

The ISR/VPR Framework as a Structural Account of Unresolved Problems in Modern Physics: A Collaborative Analysis with AI

Toward a Description of What Lies at the Boundary
That Physical Equations Mark with ∞

Jinco K. · Lead Researcher, J-Katakamuna Research · <https://j-katakamuna.com/>
in collaboration with Claude (Anthropic)

ABSTRACT

This paper applies a two-domain interface framework — ISR (Invisible Source Realm) and VPR (Visible Phenomenal Realm) — to five unresolved problems in modern physics: the vacuum catastrophe, the nature of dark energy, the perpetual orbital motion of electrons, the universality of physical constants, and the incompatibility of quantum mechanics with general relativity. Structural interpretations of each problem are offered through the ISR/VPR framework, with existing equations augmented by symbolic interface terms whose explicit forms are presented as open questions for theoretical physicists.

This analysis was developed in collaboration with Claude (Anthropic). The involvement of AI as a research partner reflects a deliberate methodological choice: an AI system carries no vested interest in existing paradigms, and is therefore positioned to evaluate both the claims and the anticipated objections with equal neutrality. In accordance with this approach, each interpretation in this paper is accompanied by an assessment of its anticipated scientific objections and a structural response.

The paper does not present solutions. It presents a framework and the questions that follow from it. The source of this framework is disclosed in Section 6.

Index Terms — ISR, VPR, Vacuum Catastrophe, Dark Energy, Physical Constants, Quantum Gravity, Katakamuna, Artificial Intelligence, Unnamed Variables, Interface Framework.

INTRODUCTION

In 2025, AI demonstrated a capacity that reframed the relationship between physics and its instruments. A research team at Columbia University showed that an AI system, given no knowledge of physical laws and only video data of physical phenomena, could autonomously identify the state variables needed to describe those phenomena. To describe a flame, the AI identified 24 variables. None of them corresponded to temperature, density, or velocity — the variables human physics would reach for. They were, in the researchers' own assessment, unnamed.

Google DeepMind identified new families of unstable singularities in the Navier-Stokes equations. AI analysis of cosmic microwave background radiation extracted three times the information from the same observational data that had been available to human analysts for decades. An AI system given only angular data of the Sun and Mars from Earth's perspective arrived independently at the heliocentric model — without having been taught either geocentrism or heliocentrism. What it determined was that the Sun-centred model compressed the data more efficiently.

These are not AI as a tool. These are AI as a discov-

erer.

The history of physics is a history of finding better languages to describe the universe. Calculus gave Newton the language for motion. Tensors gave Einstein the language for gravity. AI is now generating a third descriptive form — one that removes the constraint of human readability and operates at a higher information density than any equation a human hand has written.

And yet there is a boundary AI does not cross. Why do physical constants hold the same values everywhere in the universe? Why does the electron continue its orbital motion without energy loss across billions of years? Why does the vacuum contain energy at all — and why does the quantity of that energy diverge from theoretical prediction by 120 orders of magnitude? These questions are not answered by processing more VPR data. They arise from something the VPR framework itself cannot account for.

This paper proposes a structural framework for the domain that lies beyond that boundary: ISR (Invisible Source Realm) and VPR (Visible Phenomenal Realm), and the interface between them. The framework was developed through iterative analysis with Claude (Anthropic). AI brings no attachment to existing paradigms

and no resistance to the questions that paradigms have left unanswered. This makes it an unusual but appropriate research partner for the present investigation.

This paper adopts the following structure: each interpretation is accompanied by an assessment of its anticipated scientific objections and a structural response to those objections. The source of the ISR/VPR framework is disclosed in Section 6.

THE ISR/VPR FRAMEWORK

The framework proposed in this paper consists of two domains and the interface between them.

ISR — Invisible Source Realm. The domain that is immeasurable and invisible by the methods of current physical instrumentation. ISR is the source from which information and energy are supplied to the phenomenal world. Modern physics has no direct means of accessing this domain. Its action, however, appears as observable results within the VPR.

VPR — Visible Phenomenal Realm. The domain of the measurable and observable. Matter, energy, space-time, and all phenomena accessible to physical instrumentation exist within the VPR. Modern physics describes this domain. AI, too, derives the structure of the VPR from VPR data.

