Structural Diagnostic Principle for Dynamical Models

Based on Emergence of Universal Newtonian Dynamics
from Metric Inertial Systems

Boris Kriger
Institute of Integrative and Interdisciplinary Research
boriskriger@interdisciplinary-institute.org

Abstract

This paper derives a general modeling principle from the structural theorem proven in *Emergence of Newtonian Dynamics from Metric Inertial Systems* [Kriger, 2018]. That work established that within a specific axiomatic framework—smooth Riemannian state spaces satisfying Persistence, Additivity, and Compensation—second-order dynamics emerges as a structural necessity rather than an empirical contingency. We introduce the concept of **Universal Newtonian Dynamics** (UND)—more precisely understood as a *Structural Second-Order Requirement for Additive Systems*—recognizing that this mathematical structure constitutes a necessary template for modeling systems where influences combine additively and act independently of current trends.

Crucially, our principle is diagnostic, not prescriptive. Before applying UND, practitioners must first verify whether their system satisfies the axioms: Do influences genuinely combine additively? Should their effects be independent of the system's current direction of change? Only if both answers are affirmative does the theorem apply, and only then is first-order modeling structurally incomplete. We provide the **Structural Diagnostic Principle** and a practical protocol enabling practitioners to (1) test axiom applicability, (2) identify structural incompleteness, and (3) systematically correct models through state-space expansion.

Keywords: Universal Newtonian Dynamics, dynamical models, additive interaction, state-space expansion, structural diagnostics, second-order dynamics, modeling principle

1 The Problem: Why Many Dynamical Models Systematically Fail

A pervasive pattern appears across quantitative disciplines: models that predict future states from current states alone exhibit systematic instabilities, inconsistencies, or require extensive ad-hoc corrections. In economics, simple trend extrapolation fails to capture market dynamics. In epidemiology, models that project infection rates from current prevalence struggle with behavioral feedback. In machine learning, gradient descent without momentum oscillates inefficiently. In organizational dynamics, forecasting performance from current metrics misses the trajectory of change.

These failures share a common structure. Each involves a system subject to multiple influences that should, in principle, combine to determine evolution. A firm faces market conditions, competitive pressures, and internal capabilities simultaneously. An epidemic responds to transmission rates, behavioral changes, and policy interventions concurrently. An optimization algorithm experiences gradients, regularization, and learning rate schedules together.

The conventional response treats each domain separately, developing specialized corrections: momentum terms in optimization, expectation adjustments in forecasting, feedback mechanisms in control theory. Yet the persistence of similar problems across unrelated fields suggests a deeper structural issue. What feature is missing from these models that generates systematic failure?

The answer lies in a mathematical result established by Kriger [2018]. While that work concerned the foundations of mechanics, its implications extend far beyond physics. The present paper extracts the general modeling principle implicit in that theorem and provides practitioners with a diagnostic framework for identifying and correcting structurally incomplete models.

2 What Was Established in the Previous Paper

In *Emergence of Newtonian Dynamics from Metric Inertial Systems*, Kriger [2018] proved a theorem with precise scope: within a specific class of systems—smooth deterministic dynamics on Riemannian state spaces—three structural constraints jointly necessitate second-order dynamics. These constraints were formalized as:

Persistence: In the absence of interaction, the system follows geodesics—paths of constant velocity in the Riemannian sense. Change of velocity requires a cause.

Additivity: When multiple interactions act, their effects on acceleration combine linearly. Combined causes produce combined effects.

Compensation: In closed systems, total momentum is conserved. Internal interactions redistribute momentum without changing its total.

Note on Compensation in non-physical domains: While Persistence and Additivity translate directly to non-mechanical systems, Compensation requires interpretation. In economics, it may manifest as conservation of value in closed transactions; in social dynamics, as conservation of total opinion "intensity" in pure persuasion (without external information). Importantly, the incompatibility theorem's core result—that first-order dynamics cannot support velocity-independent additive response—follows primarily from Persistence and Additivity. Compensation provides additional constraints on internal interactions but is not required for the basic diagnostic. Systems satisfying only Persistence and Additivity already require second-order form for coherent modeling.

The incompatibility theorem (Theorem 4.1 in [Kriger, 2018]) demonstrated that any first-order dynamical law on configuration space—that is, any law of the form $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = f(x, F)$ where x represents position and F represents external influences—violates at least one of these constraints unless the dynamics is trivial.

The key insight was structural: in a first-order system, velocity is not an independent variable but a derived quantity, determined by the equation itself. This makes it impossible to have two systems at the same position with different velocities—the concept is undefined. Consequently, there can be no velocity-independent response to interaction, which Additivity requires.

The resolution required *promoting velocity to an independent state variable*, yielding second-order dynamics on configuration space (equivalently, first-order dynamics on the tangent bundle). Only then could the system support a universal map from interaction to acceleration that applies regardless of the system's current velocity.

