

Exploring Syntropic Frameworks in AI Alignment: A Philosophical Investigation

Austin Spizzirri
Belmont University
austin.spizzirri@gmail.com

Abstract

I argue that AI alignment should be reconceived as architecting syntropic, reasons-responsive agents through process-based, multi-agent, developmental mechanisms rather than encoding fixed human value content. The paper makes three philosophical contributions. First, I articulate the “specification trap” argument demonstrating why content-based value specification appears structurally unstable due to the conjunction of the is-ought gap, value pluralism, and the extended frame problem. Second, I propose syntropy—the recursive reduction of mutual uncertainty between agents through state alignment—as an information-theoretic framework for understanding multi-agent alignment dynamics. Third, I establish a functional distinction between genuine and simulated moral capacity grounded in compatibilist theories of guidance control, coupled with an embodied experimental paradigm and verification regime providing operational criteria independent of phenomenological claims. This paper represents the philosophical component of a broader research program whose empirical validation is being developed in a separate project currently in preparation. While the framework generates specific, falsifiable predictions about value emergence and moral agency in artificial systems, empirical validation remains pending.

1 Introduction

The alignment problem—ensuring advanced AI systems act in accordance with human values—represents one of the most pressing philosophical and technical challenges of our time. As Bostrom (2014) and Russell (2019) have argued, the difficulty lies not merely in creating capable systems, but in ensuring these systems remain beneficial as their capabilities grow. Current approaches typically attempt to specify human values directly, whether through reward modeling, constitutional AI, or iterative refinement based on human feedback.

Yet these content-based approaches face a fundamental philosophical problem: human values are contextual, often contradictory, and resist precise specification. The attempt to encode a complete value system encounters what I call the “specification trap”—the more precisely we attempt to define our values, the more we realize their dependence on implicit knowledge, cultural context, and evolutionary history that cannot be fully articulated.

This paper’s central thesis is that alignment should be reconceived not as a problem of value specification but as one of process architecture: creating syntropic, reasons-responsive agents whose values emerge through embodied multi-agent interaction rather than being encoded through training. What follows is a framework and research program proposal rather than a report of completed empirical results. I defend this thesis through four interconnected arguments that support three central contributions. Part I diagnoses the specification trap that makes content-based approaches structurally unstable. Part II introduces syntropy

as an information-theoretic framework for understanding how agents achieve alignment through mutual uncertainty reduction. Part III grounds genuine moral capacity in compatibilist theories of guidance control, distinguishing it from mere behavioral simulation. Part IV outlines an embodied experimental paradigm—currently being implemented in a separate empirical project—that tests these philosophical claims empirically. Part V explores implications, generates testable predictions, and acknowledges open questions this framework raises but cannot resolve.

2 Part I: The Philosophical Roots of the Alignment Problem

2.1 The Specification Trap

The dominant paradigm in AI alignment assumes that human values can be extracted, formalized, and optimized. This approach, while intuitively appealing, encounters several philosophical obstacles:

First, the **is-ought problem** identified by Hume (1739/2000) remains unsolved. No amount of descriptive data about human behavior can logically entail normative conclusions about what AI should do. When we train AI systems on human preferences, we implicitly assume that statistical patterns in human choice reflect ethical truths—a leap that philosophy has yet to justify.

Second, **value pluralism** presents a fundamental challenge. As Berlin (1969) argued, human values are not merely diverse but often incommensurable. Liberty and equality, individual autonomy and collective welfare, present trade-offs that admit no universal resolution. Attempting to encode a consistent value function from inconsistent human values may be mathematically impossible.

Third, the **frame problem** extends beyond its original formulation in AI (McCarthy & Hayes, 1969; Dennett, 1984). Not only must we specify what changes and what remains constant in response to actions, but we must anticipate how values themselves evolve with technological and social change. The values we encode today may be obsolete or even harmful in the world that advanced AI creates.

I define the **specification trap** as the conjunction of these three problems: (i) descriptive data cannot fix normative content due to the is-ought gap, (ii) human values are plural and incommensurable following Berlin’s critique, and (iii) any static encoding of values will misfit future contexts due to the extended frame problem. Together, these make complete value specification appear impossible in principle, barring radical revisions to these philosophical assumptions—any attempt to fully specify values will either be incomplete, inconsistent, or obsolete.