The Interface. ISR and VPR are not two separated domains. They act upon each other continuously through an interface. It is through this interface that information and energy are supplied from the ISR to the VPR — not as a singular event, but as a continuous and ongoing process.

2.1 The Position of This Framework

ISR/VPR is not a metaphysical assertion. It is a structural framework derived from an observation: the group of problems that modern physics has left unresolved cannot generate structural interpretations within the VPR framework alone.

Modern physics describes the VPR with precision. AI extends that precision beyond the limits of human computation. But neither reaches the source domain: why the VPR behaves as it does. ISR/VPR gives a structural name to that source domain. The framework does not assert that the ISR exists in a manner susceptible to current experimental verification. It asserts that the class of problems described in Section 3 requires a term that VPR-only frameworks do not contain.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

ISR lacks an operational definition. Postulating an immeasurable domain violates the basic principle of scientific methodology — falsifiability. This is a metaphysical assumption that does not meet Popper's criterion.

Response. The falsifiability criterion is important. However, the ISR/VPR framework does not claim that the ISR exists as a verifiable entity. It claims that the class of phenomena described in Section 3 cannot generate structural interpretations within the VPR alone —

and that a term representing an external source domain is required.

This is the same logical position as dark matter. Dark matter cannot be directly observed. Its existence is inferred from the behaviour of observable phenomena that VPR-only frameworks cannot account for. The ISR/VPR framework occupies the same inferential position. The question is not whether the term can be immediately verified, but whether its introduction generates a more coherent account of the phenomena in question.

FIVE UNRESOLVED PROBLEMS IN MODERN PHYSICS

Modern physics constructed two monumental theoretical frameworks in the twentieth century: quantum mechanics and general relativity. Each is internally precise. Each has been experimentally verified to extraordinary accuracy within its domain. And yet the two cannot be unified. Within each framework, there remain questions that the VPR alone cannot answer.

3.1 The Vacuum Catastrophe

Quantum field theory predicts a vacuum energy density of approximately 10^{74} GeV⁴. Cosmological observation yields a value of approximately 10^{-46} GeV⁴. The discrepancy is:

$$\frac{\rho_{\text{vac}}^{\text{QFT}}}{\rho_{\text{vac}}^{\text{obs}}} \sim 10^{120} \quad (1)$$

This is the largest discrepancy between theoretical prediction and observational measurement in the history of physics. No resolution exists within current frameworks.

3.2 The Nature of Dark Energy

Approximately 68% of the total energy of the universe consists of dark energy — the force driving the accelerating expansion of the universe. It cannot be directly observed. No theoretical framework explains what it is or why it holds the value it does.

3.3 The Perpetual Orbital Motion of the Electron

Classical electromagnetism predicts that an accelerating charge radiates electromagnetic energy (Larmor radiation):

$$P = \frac{e^2 a^2}{6\pi\epsilon_0 c^3} \quad (2)$$

By classical calculation, the electron should lose energy and spiral into the nucleus within approximately 10^{-11} seconds. Quantum mechanics resolves this by describing the electron's state as a ground state:

$$E_n = -\frac{m_e e^4}{2\hbar^2 n^2} \quad (3)$$

But quantum mechanics does not identify the source of the energy that maintains that state across billions of years. The question is deferred, not answered.

3.4 The Universality of Physical Constants

The speed of light c , Planck's constant $\hbar$, and the gravitational constant G hold the same values everywhere in the observable universe:

$$c = 2.998 \times 10^8 \text{ m/s} \quad (4)$$

$$\hbar = 1.055 \times 10^{-34} \text{ J s} \quad (5)$$

$$G = 6.674 \times 10^{-11} \text{ N m}^2 \text{ kg}^{-2} \quad (6)$$

Modern physics measures these constants. It does not explain why they are constant, or why they hold the specific values they do.

3.5 The Incompatibility of Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity

Attempts to unify quantum mechanics and general relativity produce divergences at the Planck scale:

$$\ell_{\text{Pl}} = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar G}{c^3}} \approx 1.616 \times 10^{-35} \text{ m} \quad (7)$$

$$\lim_{E \rightarrow E_{\text{Pl}}} \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \infty \quad (8)$$

The scattering amplitude $\mathcal{M}$ diverges. Renormalisation does not resolve the divergence. After a century of effort, no unified theory has been experimentally verified.