Crucially, the paper distinguished between *form* (the mathematical structure of dynamical laws) and *content* (specific potentials and coupling constants). The theorem concerns form only: that Newtonian-type second-order dynamics emerges structurally, while the specific forces remain empirically determined.

3 Generalizing the Result Beyond Mechanics

The theorem in [Kriger, 2018] was proven in mechanical terms—positions, velocities, forces. Yet nothing in the mathematical structure restricts its applicability to physics. The essential concepts generalize directly:

"Position" becomes *any state variable*—market conditions, opinion distributions, skill levels, system configurations.

"Velocity" becomes *rate of change of state*—growth rates, opinion shifts, learning rates, system trends.

"Interaction" becomes *any influence acting on the system*—market forces, social pressures, training signals, control inputs.

"Acceleration" becomes *change in the rate of change*—how influences modify the trend rather than the level.

Under this interpretation, the theorem states: if a system admits multiple influences that should combine additively and act independently of the system's current direction of change, then any model formulated solely in terms of current state variables cannot faithfully represent how those influences combine.

This is not analogy; it is the same mathematical structure. The proof in [Kriger, 2018] depends on the structural fact that first-order systems have velocity *slaved to position*. In any domain where we model $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = f(x, \text{factors})$, the rate of change is determined by the current state—it is not free. Any influence that should act on the system the same way regardless of its current trend cannot be properly represented.

4 Universal Newtonian Dynamics: A Conceptual Framework

The generalization presented in the previous section motivates the introduction of a unifying concept: **Universal Newtonian Dynamics** (UND). This framework recognizes that the mathematical structure underlying Newton's laws of motion—second-order differential equations arising from persistence, additivity, and compensation—constitutes a necessary template for modeling systems with additive interactions, regardless of the domain in which they appear.

Remark 1 (On Terminology)**.** *The name "Universal Newtonian Dynamics" may initially suggest an overreach—a claim that all systems are secretly Newtonian. This is emphatically not our claim. A more precise (if less evocative) name would be* ***Structural Second-Order Requirement for Additive Systems****. The "Newtonian" label reflects the mathematical form that emerges (second-order differential equations with additive forcing), not a claim about physical content. The "Universal" refers to domain-independence of the theorem: if a system satisfies the axioms, then the requirement applies, regardless of whether the system involves particles, prices, or opinions. The framework is universal in scope but conditional in application.*

4.1 Definition

We define **Universal Newtonian Dynamics** as the class of dynamical systems characterized by the following structural properties:

- The system state includes both a configuration variable x and its rate of change v as independent components.
- Evolution is governed by second-order dynamics: influences act on $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t$ (acceleration), not directly on $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$ (velocity).
- Multiple influences combine additively in their effect on acceleration.
- In the absence of external influence, the system preserves its current trajectory (persistence/inertia).
- Internal interactions conserve total momentum (compensation).

The canonical form of Universal Newtonian Dynamics is:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = v \tag{1}$$

$$m \cdot \frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = \sum_i F_i \tag{2}$$

where m represents the system's inertia (resistance to change in trend) and F_i are the various influences acting on the system. The key insight is that this structure is not specific to physical mechanics—it is the necessary form for any system satisfying the structural postulates.

Critical caveat: Whether any particular non-mechanical system satisfies these postulates is an *empirical question*, not an assumption of the framework. The theorem tells us what follows *if* the axioms hold; it does not assert that they hold in any given domain.

4.2 The Newtonian Analogy Made Precise

Universal Newtonian Dynamics provides a precise mapping between mechanical concepts and their generalizations:

Mass → Inertia: Resistance to change in the rate of change. In economics, this might be market friction or institutional rigidity. In learning, cognitive load or habit strength. In social dynamics, cultural inertia or network density.

Force → Influence: Any factor that changes the system's trend. Competitive pressure, pedagogical intervention, policy change, information flow.

Momentum → Trend Strength: The product of inertia and velocity ($m \cdot v$). A system with high trend strength requires strong opposing influences to reverse direction.

Kinetic Energy → Trend Capacity: The quantity $\frac{1}{2}mv^2$ representing the system's capacity to continue changing even against resistance.

4.3 Why 'Universal'?

The term 'Universal' is not rhetorical but technical—and requires careful interpretation. The theorem in [Kriger, 2018] establishes that within the specified axiomatic framework, second-order dynamics is not one option among many—it is the unique form compatible with the structural constraints. Any system satisfying persistence, additivity, and compensation must exhibit Newtonian-form dynamics, regardless of whether the system involves particles, prices, opinions, or any other evolving quantity.

