or data fitting, but through the structural behavior of systems in which coherence is a defining property. Its claims concern the stability of proportional relations under transformation. These claims can be examined empirically even without numerical prediction.

Two types of observations are relevant. First, if systems widely regarded as coherent consistently fail to exhibit proportional relational invariance, the theory's central mechanism would be challenged. Second, if systems known to be unstable or chaotic nevertheless maintain stable relational proportions across transformations, this would contradict the idea that proportional invariance underlies coherence. In both cases, empirical findings could place real pressure on the theoretical core of RST.

Empirical grounding does not require that proportional invariance be expressed through specific measurements. It can also be examined qualitatively or structurally. For spatial systems, one can analyze whether a structure retains recognizable identity when its components are transformed. For dynamic systems, one can study whether phase transitions or rhythmic patterns rely on stable relations between internal forces. For cognitive systems, one can observe whether meaningful interpretation depends on stable proportional alignment between relational structure and incoming information. These inquiries do not prove the theory, but they can support or undermine its plausibility.

The interpretive value of RST lies in its ability to describe when a system's transformations remain intelligible. Coherence is not derived from the stability of surface-level states, but from the persistence of deeper relational proportions. Empirical work can therefore focus on how systems behave when perturbed, compressed, accelerated, or reframed. If relational proportions remain stable across such conditions, the theory gains support; if they do not, RST must be refined or rejected.

Because RST is structural, its empirical grounding will not take the form of a single decisive experiment. Instead, it requires a gradual accumulation of evidence across domains where coherence is central. By clarifying the relational conditions under which systems remain stable, RST creates a framework that can guide empirical inquiry without dictating its results. This makes empirical grounding an essential part of the theory's development, but not its foundation.

10. Limitations and future directions

Although relational systems theory offers a unified account of coherence across domains, it remains an emerging framework with several substantive limitations. These limitations do not weaken the theory's conceptual contribution, but they do define the work required for RST to mature into a fully formalized and empirically validated model.

A first limitation concerns formalization. RST introduces proportional invariance as the structural basis for coherence, but the mathematical description of proportionality remains minimal. The theory currently defines proportional invariants in general terms, without providing a complete algebraic or topological treatment. Establishing a rigorous formal language is necessary to distinguish proportional transformations from superficial similarity and to specify coherence conditions with greater precision.

A second limitation concerns measurement. While the coherence criterion describes proportional invariance conceptually, the theory does not yet offer standardized metrics for evaluating proportional alignment in empirical systems. Different domains may require different tolerance thresholds or relational mappings, and the theory does not yet provide a unified methodology for deriving or validating these metrics. Without such tools, empirical testing remains constrained.

A third limitation involves scope. The examples motivating RST come from spatial, temporal, and cognitive domains, but the theory has not yet been evaluated across the wider range of natural, social, or engineered systems where relational patterns are known to operate. Whether proportional invariance provides an adequate account of coherence in biological development, ecological adaptation, organizational dynamics, or distributed computation remains an open question.

A fourth limitation is methodological. RST is explanatory rather than predictive: it describes the conditions under which coherence can arise, but it does not specify future states or outcomes. This limits its usefulness in domains where prediction and control are central, such as engineering or applied dynamics. The theory may need to be integrated with existing predictive frameworks to achieve practical utility without compromising its conceptual clarity.

A fifth limitation concerns falsifiability. For RST to qualify as a scientific framework, it must define conditions under which the theory can be contradicted. While the coherence criterion provides a conceptual boundary, it has not yet been translated into explicit empirical tests. Developing falsification pathways, including measurable boundary violations, is essential for validating or refining the theory.

Finally, the relational field itself remains abstract. Although the concept provides a powerful unifying structure, its mathematical status (whether geometric, algebraic, topological, or something distinct) has not yet been fully explored. A more precise formulation could clarify how relational fields intersect, deform, or constrain one another, and how systems transition between different relational regimes.

Future research can proceed along several clear directions. Formalizing the mathematics of relational proportion, constructing proportional metrics for empirical analysis, extending the theory to additional domains, and integrating RST with predictive models all represent essential steps. In parallel, developing a rigorous account of the relational field may reveal deeper structural principles that unify coherence across physical, biological, cognitive, and artificial systems. As these efforts progress, RST can evolve from a conceptual framework into a comprehensive theory of relational coherence.

11. Conclusion

Relational systems theory proposes that coherence in complex systems arises from the proportional structure of their relations rather than from the properties of their components. By identifying relation as the smallest functional unit, proportion as the mechanism that preserves relational integrity, and the relational field as the structural space in which coherence is maintained, RST provides a unified account of why systems remain intelligible as they scale or transform. This framework does not depend on the physical or informational nature of a system, making it applicable across spatial, temporal, and cognitive domains.

The theory offers a shift in perspective: coherence is not a secondary effect of dynamics, computation, or emergence. It is a primary structural condition that enables these processes to produce stable and interpretable behavior. Spatial proportion explains how structures preserve identity under transformation; temporal proportion explains how systems evolve without losing coherence; and cognitive proportion explains how meaning emerges from the alignment between internal relational structure and external patterns. Taken together, these dimensions demonstrate that coherence is not domain specific but relational in nature.

Although the theory provides a clear conceptual foundation, it remains at an early stage of development. Its mathematical formalization is minimal, its empirical metrics are not yet standardized, and its applicability across additional domains must be tested. These limitations point to the work that remains for RST to become a mature theoretical framework. Nevertheless, the consistency of proportional patterns observed across disparate systems suggests that relational invariance may offer a deeper structural explanation for coherence than component-based or data-driven approaches.

RST does not seek to replace existing theories. Instead, it identifies the structural conditions under which those theories succeed. It provides a foundation for understanding why spatial forms remain recognizable across scale, why dynamic systems exhibit stable phases, and why cognitive systems can interpret new information coherently. By clarifying the relational principles that underlie coherence, RST opens a path toward designing systems that remain stable, adaptable, and meaningful even under substantial transformation.

The central insight of RST is simple: coherence is a relational achievement. When proportional structure is preserved, systems retain identity, resist noise, and generate meaning. When it is lost, the system’s behavior becomes fragmented or opaque. Understanding this principle may allow researchers and practitioners to build more coherent systems across many domains, grounding analysis and design not in the properties of parts, but in the structure that holds them together.

Appendices (models)

Hier komen pas:

- Appendix A: GRM as an instantiation of spatial proportion
- Appendix B: MFM as an instantiation of temporal proportion
- Appendix C: AIDEN as an instantiation of cognitive proportion