3.6 An Observation That Runs Through All Five Problems

The five problems share a common structural moment. In each case, physicists pursuing the calculation to its limit encounter ∞ . The standard response has been to treat this infinity as a breakdown of the calculation, and to develop techniques — most notably renormalisation — to remove it.

Renormalisation works. Quantum electrodynamics, built on renormalised calculations, is the most precisely verified theory in the history of physics. Feynman himself described renormalisation as a strange trick — but a trick that produces correct answers.

What was not asked is what the infinity meant before it was removed.

An alternative interpretation is proposed here. When a physical equation produces ∞ , it may not be signalling the breakdown of the calculation. It may be signalling that the VPR description has reached the boundary of the ISR — that the framework has arrived at the edge of the domain it was built to describe, and is registering the presence of something beyond that edge.

Renormalisation, under this interpretation, is the mathematical operation that closes the door to the ISR. What it removes, along with the infinity, may be the signal that something lies beyond.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Renormalisation is not merely a mathematical trick. It has a physical interpretation rooted in effective field theory. The infinities

it removes are artefacts of applying a theory beyond its domain of validity, not signals of something beyond the VPR.

Response. The effective field theory interpretation is well-established and not disputed here. The claim is not that renormalisation is physically unjustified. The claim is that the boundary at which a theory ceases to be valid — the scale at which the infinity appears — may itself carry structural information. Effective field theory acknowledges that each framework has a domain of validity and breaks down beyond it. ISR/VPR proposes a name for what lies beyond that boundary. The infinity is where the VPR framework ends. That ending may be the beginning of something the framework was not built to see.

ISR/VPR INTERPRETATION OF EACH PROBLEM

The five problems are now interpreted through the ISR/VPR framework. These are not solutions. They are structural interpretations — accounts of what each problem may be pointing toward when read through a framework that includes a source domain beyond the VPR. Each interpretation is accompanied by its anticipated objection and a structural response.

4.1 The Vacuum Catastrophe

Existing formulation:

$$\rho_{\text{vac}}^{\text{QFT}} = \sum_k \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_k \sim M_{\text{Pl}}^4 \approx 10^{74} \text{ GeV}^4 \quad (9)$$

$$\rho_{\text{vac}}^{\text{obs}} \approx 10^{-46} \text{ GeV}^4 \quad (10)$$

ISR/VPR interpretation: The energy that appears in the VPR is not the total VPR potential, but the portion drawn through the ISR/VPR interface:

$$\rho_{\text{obs}} = \rho_{\text{vac}}^{\text{QFT}} \cdot \mathcal{F}(\alpha_{\text{ISR/VPR}}) \quad (11)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(\alpha_{\text{ISR/VPR}})$ is an interface modulation function satisfying $\mathcal{F} \approx 10^{-120}$. The 120-order discrepancy is the ratio between the total VPR potential and what the ISR/VPR interface draws into phenomenal existence. *The explicit form of $\mathcal{F}$ is an open question for theoretical physicists.*

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Introducing $\mathcal{F}$ without specifying its form is not a physical explanation — it is a relabelling of the problem.

Response. The objection is acknowledged. $\mathcal{F}$ as presented here is a placeholder, not a derivation. However, the introduction of a structurally motivated placeholder is a recognised step in theoretical physics. The cosmological constant Λ was introduced as a term whose physical content was initially unspecified. Dark energy was named before it was characterised. What ISR/VPR adds is a structural account of why the term is required: the VPR framework is calculating the total potential of a system that is not closed.

4.2 Dark Energy

Existing formulation:

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu} \quad (12)$$

ISR/VPR interpretation: The cosmological constant is decomposed into two structural terms:

$$\Lambda = \Lambda_{\text{VPR}} + \Lambda_{\text{ISR}} \quad (13)$$

$$G_{\mu\nu} + (\Lambda_{\text{VPR}} + \Lambda_{\text{ISR}})g_{\mu\nu} = \frac{8\pi G}{c^4} T_{\mu\nu} \quad (14)$$

Λ_{ISR} represents the continuous action of the ISR on the VPR — a force that does not manifest as observable matter or radiation, but drives the expansion of the phenomenal world from its source domain. *The explicit decomposition of Λ is an open question for theoretical physicists.*

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

Decomposing Λ into Λ_{VPR} and Λ_{ISR} does not constrain either term. Without a mechanism, this decomposition generates no testable predictions.