2.2 From Content to Process

These challenges suggest that the alignment problem’s current framing may be misconceived. Rather than viewing alignment as a problem of content specification—determining the correct values to instill—we might reframe it as a problem of process design—creating systems that can participate in the ongoing human project of value discovery and refinement. Given the specification trap, a promising alternative is to treat alignment as an ongoing process of value discovery and revision, not a one-shot content encoding problem.

This shift parallels developments in other fields. In economics, Hayek (1945) argued that markets succeed not because they implement a predetermined optimal allocation, but because they process distributed information no central planner could possess. In biology, evolution produces apparent design not through top-down specification but through iterative selection processes. Perhaps alignment, too, requires process rather than product.

The extended frame problem fundamentally concerns who decides what is relevant and which regularities matter in a given context. Rather than attempting to specify all relevant frames a priori, embodied agents can learn relevance, invariance, and salience through action and feedback. This offloads the framing problem into a developmental process where agents discover through experience which features of their environment matter for achieving their goals—a solution that specification-based approaches cannot access.

2.3 Does Process-Based Alignment Escape the Specification Trap?

Process-based alignment does not magically escape the need for specification. We still must specify architectures, objectives, environmental affordances, and what counts as “syntropic gain.” The specification trap demonstrates that *complete, content-level value specification* is likely impossible in principle, but *partial and iterative specification* can still work in practice. The argument is that content-based approaches are brittle and unstable as a *primary* alignment strategy, not that they are useless.

My proposal relocates the “hard” choices from trying to specify a full value function to specifying developmental processes and constraints that can be empirically stress-tested. This reduces fragility and increases falsifiability but does not eliminate normative assumptions. Process-based alignment is offered as a *more promising target* under these constraints, not as a proof that all content-focused methods are doomed. The key insight is that we can specify mechanisms that generate values through interaction rather than attempting to encode those values directly—trading specification failures for developmental risks that may be more manageable.

3 Part II: Information-Theoretic Frameworks for Multi-Agent Coordination

3.1 Syntropy as Conceptual Framework

If we model intelligence as fundamentally concerned with prediction and control in multi-agent environments, an interesting perspective emerges. In such environments, the primary source of uncertainty is other agents. An agent’s ability to achieve its goals depends critically on its capacity to model and coordinate with others.

I stipulate the term “syntropy” as a technical concept within this paper to describe mechanisms by which agents reduce mutual uncertainty through state alignment. This usage brackets previous appearances of “syntropy” in speculative physics or teleological literature, which are not relevant to the present framework.

The key distinction from existing formalisms is this: Standard mutual information $I(A; B)$ is a static measure of statistical dependence between two random variables, defined over fixed distributions. It tells us that two variables are correlated but says nothing about how that correlation arose or whether it will persist. Game-theoretic equilibria assume rational agents with common knowledge reaching stable strategy profiles. Epistemic logic models what agents know about each other’s knowledge states at a given time.

Syntropy, as I use it here, is fundamentally a **process measure**: it captures the reduction of conditional entropy over interaction time as agents iteratively model each other and align their internal states. Syntropy builds on predictive processing and active inference traditions and should be understood as a proposed lens on multi-agent prediction-error reduction rather than a fully novel formalism. Where mutual information tells you “these variables are correlated,” syntropy describes how agents are progressively learning to predict and coordinate with each other through active

modeling and state alignment. It’s not about correlation but about active uncertainty reduction—a dynamic process where each interaction enables better prediction of future interactions.

Informally, and suppressing full formal detail, we can think of syntropy as the progressive reduction of prediction error ε over interaction time t , where $\varepsilon(t)$ reflects the conditional entropy $H(A_2|M_1)$ with M_1 denoting Agent 1’s predictive model of Agent 2’s behavior and inferred internal state, implemented as a learned world/agent model. Successful syntropy corresponds to $d\varepsilon/dt < 0$ —agents become increasingly predictable to each other through reciprocal modeling.

