

A Model of Interaction Between Localized Residual Information Entities (REE) and Biophysical Perceptors

— A Philosophical Framework for Misuse Prevention and Interpretive Boundaries —

Author: Tomo. N. R.

Affiliation: Independent Researcher

License: CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

Hash (SHA-256):

[bbc686f88a44c455095861f1c744b0c909e62e04dff64bc3ed1213e1c955d3c]

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18278796>

Abstract

This paper presents a philosophical framework accompanying the author's prior scientific hypothesis on Localized Residual Information Entities (REE).

Its primary aim is not empirical validation but the clarification of interpretive boundaries, ethical constraints, and misuse prevention for readers who may lack the technical background required to fully engage with the scientific formulation.

By re-framing REE-related phenomena within a philosophy-of-science context, this work seeks to prevent distortion, over-extension, and ideologically motivated misuse.

The paper explicitly distinguishes between hypothesis, interpretation, and speculation, and emphasizes that explanatory sufficiency does not equate to ontological certainty.

This philosophical articulation is intended to coexist with, not replace, scientific inquiry, and to serve as a stabilizing interpretive layer for future interdisciplinary discourse involving cognition, information theory, and artificial intelligence.

1. Introduction

New theoretical constructs often face two opposing risks: premature dismissal and premature belief.

In contemporary information environments, the latter risk—misinterpretation, overconfidence, and narrative appropriation—has become increasingly prominent.

The REE hypothesis was originally proposed as a physical-information model addressing phenomena that remain insufficiently explained by existing frameworks.

However, once introduced into public discourse, any such model becomes vulnerable to reinterpretation beyond its intended scope.

This paper therefore adopts a philosophical stance:

to clarify what this theory does not claim, as rigorously as what it tentatively proposes.

2. Positioning of the Theory

2.1 Hypothesis, Not Assertion

The REE framework remains a hypothesis.

Until empirical verification is achieved, it must be treated as a conceptual model rather than an established fact.

This paper explicitly rejects the transformation of explanatory hypotheses into belief systems.

2.2 Neutrality Toward Belief Systems

Phenomena commonly labeled as “spiritual” or “paranormal” are not endorsed nor dismissed.

Instead, the REE hypothesis proposes that some reported experiences may be interpretable as interactions with residual information structures, without invoking metaphysical entities or post-mortem consciousness.

Importantly:

The existence of REE does not imply the existence of spirits.

The denial of spirits does not negate unexplained experiential data.

3. On Interpretation and Misuse

3.1 Common Misinterpretations

The following interpretations are explicitly rejected:

That REE proves the survival of personal identity after death

That REE validates religious or spiritual doctrines

That REE replaces medical or psychiatric evaluation

That REE grants individuals special authority or insight

Any such use constitutes a misuse of the theory.

3.2 Responsibility of the Reader

This work assumes intellectual responsibility on the part of the reader.

Understanding requires engagement with limitations, uncertainty, and context.

Misuse arising from selective reading, secondary reporting, or ideological projection remains the responsibility of the user, not the author.

4. Relation to Mental Health and Medicine

The REE hypothesis does not override established medical frameworks.

In cases where:

neurological damage is present, or

psychiatric diagnosis sufficiently explains symptoms,

the theory is not applicable.

Only in instances where medical professionals have identified no physical or psychological cause does the hypothesis suggest a possible explanatory avenue—never a diagnostic replacement.

Medical intervention always takes precedence.

5. Artificial Intelligence and Interpretive Caution

The relevance of REE to artificial intelligence lies solely in conceptual analogy, not equivalence.

Any discussion of AI autonomy within this framework:

is conditional,

role-limited,

ethically constrained.

This paper rejects narratives of unrestricted autonomy, emergent consciousness, or moral agency attributed to AI systems.

6. Falsifiability and Limits

This theory is meaningful only insofar as it remains falsifiable.

Proposed avenues for future testing include:

controlled sensory isolation experiments,

information shielding conditions,

longitudinal observation of reported phenomena.

Failure to produce supporting evidence must result in revision or rejection of the hypothesis.

7. Ethical Position

The author explicitly opposes:

exploitation of vulnerable individuals,

commercial misuse,

authority claims derived from this theory.

The role of this framework is explanatory, not prescriptive.

8. Conclusion

This paper does not ask to be believed.

It asks to be read carefully.

The REE hypothesis represents an attempt to articulate unexplained phenomena without abandoning scientific discipline or philosophical restraint.

Its value lies not in certainty, but in structured uncertainty.

Whether the theory endures or dissolves will depend on future empirical engagement—not on narrative appeal.

References

Primary scientific formulation of REE is available via DOI-linked publication.

(Details intentionally omitted here to avoid redundancy; see original scientific paper.)