Response. Correct — and acknowledged as a limitation. The decomposition is structural, not quantitative. Its purpose is to propose that the single term Λ conflates two physically distinct contributions. Distinguishing them is a precondition for explaining why Λ holds its specific value — a question the undivided Λ cannot answer.

4.3 The Perpetual Orbital Motion of the Electron

ISR/VPR interpretation:

$$E_{\text{electron}}(t) = E_{\text{VPR}} + \Phi_{\text{ISR}}(t) \quad (15)$$

$$\frac{d\Phi_{\text{ISR}}}{dt} = \mathcal{G}(\alpha_{\text{ISR/VPR}}) \quad (16)$$

$\Phi_{\text{ISR}}(t)$ is a continuous ISR energy supply term. The ground state is not a state of minimum energy with no further dynamics. It is a state of dynamic equilibrium between VPR energy loss and ISR energy supply. *The explicit form of $\mathcal{G}$ is an open question for theoretical physicists.*

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

The Heisenberg uncertainty principle already accounts for the stability of the ground state. No additional energy supply term is required.

Response. The uncertainty principle explains why the electron cannot collapse — it establishes a minimum energy state. It does not explain what maintains that state across billions of years. Stability and maintenance are not the same question. The ISR/VPR framework proposes that the dynamic persistence of the ground state through time involves a continuous supply from beyond the VPR.

4.4 The Universality of Physical Constants

ISR/VPR interpretation:

$$c, \hbar, G = f\left(\alpha_{\text{ISR/VPR}}^{\text{universal}}\right) \quad (17)$$

Physical constants are the expression of a uniform ISR/VPR interface condition $\alpha_{\text{ISR/VPR}}^{\text{universal}}$ that holds across the entire observable universe. Because the interface condition is uniform, its expression in the VPR — the physical constants — is uniform. *The explicit form of f is an open question for theoretical physicists.*

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

The anthropic principle already offers an account of why physical constants hold their observed values. No appeal to an ISR is required.

Response. The anthropic principle does not explain why the constants are universal — only why, given that we exist, the constants we observe must be compatible with our existence. A universe in which constants varied by location would still permit observers in regions where the constants supported their existence. The anthropic principle cannot account for the observed uniformity. ISR/VPR proposes that the uniformity has a structural cause.

4.5 The Incompatibility of Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity

ISR/VPR interpretation:

$$\mathcal{M}_{\text{unified}} = \mathcal{M}_{\text{QM}} + \mathcal{M}_{\text{GR}} + \mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}} \quad (18)$$

The divergence at the Planck scale is proposed to arise from the absence of the third term $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}}$ — the interface contribution. Its inclusion is proposed as the structural condition for a finite unified description:

$$\lim_{E \rightarrow E_{\text{Pl}}} (\mathcal{M}_{\text{QM}} + \mathcal{M}_{\text{GR}} + \mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}}) = \mathcal{M}_{\text{finite}} \quad (19)$$

The explicit form of $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}}$ is an open question for theoretical physicists.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

String theory, loop quantum gravity, and related frameworks have been developed over decades to address unification. Introducing $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}}$ adds nothing that these programmes do not already contain in more precise form.

Response. The mathematical rigour of these programmes is not disputed. What is noted is that neither has produced an experimentally verified prediction. The ISR/VPR framework does not compete with them at the mathematical level. It proposes a structural observation: that the unification problem may be unsolvable within VPR-only frameworks — regardless of their mathematical sophistication — because the missing term is not a VPR term. $\mathcal{M}_{\text{ISR}}$ is not a solution. It is a proposal about where the solution must come from.

WHAT AI CANNOT REACH

AI is becoming the ultimate describer of the VPR. This must be stated plainly. The capacity demonstrated in 2025 — autonomous identification of state variables from raw data, independent derivation of the heliocentric model, extraction of three times the information from existing cosmological observations — represents not an improvement in physical instrumentation but a change in the nature of physical description itself.

