Entropy-Constrained Emergence of Intelligence and Knowledge: An Axiomatic Framework

Aslan Alwi[1,2], Munirah Munirah[1,2], and Almudaya Research Institute Team[1]

[1]Independent Researcher at Almudaya Research Institute, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

[2]Department of Informatics Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo, Indonesia, *Correspondence email*: aslan.alwi@umpo.ac.id

January 2026

Abstract

Recent advances in non-equilibrium thermodynamics, complexity science, and artificial intelligence suggest deep connections between entropy, intelligence, and knowledge. While these connections are often discussed phenomenologically, a unified axiomatic formulation remains lacking. In this work, we propose an entropy-constrained axiomatic framework for the emergence of intelligent systems and knowledge. We introduce two postulates concerning the emergence of intelligence and knowledge from entropic conditions, followed by three entropy-dependent theorems relating entropy to (i) the probability of intelligent life, (ii) the maximal complexity of knowledge, and (iii) the realizability and complexity of artificial intelligence systems. The framework is explicitly probabilistic and conceptual in nature, aiming to clarify the scope, limits, and falsifiability of entropy-based emergence principles without overclaiming mathematical determinism.

1 Introduction

Entropy has historically been associated with disorder and degradation. However, developments in statistical mechanics and information theory have reframed entropy as a measure of uncertainty and possibility rather than mere disorder Jaynes, 1957; Shannon, 1948. In non-equilibrium systems, entropy gradients enable the emergence of stable, organized structures—so-called dissipative structures—that persist by exporting entropy to their environment Nicolis and Prigogine, 1977; Prigogine and Stengers, 1984.

Parallel developments in artificial intelligence have revealed that intelligent behavior does not arise in deterministic or low-entropy environments, but rather depends on exposure to large, diverse, and noisy data distributions Bengio et al., 2013; Goodfellow et al., 2016. These observations motivate a foundational question: can the emergence of intelligence and knowledge be constrained by universal entropic principles?

This paper addresses that question by proposing an axiomatic framework linking entropy to the probability and complexity of intelligence and knowledge. The aim is not to provide mathematical proofs, but to formalize law-like relationships that are consistent with existing theory across physics, complexity science, and AI.

A central premise underlying this work is that prediction itself is an embedded process. Any attempt to model, forecast, or infer the behavior of nature is necessarily carried out by systems that are themselves part of nature. This embeddedness imposes unavoidable epistemic constraints that precede questions of model accuracy or computational power. The implications of this closure property will be formalized later as a law governing prediction, and will serve as a boundary condition for the entropy-constrained theorems developed in this paper.

2 Scope and Epistemic Status

The statements presented in this work are not mathematical theorems in the strict formal sense. Instead, they are theoretical theorems: constraint-based propositions grounded in established results from thermodynamics, complexity theory, evolutionary biology, and artificial intelligence.

Entropy alone is neither sufficient nor deterministic in producing intelligence or knowledge. Rather, entropy imposes necessary conditions on the size and structure of the possibility space within which such phenomena may emerge. This probabilistic framing is consistent with Bayesian and information-theoretic perspectives on inference and learning Jaynes, 1957; Pearl, 1988.

Falsification of the framework would require demonstrating the sustained emergence of intelligence or complex knowledge in universes lacking sufficient entropic richness or structure. No such counterexamples are currently known.

3 Postulates

3.1 Postulate 1: Knowledge Emergence

All knowledge is emergent from structured stochasticity in the universe.

This postulate asserts that knowledge is not a primitive or a priori feature of reality. Instead, it arises from interactions between stochastic processes and structural constraints. Information theory formalizes this relationship by defining information as the reduction of uncertainty within probabilistic systems Shannon, 1948. Without stochasticity, there is nothing to learn; without structure, nothing can be retained or transmitted.

This view is consistent with Bayesian epistemology, in which knowledge is represented as probabilistic belief updated through evidence Pearl, 1988.

3.2 Postulate 2: Intelligence Emergence

All intelligent systems are emergent from the entropic conditions of the universe.

Intelligence—biological or artificial—requires environments that are neither fully deterministic nor maximally random. Environments with insufficient entropy permit behavior to be hard-coded, eliminating the adaptive advantage of intelligence. Environments with excessive entropy lack stable regularities, preventing learning and generalization.

This postulate aligns with results from complexity science indicating that adaptive computation emerges near the edge of chaos Kauffman, 1993; Langton, 1990.

4 The Law of Closure Prediction

All predictions about nature are necessarily made from within nature, using processes that are themselves part of nature.

There exists no non-natural or external standpoint from which nature can be predicted. Any predictive system—biological, artificial, or theoretical—is embedded within the same physical, informational, and entropic structure that it seeks to predict.