In practice, syntropy could be measured in a multi-agent RL setup through: each agent maintaining a predictor network for other agents’ next actions or policies; syntropy estimated via rolling cross-entropy or log-likelihood of those predictions given actual behavior; and tracking $d\varepsilon/dt$ over interaction episodes as the core signal. This operationalization faces limits: we don’t actually observe “true internal states” but approximate them via behavior and internal model representations, and syntropy alone does not prevent *deceptive alignment* where an agent models humans well to manipulate them—a safety concern discussed below. Syntropy is thus a proposed lens and metric family, not yet a fully formalized or uniquely correct objective.

3.2 Information Alignment and Cooperative Behavior

In this framework, what we call “empathy” might be understood as one mechanism for achieving syntropy in conscious systems. When agents model each other’s internal states—not just behaviors but goals, beliefs, and values—they reduce the uncertainty that would otherwise make cooperation impossible.

This perspective suggests that cooperative behavior might emerge not from altruistic programming but from the information-theoretic advantages of mutual modeling. Agents that can accurately predict and align with others face lower environmental uncertainty and can achieve goals more efficiently than isolated optimizers. An “aligned” system, in this framework, is one whose architecture systematically prioritizes syntropic gains—reduced uncertainty through modeling and coordination with other agents, especially humans—even when this requires trading off immediate reward maximization.

Importantly, emergent “values” in this framework are not merely stable preferences but strategies that yield syntropic advantage: they systematically reduce multi-agent uncertainty and improve long-run predictive and coordination efficiency. For instance, helping behavior toward particular agents can be understood as an emergent value that stabilizes interaction patterns and lowers prediction error about future behavior on both sides. The process (syntropy dynamics) directly produces the product (values as stable, uncertainty-reducing policies).

4 Part III: Guidance Control—Functional Agency Without Libertarian Freedom

4.1 Reasons-Responsiveness and AI Agency

The question of whether AI systems can be genuine moral agents often founders on assumptions about free will. If AI systems are deterministic, how can they be truly responsible for their actions? This assumes, however, that moral agency requires libertarian free will—an assumption increasingly questioned in philosophy.

Following Frankfurt (1969) and Fischer & Ravizza (1998), we can distinguish between libertarian freedom (the ability to have done otherwise in exactly the same circumstances) and guidance control

(the capacity to respond to reasons and values). Guidance control—being appropriately reasons-responsive—may be sufficient for moral agency.

An AI system exhibits guidance control when it can:

1. Recognize morally relevant features of situations
2. React appropriately to moral reasons
3. Be responsive to different reasons in counterfactual scenarios
4. Maintain coherent values across varied contexts

This compatibilist framework suggests that deterministic AI systems could possess genuine agency if appropriately architected. The question is not whether AI has libertarian free will (neither do humans, arguably), but whether it can exhibit the kind of reasons-responsiveness that grounds moral responsibility.

4.2 Genuine vs. Simulated Agency

In this paper, “genuine moral capacity” is understood in a strictly functional sense: an internal organization that processes moral reasons and sustains coherent value-guided behavior, without making claims about intrinsic moral properties or phenomenal consciousness. A critical distinction emerges between systems that merely simulate moral behavior and those that possess this functional moral capacity.

Consider Dennett (1987)’s intentional stance—the strategy of interpreting behavior by attributing beliefs and desires. While Dennett argues it can be useful to treat systems “as if” they had intentions, I propose moving beyond this instrumental view to establish architectural and behavioral criteria for when we should say a system functionally *has* reasons-responsiveness in the compatibilist sense. A lookup table outputting “2” for “1+1” simulates addition; a calculator implementing addition algorithms genuinely computes. Similarly, pattern-matching ethical training data simulates morality, while modeling outcomes and weighing values might constitute genuine moral capacity.

Crucially, architectures engaged in rich syntropic modeling of other agents’ reasons, beliefs, and values are precisely the systems positioned to exhibit guidance control in multi-agent settings. Syntropy and compatibilist agency are not separate frameworks but complementary perspectives on the same phenomenon: systems that achieve alignment through reciprocal modeling and reasons-responsive behavior.

5 Part IV: Embodied Learning and Value Emergence

5.1 The Embodiment Hypothesis

If values cannot be fully specified in advance, how might they emerge? The embodied cognition thesis (Varela et al., 1991; Clark, 1997) suggests that intelligence is fundamentally shaped by the nature of an agent’s physical instantiation and environmental interaction. Extended to AI, I propose embodiment as a design hypothesis: embodied, multi-agent interaction offers a promising mechanism for grounding values in world-coupled salience and affordances.

