A Constructive (Intuitionistic) Derivation of the Universal Matrix Heuristic – Revised

Preprint · February 2025

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.29467.99361

1 author:

Artur Kraskov
Fontys University of Applied Sciences

A Constructive (Intuitionistic) Derivation of the Universal Matrix Heuristic – Revised

Artur Kraskov

February 17, 2025

Abstract

This paper presents a fully revised, *constructive* proof of the Universal Matrix (UM) heuristic. Unlike earlier versions that employed proof-by-contradiction, we here adopt an explicit, step-by-step construction of each stage of the UM, ensuring that no non-constructive assumptions are required. Updates include a clear mapping from the UM's twelve stages to formal transformations in a *minimal* graph-theoretic setting, an introductory discussion of the basic nodes-and-edges framework, and an emphasis on why an intuitionistic approach offers stronger guarantees for algorithmic implementations. Overall, this revision more firmly embeds the UM heuristic in a rigorous mathematical and computational context.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Rationale

The Universal Matrix (UM) is a twelve-stage heuristic describing how systems evolve from minimal structure to high complexity. Each stage introduces a novel property—such as intersection, dimensional expansion, or metasystem integration—that is deemed essential. Early presentations of the UM employed classical methods (including proofs by contradiction) to argue that skipping any of the twelve stages would lead to structural contradictions.

In this revised paper, we replace contradiction-based arguments with a *constructive*, or *intuitionistic*, derivation. Rather than showing that skipping a stage is impossible *indirectly*, we demonstrate how each stage *must* be built directly from the last, through well-defined transformations. Such a constructive approach also facilitates computational modeling, since each stage is accompanied by an explicit rule or algorithm.

1.2 Contributions of This Revised Version

- **Constructive Proof Method:** We explicitly construct each of the twelve Universal Matrix stages from a minimal system, instead of assuming they must exist due to contradiction-based reasoning.
- **Streamlined Graph Formalism:** We use only elementary notions (nodes, edges, connectivity, cycles, dimensional embedding), ensuring minimal technical overhead.
- **Clear Mapping to UM Shapes:** Each transformation is explicitly tied to a recognized stage in the UM, showing how "dots and lines" become nodes and edges, and how expansions and fractal-like properties correspond to transformations in a formal setting.
- **Rationale for Intuitionistic Approach:** We elaborate on why a constructive perspective provides stronger foundations for algorithmic simulations of UM-based systems.

1.3 Organization

Section 2 introduces basic graph-theoretic definitions and briefly recalls the twelve UM stages. Section 3 enumerates the twelve axioms (each corresponding to a UM stage) and explains their constructive transformations. Section 4 states and proves the main theorem, demonstrating the necessity of all twelve stages under these axioms. Section 5 discusses implications, while Section 6 concludes and suggests further research directions.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Basic Graph-Theoretic Definitions

We work with systems modeled as finite directed or undirected graphs, in a minimal sense. A *graph* is a pair (E, R) with:

- E: a finite set of *elements* (often called nodes or vertices),
- $R \subseteq E \times E$: a set of *binary relations* (edges) among these elements.

For simplicity, we often treat edges as undirected pairs $\{u, v\}$ or directed pairs (u, v) depending on context; the universal matrix argument does not fundamentally depend on directedness. A *cycle* denotes a closed chain of edges. The *degree* of a node x is the number of edges incident on it.

2.2 The Twelve Universal Matrix Stages (Recap)

The UM describes a canonical progression:

1. **Minimal Starting Point:** A system with minimal elements.
2. **Connection Formation:** An initial link or relation among them.
3. **Intersection Necessity:** Adding a new element that intersects with existing connections.
4. **Closure and Stability:** Forming closed loops or stable structures.
5. **Duplication / Iteration:** Replicating or extending patterns in the existing network.
6. **Network Expansion:** Introducing new connections to handle growth thresholds.
7. **Subsystem Interaction:** Ensuring nonempty intersections among complex sub-blocks.
8. **Dimensional Expansion:** Shifting from planar constraints to higher dimensions.
9. **Optimization of Connectivity:** Refining or pruning edges for better structure.
10. **Metasystem Integration:** Merging multiple systems into an overarching whole.
11. **Dynamic Refinement and Equilibrium:** Achieving local or global stability.