5.1 AI as the Ultimate Describer of the VPR

The history of physics is a history of compression. Newton compressed the motion of every object in the universe into three laws. Einstein compressed the geometry of spacetime into ten equations. Each compression was constrained by the requirement that a human mind could hold it.

AI removes that constraint.

The 24 unnamed variables that an AI identified to describe a flame are not a failure of communication. They are a description more accurate than any human physicist has produced — and entirely inaccessible to human understanding. They are unnamed because no human framework has concepts that correspond to them. This is the third descriptive form: more precise than human mathematics, operating beyond human readability, derived directly from the raw data of the VPR.

Within the VPR, AI has surpassed the human physicist.

5.2 The Boundary AI Does Not Cross

The five problems of Section 3 remain. AI can calculate the vacuum energy density predicted by quantum field theory and quantify the 120-order discrepancy with precision no human calculator could match. What it cannot do is answer why the discrepancy exists — because that answer does not lie in the VPR data.

The boundary is structural, not computational. More data, more parameters, more processing power — none of these cross it. The boundary is the edge of the VPR itself. AI arrives at the same infinities that human physics arrives at. It processes them faster and more accurately. It does not know what they mean — because meaning, in this context, requires access to what lies beyond the boundary.

5.3 What Remains for the Human

There is a tendency, when physical theory reaches a boundary, to assign the unexplained to a category that stops inquiry. The ISR/VPR framework proposes that this tendency is a structural error: the infinity is not the end of the question. It is the beginning of a different one.

Intuition is not the reception of a message from a supernatural source. It is the capacity to receive information from the ISR in the form of image, sensing, and direct knowing — before that information has been translated into VPR language. This capacity is not avail-

able to AI. AI processes VPR data and generates VPR descriptions. The ISR is not in its training data.

This capacity is not the exclusive possession of exceptional individuals. It is latent in most human beings — present before formal education overlays it, accessible in silence, in sustained practice, in the moment when the noise of the VPR quiets sufficiently for something else to arrive.

5.4 The Division of Labour

AI	Human
Describes the VPR	Senses the ISR
Calculates, predicts	Receives what is not in the data
Identifies patterns	Asks <i>why</i> — not only <i>what</i>
Processes phenomenal data	Crosses the boundary computation cannot reach

This paper is a product of that division. The ISR/VPR framework originates in the sensing of Jinco K. The verification, articulation, and critical assessment of that framework has been carried out in collaboration with Claude (Anthropic). Neither alone would have produced this paper.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

The claim that humans can “sense the ISR” is not a scientific proposition. Intuition has a well-established neurological account — unconscious pattern recognition and the integration of prior experience. No appeal to a source domain beyond the VPR is required.

Response. The neurological account describes how intuitive processing occurs within the brain — the VPR substrate of the sensing capacity. It does not account for the content of what arrives. Unconscious pattern recognition operates on patterns that have been encountered before. What it cannot account for is the arrival of information that has no precedent in prior experience. Einstein’s image of riding alongside a light wave preceded the mathematics of special relativity by years. Kekulé’s image of a serpent eating its tail preceded the structural confirmation of the benzene ring. The neurological account describes the mechanism of delivery. It does not account for the origin of what was delivered. ISR/VPR proposes that the neurological mechanism is the VPR channel through which ISR information arrives. The channel and the source are not the same question.

THE SOURCE OF THIS FRAMEWORK

Whether the source of the framework presented in this paper is an ancient text, a direct intuition, or any other origin is independent of its validity. The history of science records discoveries initiated by dreams, by visual images, by observations made

outside any institutional context. What is asked of a framework is not the respectability of its origin, but whether it is useful in the pursuit of understanding. That is the only question this paper asks the reader to hold.

6.1 What Katakamuna Is

The ISR/VPR framework presented in Sections 2 through 5 derives from Katakamuna — an ancient Japanese descriptive system consisting of 48 Sonic Elements and 80 Verses.

Each of the 48 Sonic Elements carries a unique geometric structure, an acoustic value, and a structural meaning. The combinations of these elements across the 80 Verses constitute a systematic description of the interface between the ISR and the VPR — the source domain and the phenomenal world, and the continuous action between them.