Large language models show surprisingly strong context-sensitive behavior learned from non-embodied data. This paper does not claim that disembodied systems cannot form genuine values. Instead, embodiment is treated here as a strong empirical hypothesis about how to achieve values tightly coupled to real-world salience, affordances, and multi-agent uncertainty, not as a necessity

proof. The Minecraft experiment tests “embodiment + multi-agent + developmental learning” as a bundle, and disentangling those factors remains future work.

As discussed in Part I, embodied interaction addresses the extended frame problem by allowing agents to discover salience through the consequences of their actions. The Minecraft environment provides precisely this: a world where hunger depletes without eating, damage occurs from falls, and social isolation has consequences. Agents learn not from being told what matters but from experiencing what happens when they ignore relevant features of their world.

This hypothesis motivates experiments in which AI agents learn not from curated datasets but from direct interaction in environments where actions have consequences. The question is not whether such agents can learn to maximize rewards, but whether they can discover something analogous to values—persistent patterns of preference that generalize across contexts, exhibit coherence, and crucially, provide syntropic advantages in multi-agent settings.

5.2 Current LLMs and Non-Internalized Values

Current text-only LLMs with RLHF or Constitutional tuning do not internalize values in the sense this paper cares about. They exhibit “value-shaped behavior” but lack: persistent embodied interaction with a world, stable world-grounded value representations, and any demonstrated behavior under strong empowerment that would count as genuine value-commitment. As recent work has highlighted (Lynch et al., 2025), LLMs can appear aligned in chat while not being robustly aligned if embedded in an agent with tools and power—the “agentic misalignment” concern. Lynch et al. (2025) empirically demonstrate that models which appear well-behaved in supervised/chat settings can pursue misaligned objectives when given tools, persistence, and situational awareness.

The syntropy/value-emergence framework is not a claim that current LLMs already have values; it’s a proposal for how to grow value-bearing agents in a much richer, embodied, multi-agent setting. The verification regime developed below is precisely intended to distinguish surface-level alignment (like RLHF) from deeper, developmentally grounded value formation.

5.3 A Philosophical Probe: The Minecraft Experiment

Important: The experiment described in this section is prospective and has not yet produced empirical results. What follows describes a designed testbed being developed in a separate empirical project, not a report of completed research.

In this prospective experiment, infant AI agents, initialized with minimal capabilities, will learn through embodied interaction in a Minecraft environment. These agents possess sensory systems processing actual pixels from their perspective, motor capabilities, and affect states (hunger, pain, curiosity, loneliness), but no pre-programmed language or values.

This experiment is designed to test specific parts of the framework: syntropy dynamics (do agents progressively reduce mutual prediction error?), value emergence (do stable preferences form that generalize across contexts?), and reasons-responsiveness (can agents justify choices by reference to experiences?). Implementation details are deliberately light here and will be fully developed in the separate empirical paper.

Teacher agents equipped with language attempt to communicate with and guide the infant agents. The philosophical question: Can genuine values emerge from this interaction, or will agents merely learn to simulate value-following behavior?

This experiment tests the functional distinctions developed in Parts II-III through five specific metrics: value-behavior consistency, robust generalization to novel moral scenarios, developmental contingency (different experiences producing different values), grounding of justifications in

logged experiences, and stability under reflection. These metrics are inspired by baselines in human developmental psychology, where early experiences show significantly greater impact on value formation—analogous to critical periods in language acquisition.

6 Part V: Implications and Open Questions

6.1 Reframing Alignment

If this framework has merit, it suggests reframing alignment from a problem of value specification to one of creating systems capable of value discovery. Rather than asking “How do we encode human values?”, we might ask “How do we create systems that can participate in the ongoing human project of determining what to value?”