However, "universal" does not mean "unconditional." The universality is *conditional universality*: the theorem applies universally to all systems satisfying its premises, but whether any given system satisfies those premises must be established independently. A reader from economics, sociology, or medicine is entitled to ask: "Why should I believe that additivity and velocity-independence hold in my domain?" This is the right question. Our answer is not "they always hold" but rather: "You must check. If they hold, first-order models are structurally inadequate. If they don't hold, our theorem doesn't apply—but then you need a different framework anyway."

The practical implication: the success of Newtonian mechanics in physics is not a special fact about physical matter but a manifestation of a deeper structural truth. The same mathematical framework applies—with appropriate reinterpretation of variables—to any domain where influences combine additively and act independently of current trends. But this is an *if*, not a *given*.

4.4 Scope and Boundaries

Universal Newtonian Dynamics applies where its axioms hold. Important boundaries include:

Non-additive interactions: Systems where influences combine nonlinearly (saturation effects, threshold phenomena) may require extensions or fall outside the framework.

Velocity-dependent influences: Friction and drag are velocity-dependent forces that fit within the framework as $F(v)$ terms in equation (2).

Stochastic systems: Random influences can be incorporated as stochastic forcing terms while preserving the second-order structure (Langevin dynamics).

Discrete systems: Systems without smooth state spaces require separate treatment, though discrete analogues often exist.

The power of Universal Newtonian Dynamics lies not in claiming that all systems are Newtonian, but in providing a *structural diagnostic*: if a system should satisfy the axioms but is modeled in first-order form, the model is incomplete. The framework tells us exactly what is missing and how to correct it.

4.5 Theoretical Foundations for Domain Independence

A natural question arises: why should a theorem proven for mechanical systems apply to economics, epidemiology, or machine learning? The answer lies in the abstract mathematical structure underlying the proof in [Kriger, 2018], which we sketch here to establish self-containment.

The key observation is that the incompatibility theorem depends only on the *tangent bundle structure* of the state space, not on physical interpretation. Let S be any smooth manifold representing configuration space. The tangent bundle TS consists of pairs (x, v) where $x \in S$ and $v \in T_xS$ is a tangent vector at x.

The Abstract Argument: Consider any first-order dynamics on S: a vector field $X : S \to TS$ assigning to each point x a velocity $X(x)$. Under such dynamics, velocity is a *function* of position—it has no independent degrees of freedom. Now suppose we require that external influences F produce accelerations $a = L(F)$ via a linear map L that is independent of current velocity. This is impossible: at any point x, there is only one velocity (namely $X(x)$), so the question "what acceleration does F produce at (x, v) for arbitrary v?" is ill-posed.

The Resolution: To support velocity-independent response, velocity must become a free variable. This requires working on TS rather than S—that is, treating (x, v) as the full state. Dynamics on TS is first-order in the extended state but second-order when projected to S alone.

Domain Independence: This argument makes no reference to mass, force, or physical motion. It uses only: (1) a state space with smooth structure, (2) the requirement that dynamics be deterministic, (3) the requirement that influences combine linearly in their effect on acceleration, (4) the requirement that this combination be independent of current velocity. Any system satisfying (1)–(4) falls under the theorem's scope, regardless of what x, v, and F represent physically.

Verification for Non-Mechanical Systems: The applicability question reduces to: does the system satisfy conditions (1)–(4)? Condition (1) typically holds for continuous state variables. Condition (2) holds for deterministic models (stochastic extensions are addressed separately). Conditions (3)–(4) are the substantive requirements: are influences additive, and should their effects be velocity-independent? These are empirical questions about the system being modeled, not assumptions of the framework.

For example, in market dynamics: if competitive pressure F_1 and advertising effect F_2 should each accelerate market share growth by amounts a_1 and a_2 respectively, and their joint effect should be $a_1 + a_2$ regardless of whether market share is currently rising or falling, then conditions (3)–(4) hold and the theorem applies.

5 The Structural Diagnostic Principle

We now state the central result of this paper as a modeling principle derived from the theorem in [Kriger, 2018]:

Principle 1 (Structural Diagnostic Principle)**.** *If a system admits additive influences that should act independently of the system's current direction of change, then any model formulated solely in terms of current state variables is structurally incomplete.*

The diagnostic workflow is crucial: This principle is *conditional*, and its application requires a specific order of operations:

1. **First, ask:** Do the influences on this system combine additively? (Would doubling influence F_1 while holding F_2 constant double the effect of F_1?)
2. **Second, ask:** Should these influences act independently of the system's current trend? (Should the same influence produce the same acceleration whether the system is rising or falling?)
3. **Only if both answers are "yes":** Then first-order models are structurally incomplete, and state-space expansion is necessary.
4. **If either answer is "no":** The theorem does not apply. The system may still benefit from second-order modeling for other reasons, but structural necessity is not established.