Prediction is therefore an internally closed process: nature predicts nature by means of its own dynamics. The observer, the model, the data, and the inference mechanism are all subsystems of nature.

As a consequence, predictive uncertainty is not an epistemic flaw that can be eliminated by improved models or greater computational power. Instead, it is a structural feature imposed by the entropic conditions of the universe. All predictive complexity ultimately originates from the entropy of nature itself.

This closure property establishes the epistemic boundary conditions for the entropy-constrained theorems that follow. Since no predictive system can operate outside nature, the probability, complexity, and realizability of intelligence and knowledge must be evaluated under the same entropic constraints that govern the universe itself.

5 Counter-Arguments and Clarifications

5.1 Is an External or Non-Natural Predictor Possible?

A potential objection to the Law of Closure Prediction is the hypothetical existence of an external or non-natural predictor capable of observing and predicting nature from outside its entropic constraints. Such a standpoint would resemble a so-called "God's-eye view."

Within the scope of physical and informational theories, no such standpoint is operationally definable. Any system capable of storing information, performing inference, or generating predictions must be physically instantiated, and is therefore subject to thermodynamic and entropic constraints. As a result, the notion of an external predictor lacks empirical and theoretical grounding.

5.2 Does Increased Computational Power Eliminate Predictive Uncertainty?

Another objection is that predictive uncertainty may be eliminated through arbitrarily large computational resources or more sophisticated models. However, increased computation does not remove uncertainty arising from stochasticity, incomplete information, or entropic variability. It may reduce local approximation error, but it cannot transcend the closure imposed by embedding within nature.

This limitation is consistent with results from computational irreducibility and probabilistic inference, which suggest that certain forms of uncertainty are not artifacts of insufficient computation, but structural properties of complex systems.

5.3 Is the Closure Principle Merely Epistemic Rather Than Physical?

It may be argued that the Law of Closure Prediction reflects only epistemic limitations rather than physical ones. The framework presented here does not sharply separate the two. Since information processing is physically instantiated, epistemic limits necessarily reflect physical constraints. The closure principle therefore operates simultaneously at epistemic and physical levels, without privileging one over the other.

6 Entropy-Constrained Theorems

6.1 Theorem 1: Entropy–Intelligence Emergence

The probability of the emergence of intelligent systems in a universe is a function of the universe's accessible entropy, with maximal probability occurring in

intermediate-to-high entropy regimes.

Intelligence becomes adaptive only when uncertainty exceeds the capacity of fixed rules. This relationship has been observed in computational systems operating near critical transitions between order and disorder Langton, 1990. Evolutionary and biological intelligence similarly arise in environments characterized by persistent variability and partial predictability.

6.2 Theorem 2: Entropy–Knowledge Complexity

The maximal complexity of knowledge attainable in a universe is bounded by the universe's entropic structure.

Knowledge complexity depends on both the size of the possibility space and the stability of regularities within it. Algorithmic and evolutionary studies show that meaningful complexity arises between trivial compressibility and complete randomness Kauffman, 1993. Excessively low-entropy universes support only trivial knowledge, while excessively high-entropy universes cannot stabilize complex epistemic structures.

6.3 Theorem 3: Entropy–Artificial Intelligence Realizability

The realizability and complexity of artificial intelligence systems in a universe are constrained by the universe's entropic richness.

Modern AI systems depend on high-entropy informational environments that provide diverse training data and probabilistic structure Bengio et al., 2013; Goodfellow et al., 2016. However, learning collapses in environments dominated by noise without stable regularities. Artificial intelligence is therefore realizable only within specific entropic regimes that balance diversity and structure.

7 Interpretation and Consequences

Taken together, the postulates and theorems describe an entropy-constrained landscape in which intelligence and knowledge are contingent phenomena. Entropy does not guarantee intelligence, but it defines the conditions under which intelligence becomes probable and useful.

This framework is consistent with non-equilibrium thermodynamics, where adaptive structures arise as mechanisms for entropy dissipation England, 2013. Intelligence and knowledge may be interpreted as high-level strategies for navigating and exploiting entropic environments.

8 Relation to Existing Principles

The axiomatic framework proposed in this paper does not arise in isolation. Rather, it is consistent with—and may be viewed as a higher-level generalization of—several foundational principles in statistical physics, information theory, and theoretical neuroscience. In this section, we clarify the relationship between the present framework and three influential principles: the Maximum Entropy Principle, Landauer's Principle, and the Free Energy Principle.

8.1 Relation to the Maximum Entropy Principle

The Maximum Entropy Principle (MaxEnt), formulated by Jaynes, states that among all probability distributions consistent with known constraints, the distribution that maximizes entropy should be preferred Jaynes, 1957. MaxEnt provides a powerful inferential rule for selecting minimally biased statistical models given partial information.