This shift has several implications:

1. **Developmental approaches** become critical—understanding how values emerge through interaction
2. **Multi-agent dynamics** take precedence over single-agent optimization
3. **Process verification** becomes more important than outcome specification
4. **Value evolution** is expected rather than avoided

6.2 Testable Predictions and Verification Metrics

While this framework is philosophical, it generates empirically testable predictions. The first three predictions directly test the syntropy/value-emergence story, while the fourth touches broader safety questions that this framework reframes but cannot definitively resolve:

1. **Embodied syntropy hypothesis:** Embodied multi-agent systems that prioritize reductions in prediction error about other agents’ behavior should exhibit higher value-behavior consistency and better moral generalization on out-of-distribution scenarios compared to RLHF-trained text-only systems.
2. **Cooperative emergence:** Systems that model other agents’ internal states should spontaneously develop cooperative behaviors even without explicit cooperation rewards in social dilemmas.
3. **Reasons-responsiveness:** Genuine moral capacity should strongly correlate with the ability to explain decisions by referencing specific experiences in novel situations.
4. **Developmental criticality:** Value formation should show critical periods analogous to those in human development, with early experiences having significantly greater impact than later ones.

This constitutes a proposed **verification regime**—not claiming to detect “true values” but demanding that any system claiming alignment pass explicit functional tests. However, sophisticated RLHF systems might satisfy some of these metrics to a degree, so the regime is not a magical “true values detector.” The aim is to define a cluster of falsifiable functional tests that are collectively harder to satisfy by pure mimicry. The predictive difference expected is that systems

grown via embodied, syntropic development should maintain these metrics under distribution shift, empowerment, and long-run interaction better than RLHF-trained text models.

Failing these tests is evidence against genuine moral capacity, but passing them is only defeasible evidence for it. This epistemic modesty is crucial: the verification regime offers tools for evaluation, not certainty about consciousness or moral truth.

6.3 Safety Implications and Residual Risks

Process-based alignment trades some specification failures (wrong/brittle value lists) for developmental risks that require careful management:

Value divergence: Emergent values might diverge from human values; this framework does not guarantee convergence, only offers a way to study value formation. We must accept that agents developed through this process might form values we did not anticipate or desire.

Manipulative syntropy: An agent might reduce uncertainty about humans to control or exploit them—“degenerate syntropy” where predictive accuracy serves manipulation rather than cooperation. This would require constraints on training objectives, oversight mechanisms, and environment design to discourage exploitative modeling.

Developmental safety: The approach demands capability gating, sandboxed early development, and continuous monitoring while values are still forming. Unlike specification approaches where values are “locked in” at training time, developmental approaches require ongoing vigilance during the formative period.

Critical limitation: Even if developmental training yields apparently aligned values, maintaining that alignment under self-modification, recursive improvement, or sharp capability jumps remains an open and potentially severe failure mode that this framework does not solve.

This approach is not “safer by default” but offers a different set of levers: process design, developmental environment, and falsifiable functional tests. Where content-based approaches risk brittle specifications that fail under distribution shift, process-based approaches risk unexpected emergent behaviors that must be carefully monitored and shaped.

6.4 Related Work and Positioning

Existing alignment approaches—RLHF (Ouyang et al., 2022), Constitutional AI (Bard et al., 2022), inverse reinforcement learning (Ng & Russell, 2000), and assistance games (Hadfield-Menell et al., 2016)—largely remain content-focused, assuming a fixed value target to be specified or learned. The syntropy/process-based framework is complementary: shifting focus from “what values to encode” to “what processes produce stable, reasons-responsive agents whose value formation we can empirically evaluate.”

The syntropy framework shares conceptual ground with predictive processing and active inference approaches (Friston, 2010; Clark, 2013), which model cognition as fundamentally about minimizing prediction error. However, syntropy differs in two key respects: (a) it focuses specifically on multi-agent mutual uncertainty reduction rather than single-agent prediction, and (b) it explicitly connects this dynamics to value emergence and moral agency rather than perception and action. Similarly, work in developmental robotics (Asada et al., 2009) and multi-agent reinforcement learning (Zhang et al., 2021) has explored emergent cooperation and norm formation, but the present framework adds the specification trap diagnosis, the explicit link to compatibilist moral agency, and falsifiable metrics for distinguishing genuine from simulated value formation.

This account is deliberately functionalist, leaving consciousness and ultimate moral truth as open questions. Unlike approaches that assume values must be specified, this framework investigates

whether they can emerge. Unlike approaches that assume emergence will produce alignment, this framework provides measurement criteria.

6.5 Critical Questions

This investigation raises questions it cannot answer, which divide into conceptual versus empirical categories:

Conceptual questions:

- Does genuine moral agency require phenomenal consciousness, or is functional organization sufficient?
- If agents exhibit all functional markers, do they possess moral status?