This principle serves as both a diagnostic tool and a correction procedure. Given any dynamical model, one can ask whether the influences it represents should act independently of the system's current trajectory. If so, and if the model is first-order in the state variables, the model is structurally incomplete regardless of how well it fits historical data.

The principle does not claim that all first-order models are wrong. Many systems genuinely have rates of change determined by current conditions—diffusion, certain chemical kinetics, some population dynamics. The diagnostic applies specifically when additivity of velocity-independent influences is expected.

6 Why First-State Models Contradict Additivity

Consider the typical modeling form in many applied domains:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = f(x, \text{factors}) \tag{3}$$

Here x represents the system state (market position, opinion prevalence, skill level) and "factors" represents various influences (market conditions, social pressures, training intensity). The model asserts that the rate of change is determined by current state and current influences.

Following the analysis in [Kriger, 2018], we identify the structural problem. In this formulation:

1. **Velocity ($\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$) is slaved to position.** Once x and the factors are specified, $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$ is uniquely determined. There is no freedom to specify the rate of change independently.
2. **Two systems cannot occupy the same state with different trends.** If system A and system B are both at state x under the same factors, they must have identical rates of change. The concept of "same position, different velocity" is undefined.
3. **Influences cannot act independently of current trend.** The effect of any factor on the system depends on what velocity that factor produces at the current state—but velocity itself depends on all factors. There is no way to specify how one factor affects the system holding trajectory constant.

This is the essential incompatibility. Additivity requires a map from influences to *changes in trend* that is universal—the same influence produces the same change regardless of current velocity. First-order systems cannot support such a map because velocity is not a free parameter.

7 The State-Space Expansion Rule

The resolution follows directly from Theorem 5.1 in [Kriger, 2018]: promote the rate of change to an independent state variable. The corrected modeling form is:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = v \tag{4}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = F(\text{factors}) \tag{5}$$

Here v represents the trend or momentum of the system—the rate at which the state is changing—as an independent variable. Influences act on v, not directly on x. This is the state-space expansion: the system's state is now (x, v) rather than x alone.

Under this formulation:

- Two systems can occupy the same level with different trends—they have different velocities v.
- Influences can combine additively in their effect on $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t$ regardless of current v.
- The response to a given factor is the same whether the system is rising or falling, fast or slow.

The key interpretive shift: *influences must act on change of trend, not level.* A market force does not directly set price; it accelerates or decelerates the price trend. A training signal does not directly set skill level; it accelerates or decelerates learning. This is not merely a modeling convention but a structural requirement for additive interaction to be coherent.

8 Examples Across Domains

8.1 Sales and Demand Forecasting

First-order model: $\mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t = f(\text{price, advertising, seasonality})$. Sales rate determined by current factors.

Problem: A firm with rising sales and a firm with falling sales, both at the same current level facing identical conditions, would be predicted to have identical futures. Market momentum is invisible.

Expanded model: $\mathrm{d}S/\mathrm{d}t = v$; $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = F(\text{price, advertising, seasonality})$. Sales have momentum; factors affect the acceleration of sales trends, not sales levels directly.

8.2 Opinion and Social Dynamics

First-order model: $\mathrm{d}P/\mathrm{d}t = f(\text{media exposure, peer influence, events})$. Opinion prevalence changes based on current influences.

Problem: An opinion gaining ground rapidly and one losing ground, both at 40% prevalence, would respond identically to new information. Social momentum—the trajectory of change—is ignored.

Expanded model: $\mathrm{d}P/\mathrm{d}t = v$; $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = F(\text{media, peers, events})$. Influences affect how opinion trends are accelerating or decelerating.

8.3 Learning and Performance Growth

First-order model: $\mathrm{d}L/\mathrm{d}t = f(\text{practice, feedback, difficulty})$. Learning rate depends on current training conditions.

Problem: A student improving rapidly and one stagnating, both at the same skill level under identical instruction, would be predicted identically. Learning momentum is absent.

Expanded model: $\mathrm{d}L/\mathrm{d}t = v$; $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = F(\text{practice, feedback, difficulty})$. Training affects acceleration of learning, not learning rate directly.

8.4 Control Systems and AI Agents

First-order model: Control signal directly sets target rate of change.

Problem: Such systems exhibit overshoot, oscillation, and instability when conditions change because they cannot distinguish a system moving toward target from one moving away at the same distance.

Expanded model: The derivative term in PID control is precisely the introduction of velocity as a state variable—the controller responds to both position error and rate of change of error.

9 Relation to Existing Practices

The state-space expansion we describe is not new in practice—it has been discovered independently across domains, typically through trial and error:

PID Control: The D (derivative) term responds to rate of change of error, introducing velocity implicitly. This was developed empirically in the early 20th century without structural justification.