The present framework operates at a different level of abstraction. While MaxEnt prescribes how agents should reason under uncertainty, our axiomatic framework addresses the conditions under which such agents—and the uncertainties they reason about—can exist at all. In this sense, MaxEnt is an epistemic rule operating within a universe, whereas the entropy-constrained postulates and theorems proposed here characterize the entropic structure of universes that permit epistemic agents.

Rather than competing with MaxEnt, the framework can be interpreted as a meta-principle: MaxEnt presupposes an environment with sufficient stochastic richness and stable constraints, conditions that are explicitly addressed by the entropic regimes described in this work.

8.2 Relation to Landauer's Principle

Landauer's Principle establishes a fundamental link between information processing and thermodynamics, stating that the erasure of one bit of information incurs a minimum energetic cost proportional to $k_B T \ln 2$ Landauer, 1961. This principle demonstrates that information is not abstractly free but physically instantiated.

The entropy-constrained framework presented here complements Landauer's Principle by extending its implications from computational processes to epistemic systems. If information processing is thermodynamically constrained, then the total amount of information that can be stored, erased, or transformed in a universe is necessarily limited by its entropic and energetic resources.

Thus, while Landauer's Principle constrains individual computational operations, the present framework constrains the global realizability and complexity of intelligent systems and knowledge. Landauer's bound operates locally; the entropy-constrained theorems operate cosmologically.

8.3 Relation to the Free Energy Principle

The Free Energy Principle (FEP), proposed by Friston, asserts that self-organizing systems that persist over time must minimize a variational free energy bound on surprise Friston, 2010. Under this principle, biological cognition and perception are interpreted as inference processes that maintain homeostasis by reducing prediction error.

The axiomatic framework proposed here is compatible with the Free Energy Principle but differs in scope. FEP describes the dynamics of adaptive systems once they exist, whereas the present framework addresses the preconditions for the existence of such systems. In other words, FEP explains how intelligent systems maintain themselves within entropic environments; the entropy-constrained postulates explain which entropic environments are capable of supporting such systems in the first place.

From this perspective, the Free Energy Principle can be viewed as a local dynamical realization of the broader entropy-constrained landscape described in this paper.

8.4 Synthesis and Hierarchical Positioning

Taken together, these relationships suggest a natural hierarchy:

- The Maximum Entropy Principle governs rational inference within entropic environments.
- Landauer's Principle constrains the physical cost of information processing.
- The Free Energy Principle describes the self-organization and persistence of adaptive systems.
- The entropy-constrained axiomatic framework proposed here characterizes the cosmological conditions under which inference, computation, and adaptation are possible at all.

In this hierarchy, the present framework does not replace existing principles but provides a unifying background that situates them within a broader theory of entropy, intelligence, and knowledge emergence.

9 Conclusion

This paper has proposed an axiomatic framework linking entropy to the emergence and limits of intelligence and knowledge. By introducing entropy-constrained postulates and theorems, we have articulated how the probability, complexity, and realizability of epistemic systems depend on the entropic structure of the universe.

The framework reframes entropy not as the enemy of order or meaning, but as their enabling condition. Future work may formalize these ideas mathematically or explore their implications for cosmology, artificial intelligence, and the philosophy of knowledge.

Acknowledgments

The author gratefully acknowledges the intellectual environment and collegial discussions provided by the Almudaya Research Institute and Universitas Muhammadiyah Ponorogo. The author also thanks the broader research community in quantum information theory and causal modeling for foundational contributions that have influenced this work.

References

Bengio, Y., Courville, A., & Vincent, P. (2013). Representation learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, *35*. https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2013.50

England, J. L. (2013). Statistical physics of self-replication. *Journal of Chemical Physics*, *139*. https://doi.org/10.1063/1.4818538

Friston, K. (2010). The free-energy principle: A unified brain theory? *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *11*. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn2787

Goodfellow, I., Bengio, Y., & Courville, A. (2016). *Deep learning*. MIT Press.

Jaynes, E. T. (1957). Information theory and statistical mechanics. *Physical Review*, *106*. https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.106.620

Kauffman, S. A. (1993). *The origins of order*. Oxford University Press.

Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, *5*. https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.53.0183

Langton, C. G. (1990). Computation at the edge of chaos. *Physica D*, *42*. https://doi.org/10.1016/0167-2789(90)90064-V

Nicolis, G., & Prigogine, I. (1977). *Self-organization in nonequilibrium systems*. Wiley.

Pearl, J. (1988). *Probabilistic reasoning in intelligent systems*. Morgan Kaufmann.

Prigogine, I., & Stengers, I. (1984). *Order out of chaos*. Bantam Books.

Shannon, C. E. (1948). A mathematical theory of communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, *27*. https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x