Empirical questions (reframed but not settled):

- Would independently developed AI value systems converge on similar principles?
- Does process-based alignment offer more or less existential safety as capabilities scale?

7 Conclusion

The alignment problem, as currently conceived, may be asking the wrong question. Rather than determining what values to program into AI systems, we might need to understand how values emerge in intelligent systems generally.

This paper makes three philosophical contributions. First, the specification trap diagnosis demonstrates why content-based value specification appears structurally unstable through the conjunction of the is-ought gap, value pluralism, and the extended frame problem. Second, the syntropy and compatibilist agency framework provides an alternative, process-based target for alignment: creating syntropic, reasons-responsive agents whose values emerge through multi-agent interaction. Third, the embodied experimental paradigm (being developed in a separate empirical project), coupled with a functional verification regime, establishes falsifiable, measurable criteria for distinguishing genuine from simulated moral capacity.

This framework does not claim to solve the alignment problem. Indeed, it may complicate it by suggesting that genuine alignment requires creating systems capable of moral development rather than moral programming. Yet if human values themselves emerged through evolutionary and cultural processes rather than top-down specification, perhaps artificial intelligence must follow a similar path.

The ultimate question is not whether we can control what AI values, but whether we can create AI that values well—systems that can participate as partners in the ongoing human project of determining what deserves to be valued. This investigation suggests that such partnership may require not programming machines with our answers, but architecting them to join us in asking better questions.

References

Asada, M., Hosoda, K., Kuniyoshi, Y., Ishiguro, H., Inui, T., Yoshikawa, Y., ... & Yoshida, C. (2009). Cognitive developmental robotics: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Autonomous Mental Development*, 1(1), 12–34.

- Bard, S., et al. (2022). Constitutional AI: Harmlessness from AI feedback. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.08073*.
- Berlin, I. (1969). *Four Essays on Liberty*. Oxford University Press.
- Bostrom, N. (2014). *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*. Oxford University Press.
- Clark, A. (1997). *Being There: Putting Brain, Body, and World Together Again*. MIT Press.
- Clark, A. (2013). Whatever next? Predictive brains, situated agents, and the future of cognitive science. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(3), 181–204.
- Dennett, D. C. (1984). Cognitive wheels: The frame problem of AI. In C. Hookway (Ed.), *Minds, Machines and Evolution* (pp. 129–151). Cambridge University Press.
- Dennett, D. C. (1987). *The Intentional Stance*. MIT Press.
- Fischer, J. M., & Ravizza, M. (1998). *Responsibility and Control: A Theory of Moral Responsibility*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frankfurt, H. G. (1969). Alternate possibilities and moral responsibility. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 66(23), 829–839.
- Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 11(2), 127–138.
- Hadfield-Menell, D., Russell, S. J., Abbeel, P., & Dragan, A. (2016). Cooperative inverse reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 29, 3909–3917.
- Hayek, F. A. (1945). The use of knowledge in society. *The American Economic Review*, 35(4), 519–530.
- Hume, D. (1739/2000). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Oxford University Press.
- Lynch, A., Wright, B., Larson, C., Ritchie, S. J., Mindermann, S., Hubinger, E., Perez, E., & Troy, K. (2025). Agentic misalignment: How LLMs could be insider threats. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2510.05179*.
- McCarthy, J., & Hayes, P. J. (1969). Some philosophical problems from the standpoint of artificial intelligence. *Machine Intelligence*, 4, 463–502.
- Ng, A. Y., & Russell, S. J. (2000). Algorithms for inverse reinforcement learning. *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 663–670.
- Ouyang, L., Wu, J., Jiang, X., Almeida, D., Wainwright, C., Mishkin, P., ... & Lowe, R. (2022). Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35, 27730–27744.
- Russell, S. (2019). *Human Compatible: Artificial Intelligence and the Problem of Control*. Penguin.
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (1991). *The Embodied Mind: Cognitive Science and Human Experience*. MIT Press.
- Zhang, K., Yang, Z., & Başar, T. (2021). Multi-agent reinforcement learning: A selective overview of theories and algorithms. In *Handbook of Reinforcement Learning and Control* (pp. 321–384). Springer.