Momentum in Optimization: Gradient descent with momentum maintains an exponentially-weighted history of past gradients, effectively treating velocity as a state variable. This accelerates convergence and reduces oscillation, discovered through experimentation.

State-Space Econometrics: Vector autoregression and Kalman filtering models include lagged differences (implicit velocities) as state variables. This improves forecasting accuracy, justified pragmatically.

Epidemiological Models: Compartmental models that include behavioral adaptation often introduce rate-of-change variables to capture how populations respond to trends, not just levels.

What has been missing is the unifying structural explanation. Each domain developed its own vocabulary and justification. The theorem in [Kriger, 2018] provides the common foundation: *these modifications work because they correct a structural incompleteness inherent in first-order formulations when additive, velocity-independent influences are present.*

10 Literature Review: Historical Evidence of Structural Incompleteness

The persistent structural failures of first-order dynamical models have been documented across several fields. This review establishes that practitioners in economics, AI, control theory, and epidemiology were grappling with the symptoms of structural incompleteness—and were forced to adopt second-order corrections—long before a unifying theoretical justification existed.

Remark 2 (On Retrospective Interpretation)**.** *We must be careful here. The researchers cited below did not frame their work in terms of the Structural Diagnostic Principle; they could not have, as the principle had not been articulated. They discovered empirically that certain "momentum" or "velocity" corrections improved model performance, without necessarily understanding why structurally. Our interpretation—that these corrections work because they address the incompatibility identified in [Kriger, 2018]—is offered as a retrospective unification, not a claim about the authors' intentions. The value of this interpretation is explanatory: it suggests a common cause for independently discovered fixes, and it predicts where similar fixes will be needed in the future.*

10.1 Economics and Finance: The Momentum Problem

In traditional economic forecasting, models often treat the future state as a direct function of the current state. However, empirical data from the 2008 financial crisis and subsequent analyses highlighted a recurring failure: over-extrapolation of trends.

Evidence of Failure: Research by Armstrong [2012] showed that sophisticated first-order extrapolation techniques often fail because they lack a mechanism to account for the "mass" of a trend—its resistance to reversal.

The Second-Order Necessity: Bordalo et al. [2018] demonstrated that credit cycles are driven by "extrapolative expectations." When a market has momentum, a first-order model predicts continuation of the level, whereas a second-order model correctly identifies that influences push on the trend. This is the difference between predicting a price and predicting a change in the speed of price changes.

10.2 Machine Learning: The Momentum Hack

Long before the formal derivation of Universal Newtonian Dynamics, AI researchers realized that first-order optimization was practically inadequate for deep learning—though they did not frame the problem in structural terms.

The Symptom: Standard Gradient Descent ($\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = -\nabla f(x)$) frequently gets stuck in plateaus or oscillates wildly in "ravines" because it has no memory of its previous direction.

The Fix: Sutskever et al. [2013] and Goh [2017] argued that momentum is "indispensable" for training deep neural networks. By adding a velocity term, they effectively promoted the system from first-order to second-order.

Retrospective Structural Interpretation: Importantly, these authors did not claim to have discovered a structural necessity—they presented momentum as a highly effective *practical technique*, justified by empirical performance and intuitive appeal ("rolling downhill"). The Structural Diagnostic Principle offers a *retrospective* explanation for *why* this technique is so effective: if optimization should treat gradient contributions additively and independently of current parameter velocity, then first-order dynamics is structurally incomplete. Whether this interpretation fully captures the phenomenon, or whether other factors (like noise averaging) also contribute, remains an empirical question.

10.3 Epidemiology: The Behavioral Feedback Gap

Epidemiological models like SIR (Susceptible-Infected-Recovered) are historically first-order differential equations. They assume the rate of infection is a direct function of current infected individuals.

The Failure: Funk et al. [2010] and Verelst et al. [2016] identified that these models fail to predict "behavioral inertia." When an outbreak occurs, people don't just change their state; they change their habits—their velocity of interaction.

The Universal Principle: A first-order model assumes that if you remove the threat, people immediately return to old habits. A second-order model recognizes that social behavior has persistence (inertia). The interaction (the virus) acts as a force that decelerates social interaction, and that deceleration persists even after the force weakens.

10.4 Control Theory: PID and the Derivative Correction

In engineering, the PID (Proportional-Integral-Derivative) controller is the industry standard. Åström and Hägglund [1995] noted that roughly 90% of industrial controllers use PID.

Retrospective Structural Insight: The "D" (Derivative) term in a PID controller is what the Structural Diagnostic Principle would identify as necessary for systems with inertia. Without it, a controller is "blind" to the trend. However, we must note that PID was developed through decades of engineering practice and heuristic tuning, not from first principles. Engineers discovered empirically that the D term improves stability and reduces overshoot; they did not derive it from axioms about additive, velocity-independent influences. Our interpretation—that the D term corrects a structural incompleteness—is offered as a unifying explanation, not as a claim about historical development.