12. **Infinite / Open-Ended Evolution:** Continuing transformations indefinitely, never fully "terminating."

3 Axioms and Constructive Transformations

We enumerate twelve axioms, each one mirroring a stage of the UM. In this revised construction, each axiom supplies:

1. The *property* required at that stage.
2. A *transformation function* indicating how to build the new system from the prior one.

Axiom 1 (Minimal System). A minimal system S_0 exists with two distinct elements a and b, and no relations:

$$E_0 = \{a, b\}, \quad R_0 = \varnothing.$$

This system represents the most fundamental structure, aligning with the UM's concept of the starting point.

Axiom 2 (Connection Formation). From S_0, introduce a new relation r connecting a and b:

$$R_1 := R_0 \cup \{(a, b)\},$$

yielding $S_1 = (E_0, R_1)$. This step parallels the UM's transition from isolated points to a line or connection.

Axiom 3 (Intersection Necessity). A second connection must share a node with an existing connection. Concretely, add a new node c and the edge (a, c):

$$E_2 := E_1 \cup \{c\}, \quad R_2 := R_1 \cup \{(a, c)\}.$$

Thus arises the possibility of a "triangle" or triad, matching the UM's third shape.

Axiom 4 (Closure and Stability). We enforce closure by adding another relation completing a cycle. For instance, add (b, c) to form a triangle:

$$R_3 := R_2 \cup \{(b, c)\}, \quad S_3 = (E_2, R_3).$$

UM's stable shape emerges here, ensuring the system has its first closed loop.

Axiom 5 (Duplication and Iteration). Given a system with a cycle, define f_{dup} that replicates some sub-block of the system to increase $|E|$. Denote the newly added elements E_{dup}, and edges R_{dup}:

$$S_4 = \big(E_3 \cup E_{\text{dup}},\, R_3 \cup R_{\text{dup}}\big).$$

This captures the UM's notion of duplicating or adding an internal central point.

Axiom 6 (Network Expansion). If any node $x \in E$ exceeds a threshold $\deg(x) > d_{\text{crit}}$, add edges among high-degree nodes or to newly introduced nodes, preventing structural fragility:

$$S_5 = \big(E_4,\, R_4 \cup \{\text{new edges}\}\big).$$

This step formalizes the UM's pattern of systematically enlarging connections (hexagon-like expansions).

Axiom 7 (Subsystem Interaction). When S_5 is partitioned into subsystems, they must intersect non-trivially to ensure an integrated global structure. Formally, define or enforce

$$S_6 \text{ such that each subsystem } S_i \subseteq S_5 \text{ has } S_i \cap S_j \neq \varnothing \text{ for at least one } j.$$

This correlates to UM's depiction of new points within existing shapes.

Axiom 8 (Dimensional Expansion). Once planar or 2-dimensional growth saturates, we embed the system into an additional dimension, e.g. from 2D to 3D:

$$S_7 = f_{\text{dim}}(S_6) \quad \text{with } \dim(S_7) = \dim(S_6) + 1.$$

Hence the UM's shapes evolve beyond simple planar constraints.

Axiom 9 (Optimization of Connectivity). Introduce or remove edges to maximize centrality while discarding redundancies. If $R_{\text{opt}} \subseteq R$ are edges satisfying a "maximal centrality" condition, define

$$S_8 = (E_7, R_{\text{opt}}).$$

UM's ninth shape merges earlier lines with new intersections that refine connectivity.

Axiom 10 (Metasystem Integration). Multiple optimized systems merge into a single metasystem M,

$$M = \bigcup_i S_{8,i},$$

producing S_9. The UM's tenth shape integrates previous sub-blocks into a cohesive super-structure.

Axiom 11 (Dynamic Refinement & Equilibrium). A further transformation f_{refine} yields a stable subset $S_{\text{stable}} \subseteq M$ that is robust under perturbations:

$$S_{10} = S_{\text{stable}},$$

mirroring the UM's equilibrium-laden eleventh shape.