10.5 Synthesis: Why a Universal Principle Helps

The literature shows that every field has independently discovered a “velocity” or “momentum” fix to address the failures of first-order modeling. However, these were treated as domain-specific tricks: “Momentum” in AI, “Derivative” in Control, “Expectations” in Economics, “Behavioral adaptation” in Epidemiology. The practitioners who developed these techniques did not claim to have discovered a universal structural principle; they found what worked in their domains and justified it with domain-specific reasoning.

The foundational theorem in [Kriger, 2018] offers a unifying *hypothesis*: that these independently discovered fixes work because they all address the same underlying structural incompatibility. If a system genuinely satisfies Persistence, Additivity, and Compensation, second-order dynamics is mathematically necessary. This hypothesis allows a modeler to *diagnose a potentially failing model before testing it*, by asking: should influences in this system be additive and velocity-independent? If yes, first-order models are structurally inadequate.

We emphasize: this is a diagnostic principle, not a universal prescription. The question “do my system’s influences satisfy additivity and velocity-independence?” must be answered empirically for each domain. The theorem provides the *consequence* if the answer is yes; it does not assert the answer.

11 The Modeling Corollary

We state the central result as a formal corollary:

Corollary 3 (Modeling Corollary of the Second-Order Necessity Theorem)**.** *Let M be a dynamical model of system S with state variable x. Suppose S admits influences $F_1, F_2, \ldots$ that should (i) combine additively, and (ii) act on S independently of $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$. If M has the form $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = f(x, F)$, then M cannot faithfully represent the joint effect of these influences. M must be expanded to second order: $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = v$, $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = g(x, v, F)$.*

Proof. By direct application of Theorem 4.1 in [Kriger, 2018]. The conditions (i) and (ii) correspond to Additivity; the general framework corresponds to Persistence. Compensation is automatically satisfied for closed sub-systems. The incompatibility theorem then applies: first-order dynamics cannot satisfy these constraints. □

This corollary transforms a theoretical result about the foundations of mechanics into a practical diagnostic for applied modeling.

12 Practical Challenges and Extensions

12.1 Calibrating the Inertia Variable

In the mechanical analogy, mass is a well-defined, measurable quantity. In social, economic, or cognitive systems, the inertia parameter m—representing resistance to change in trend—presents a calibration challenge. How does one measure “market inertia” or “learning resistance” in practice?

Several approaches merit consideration:

Empirical estimation: Given time-series data on state $x(t)$ and known influences $F(t)$, the inertia m can be estimated by fitting the second-order model. The ratio of influence magnitude to observed acceleration provides an empirical estimate: $m \approx F/a$.

Response time analysis: Inertia manifests as lag between influence application and trend change. Systems with high m respond slowly to new influences; low-m systems respond quickly. The characteristic response time τ is proportional to m.

Structural proxies: In specific domains, inertia may correlate with measurable structural features. Market inertia might relate to transaction costs, regulatory friction, or information delays. Learning inertia might relate to cognitive load, prior knowledge density, or habit strength.

Relative rather than absolute: For many applications, the absolute value of m matters less than relative values. Comparing inertia across market segments, learner populations, or social groups may be more tractable than absolute calibration.

Further research on domain-specific calibration methods for the inertia parameter would significantly enhance the practical applicability of Universal Newtonian Dynamics.

12.2 Handling Mostly-Additive Systems

The framework assumes strict additivity of influences. Real systems often exhibit approximate additivity with nonlinear corrections—saturation effects, threshold phenomena, interaction terms. How should practitioners handle "mostly additive" systems?

Several strategies preserve the core framework while accommodating nonlinearity:

Linearization around operating point: If the system operates within a limited range, nonlinear effects may be negligible. The additive framework applies as a local approximation, valid near the current state.

Saturation as bounded influence: Saturation effects can be modeled by capping the magnitude of individual influences: $F_{\text{effective}} = F_{\max} \cdot \tanh(F/F_{\max})$. The influences still combine additively, but each is individually bounded.

State-dependent inertia: Some nonlinearities can be absorbed into a state-dependent inertia $m(x, v)$. The equation $m(x, v) \cdot \mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = \sum F_i$ remains structurally second-order while accommodating position- or velocity-dependent resistance.

Perturbative corrections: Write $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = (1/m) \sum F_i + \varepsilon \cdot g(x, v, F)$ where ε is small and g captures nonlinear interactions. The additive structure provides the leading-order behavior; nonlinear corrections are treated as perturbations.

Regime separation: If nonlinearity is significant only in certain regimes (e.g., near saturation limits), the state space can be partitioned. The additive framework applies in the linear regime; specialized models handle boundary regions.

The key insight is that *approximate additivity often suffices.* If influences combine approximately linearly over the range of practical interest, the structural diagnostic remains valid: first-order models will still exhibit systematic failures, and state-space expansion will still improve performance. Perfect additivity is a mathematical idealization; robust approximate additivity is what practice requires.

Systems with strongly nonlinear interactions—where the effect of F_1 depends fundamentally on the presence of F_2—may require frameworks beyond Universal Newtonian Dynamics. However, such systems are often better understood as having emergent composite influences rather than independent additive ones, suggesting a reformulation of what counts as a single "influence" rather than abandonment of the framework.

13 Future Applications: Fields Requiring Second-Order Correction

Based on the Structural Diagnostic Principle, several critical fields still rely heavily on first-order models that exhibit structural incompleteness. These systems are subject to multiple additive influences that act independently of the current direction of change, yet their models fail to account for the momentum or inertia inherent in the system's trajectory. The following are key areas where adopting a second-order Universal Newtonian Dynamics framework would significantly improve modeling accuracy and stability.

13.1 Climate and Environmental Modeling

While complex climate models exist, many specific sub-models for ecological and environmental systems remain first-order. Carbon cycle dynamics models often treat the rate of carbon sequestration or release as a direct function of current concentrations and temperatures.

Why UND Helps: Environmental systems possess significant "thermal inertia" and "biological persistence." Adopting the principle would require reinterpreting environmental forces (like emissions or reforestation) as factors that accelerate or decelerate the *trend* of carbon levels, rather than setting the level directly. This captures the observation that environmental systems continue changing even after forcing stabilizes.

13.2 Public Health and Healthcare Resource Planning

Beyond standard epidemiological models, specific public health interventions often use first-order logic. Healthcare resource planning models typically predict future hospital bed demand based solely on current admission rates and prevalence.

Why UND Helps: Resource demand has a trajectory; the rate of change of the rate (acceleration) is driven by multiple additive factors like policy changes, public compliance, and viral mutation. A second-order model would treat the "trend strength" of an outbreak as an independent variable, preventing the overshoot common in hospital staffing models during rapidly evolving situations.

13.3 Corporate Strategy and Market Share Dynamics

Many business analytics tools use simple trend extrapolation or first-order regression to forecast market share. Traditional brand loyalty and churn models predict future churn based on current satisfaction levels and pricing alone.

Why UND Helps: As noted earlier, a firm with rising sales and a firm with falling sales may occupy the same current level, but they have different market momentum. Correcting these models requires promoting the rate of change in market share to an independent state variable, recognizing that competitive pressures push on the trend of customer acquisition, not customer count directly.

13.4 Advanced Machine Learning: Agent-Based and Reinforcement Learning

While the momentum technique is used in training optimization, many high-level agent-based models and reinforcement learning frameworks still operate on first-order Markov Decision Processes. AI agents often make decisions based on the current state of the environment alone.

Why UND Helps: By expanding the state space to include the agent's "behavioral velocity," models can better capture persistent habits or "cognitive load" as a form of inertia. This prevents the instability and oscillation seen in agents that lack a structural representation of their own trajectory. The agent's momentum becomes part of its observable state.

13.5 Policy Analysis and Social Engineering

Social policy models often assume that a change in influence (like a tax incentive or a new law) will immediately shift the rate of a social behavior. Economic policies are frequently modeled as having a direct additive effect on the rate of GDP growth or unemployment.

Why UND Helps: Social systems have "cultural inertia." The Structural Diagnostic Principle suggests that policy interventions should be modeled as forces that must overcome the existing momentum of social trends before a change in direction can be observed. This explains the common observation of policy lag—why effects appear delayed and why reversing social trends requires sustained effort.

14 Conclusion

We have shown that the structural theorem proven in [Kriger, 2018]—that second-order dynamics emerges necessarily from certain axioms—generalizes beyond mechanics to provide a universal modeling principle. The *Structural Diagnostic Principle* states that models admitting additive, velocity-independent influences cannot be formulated in first-order form without structural incompleteness.

This principle explains why similar corrections (momentum terms, derivative controls, state-space expansions) have been discovered independently across unrelated domains. They are not ad-hoc fixes but necessary responses to a common structural deficiency.

For practitioners, the principle provides a diagnostic tool: before building or validating a model, ask whether the influences should combine additively and act independently of current trends. If so, first-order models are structurally inadequate, regardless of fit to historical data.

The transformation from Newtonian mechanics to universal modeling principle illustrates how foundational work in one domain can illuminate practice across many others. What Kriger [2018] established for physical systems—that *velocity must be promoted to an independent state variable for interaction to exist in a coherent additive system*—applies wherever additivity and velocity-independence are expected.

The form of dynamical laws is not arbitrary. It is constrained by the structure of interaction.