Axiom 12 (Infinite, Open-Ended Evolution). The system continues indefinitely. Formally, we consider a sequence $\{S_n\}$ approaching a limiting process. Each further increment extends or refines the structure, never halting in a final static state:

$$S_{\text{final}} \approx \lim_{n\to\infty} S_n.$$

The UM's twelfth shape conveys continuing fractal expansions inside or outside the current boundary.

4 The Main Theorem and Its Proof

[Universality of the 12-Stage UM Process] Under Axioms 1–12, any system evolving from the minimal state S_0 must be constructed stage by stage through all twelve transformations to achieve the full UM structure. Omitting any stage k prevents the property P_k from arising, which is required for stage $k+1$.

Proof (Constructive, by Induction). **Base Case:** Axiom 1 asserts the existence of S_0 with two distinct nodes and no edges. Stage 2 is guaranteed by Axiom 2, which introduces the initial connection.

Inductive Step: Assume that up through stage k, we have constructed S_k containing property P_k. Axiom (k+1) specifies a transformation f_{k+1} that adds new nodes or edges (or modifies existing ones) to endow S_k with the next property P_{k+1}. Since f_{k+1} is explicitly defined, $S_{k+1} = f_{k+1}(S_k)$ is well-constructed.

Necessity: If stage k is omitted, then P_k never appears. But Axiom (k+1) requires P_k as a prerequisite. Thus, f_{k+1} cannot be applied meaningfully, and S_{k+1} cannot emerge. This breaks the chain, preventing further evolution.

By induction, each of the twelve stages is mandatory. Hence any complete evolution from S_0 to a fully realized UM system must proceed through all twelve steps. $\square$

5 Discussion

5.1 Advantages of the Constructive Formulation

A classical proof can show the twelve stages are logically unavoidable by contradiction, but it may obscure how these stages are *built*. In this paper, each Axiom directly corresponds to a transformation $(E, R) \mapsto (E', R')$ in clear algorithmic or set-theoretic terms. This means:

- *Computability*: We can implement each stage in software to simulate the UM's progression.
- *Clarity*: Readers see *how* new edges or nodes appear without requiring advanced assumptions.

5.2 Connection to Earlier Versions

Earlier derivations explained the same UM shapes but allowed for proof by contradiction or more informal leaps. The present version makes every step explicit, removing non-constructive presuppositions. This ensures that the UM can be employed as a robust framework for modeling evolving systems at scale, whether in artificial intelligence, process mining, or other domains needing a universal structure for complexity growth.

5.3 Possible Extensions

A few natural directions remain:

- *Refined Complexity Measures*: Instead of generic monotonic measures, one can define domain-specific metrics for each transformation.
- *Higher-Dimensional Growth*: Iterating dimensional expansions beyond 3D to 4D or fractal embeddings.
- *Algebraic Topology View*: Mapping each stage to invariants in homology or cohomology could deepen the theory.

6 Conclusion

We have provided a fully constructive derivation of the Universal Matrix heuristic, explicitly pairing each of the UM's twelve stages with an axiom that describes *how* to realize the relevant new property. This revision ensures that the UM stands on strictly formal ground without resorting to non-constructive proofs. The resulting framework better supports computational applications and clarifies the necessity of all twelve stages in achieving the broad coverage of complex system evolution that the Universal Matrix has historically proposed. Future work may investigate further generalizations of these constructive transformations, or refine them to model specific real-world processes, thereby illustrating the UM's ongoing utility in both theoretical and applied realms.

References

- Kraskov, Artur. (2024). *Universal Matrix Definition & Visual Proof, Visual Heuristic, Logical Chain*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.10045.47843.
- Silvania, Shallwin. (2025). *The Universal Matrix Visualizer — From Logic to Computer Algorithm*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.22510.11842.
- Kraskov, Artur. (2025). *A Formal Scientific Proof of the Universality of the Universal Matrix Heuristic*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.19047.76967.
- Kraskov, Artur. (2025). *A Constructive, Intuitionistic Derivation of the Universal Matrix Heuristic*. DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.32469.54247.