A Practical Diagnostic and Transformation Protocol

A.1 Diagnostic Questions

When evaluating or constructing a dynamical model, systematically ask:

1. What are the state variables? Is the model predicting future states from current states alone?
2. What influences affect the system? List all factors that drive change.
3. Should these influences combine additively? Would doubling one influence (holding others constant) double its effect?
4. Should influences act independently of current trend? Would the same influence have the same effect on a rising system as on a falling system at the same level?
5. Does the model include rate-of-change as an independent variable, or only current levels?

A.2 Interpreting Answers

If the answers to questions 3 and 4 are *yes* (influences are additive and velocity-independent) and question 5 is *no* (only current levels are state variables), then **the model is structurally incomplete** by the Structural Diagnostic Principle.

Signs of structural incompleteness in practice include: models that fit historical data well but extrapolate poorly; models requiring frequent recalibration; models that oscillate or overshoot under changing conditions; models where practitioners add ad-hoc "momentum" or "trend" corrections.

A.3 Transformation Procedure

To correct a structurally incomplete model:

Step 1: Identify the original state variable(s) x.

Step 2: Introduce velocity $v = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$ as an independent state variable.

Step 3: Rewrite $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = f(x, \text{factors})$ as two equations:

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\mathrm{d}t} = v$$
$$\frac{\mathrm{d}v}{\mathrm{d}t} = F(x, v, \text{factors})$$

Step 4: Reinterpret influences as acting on $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t$ (change of trend) rather than $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$ (current change).

Step 5: If needed, introduce an inertial parameter m representing resistance to trend change: $m \cdot \mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = F$.

Step 6: Specify initial conditions for both $x(0)$ and $v(0)$—the system now requires knowledge of both current level and current trend.

Algorithm: State-Space Expansion for Structural Completeness

INPUT: First-order model $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = f(x, F_1, F_2, \ldots)$
OUTPUT: Second-order model (x, v) with $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = v$, $m \cdot \mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = \sum F_i$

1. **IDENTIFY** state variable x and influences $F_1, F_2, \ldots$
2. **CHECK** additivity: Do influences combine linearly?
3. **CHECK** velocity-independence: Same $F \rightarrow$ same effect regardless of $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$?
4. **IF** both checks pass AND model is first-order: EXPAND
5. **PROMOTE** $v = \mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t$ to independent variable
6. **REWRITE** as: $\mathrm{d}x/\mathrm{d}t = v$; $\mathrm{d}v/\mathrm{d}t = (1/m) \cdot \sum F_i$
7. **ESTIMATE** inertia m from response time or empirical fit
8. **INITIALIZE** both $x(0)$ and $v(0)$ from historical data

A.4 Practitioner Interpretation Guide

For those working without formal mathematical training, the principle can be stated simply:

> *If your model predicts the future from where things are, but ignores which direction things are moving, and the forces on your system should work the same way whether things are going up or down—your model is missing something structural. You need to track momentum, not just position.*

The practical implication: when multiple factors affect a system and should add up in their effects, those factors must be understood as pushing on the trend, not the level. Markets don't set prices; they accelerate or decelerate price changes. Training doesn't set skill; it accelerates or decelerates learning. This is not a choice but a structural requirement.

References

Armstrong, J. S. (2012). Forecasting by Extrapolation: Conclusions from Twenty-five Years of Research. Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania.

Åström, K. J. and Hägglund, T. (1995). *PID Controllers: Theory, Design, and Tuning*. Instrument Society of America.

Åström, K. J. and Murray, R. M. (2008). *Feedback Systems: An Introduction for Scientists and Engineers*. Princeton University Press.

Bordalo, P., Gennaioli, N., and Shleifer, A. (2018). Diagnostic Expectations and Credit Cycles. *The Journal of Finance*, 73(5):1999–2027.

Funk, S., Salathé, M., and Jansen, V. A. (2010). Modelling the influence of human behaviour on the spread of infectious diseases. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 7(50):1247–1256.

Goh, G. (2017). Why Momentum Really Works. *Distill*. `http://doi.org/10.23915/distill.00006`

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., and Courville, A. (2016). *Deep Learning*. MIT Press.

Kriger, B. (2018). Emergence of Newtonian Dynamics from Metric Inertial Systems: A Structural Derivation of Second-Order Deterministic Evolution. Zenodo. `https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18343870`

Simon, D. (2006). *Optimal State Estimation: Kalman, $H\infty$, and Nonlinear Approaches*. Wiley.

Sutskever, I., Martens, J., Dahl, G., and Hinton, G. (2013). On the importance of initialization and momentum in deep learning. *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 1139–1147.

Verelst, H., Willem, L., and Beutels, P. (2016). Behavioural change models for infectious disease transmission: A systematic review (2010–2015). *Journal of the Royal Society Interface*, 13(125):20160820.