Katakamuna is not a belief system. It is not mythology. It is a structural descriptive system — one that encodes the relationship between the invisible source realm and the visible phenomenal world in the geometric structure of 48 phonemic units. What this paper has presented as ISR and VPR are the terms Katakamuna has carried, in its own language, across an undetermined span of time.

6.2 Why the Source Is Disclosed Here

The decision to disclose the origin of this framework in Section 6 rather than Section 1 is deliberate and requires explanation.

Had Katakamuna been named at the outset, the majority of scientifically trained readers would have encountered the word before encountering the framework — and the word carries associations, in most Western scientific contexts, that would have pre-empted engagement with the content. The framework would have been evaluated as the product of its label rather than on its structural merits.

The approach taken here is the reverse: the framework is presented first, its structural coherence assessed against five specific unresolved problems in modern physics, and its origin disclosed once the reader has had the opportunity to evaluate the framework independently of its source. This is the same epistemic principle that governs blind review in science: the argument is assessed before the author is known.

6.3 The 48 Sonic Elements and AI's Unnamed Variables

The most consequential observation of this paper is reserved for this section.

AI identified 24 unnamed variables to describe a flame — quantities that do not correspond to temperature, density, velocity, or any category that human physics currently possesses. They are unnamed because the VPR framework has no names for them.

Katakamuna has 48 Sonic Elements. Each is geometrically defined. Each carries a specific structural meaning within the ISR/VPR interface. Each describes a particu-

lar aspect of the action between the source domain and the phenomenal world — aspects for which modern physics, as yet, has no corresponding concepts.

The question this paper poses — and does not answer — is the following:

Do the unnamed variables that AI is beginning to extract from the raw data of the phenomenal world correspond, in structure, to what the 48 Sonic Elements of Katakamuna have already encoded?

If the variables required to describe a flame correspond to a subset of the 48 Sonic Elements — if what AI is discovering as unnamed quantities are what Katakamuna described as named geometric structures — then the implications extend beyond any single unresolved problem in physics. This is not a claim. It is a question. Its investigation requires collaboration between researchers in theoretical physics, AI, and the structural analysis of the Katakamuna system.

6.4 Katakamuna and AI: Two Approaches to the Same Boundary

Both Katakamuna and AI approach a boundary that human physics has not crossed. AI approaches it from within the VPR — processing phenomenal data at a density and precision that exceeds human capacity, arriving at descriptions that human conceptual categories cannot hold. It reaches the boundary from the inside.

Katakamuna approaches it from the interface — describing the action between the ISR and the VPR in the geometric language of 48 Sonic Elements. It describes the boundary from both sides simultaneously.

The convergence of these two approaches — AI's unnamed variables and Katakamuna's geometric encoding — at the same structural boundary is what this paper identifies as the most significant observation available to physical inquiry at the present moment.

6.5 Where the Analysis of Katakamuna Stands

The structural analysis of the 48 Sonic Elements and the 80 Verses is an ongoing research programme. A series of papers analysing individual Verses is being published progressively at j-katakamuna.com. The decoding methodology and its findings are publicly available and open to independent scrutiny.

CRITICAL ASSESSMENT

The decoding of Katakamuna is the work of a single researcher. Without independent verification, the claim that the 48 Sonic Elements structurally correspond to physical phenomena is not distinguishable from confirmation bias — the retrospective projection of modern physical concepts onto an ancient text.

Response. This is the most significant objection this paper faces, and it is acknowledged as such. Two responses are offered. First, the decoding of each Sonic Element proceeds from its geometric structure — a structure that is fixed and publicly documented — rather than from the physical concept it is subsequently found

to correspond with. The geometry is not adjustable to fit the desired conclusion. Second: the decoding methodology is publicly available. Independent researchers are in a position to assess whether the correspondences identified are structurally motivated or retrospectively imposed. The answer to the confirmation bias objection is not a defence — it is an open invitation to verify.

CONCLUSION

This paper has done three things.

It has identified five problems in modern physics that cannot generate structural interpretations within a VPR-only framework. It has proposed that the appearance of ∞ in physical equations — routinely treated as a computational breakdown — may be a structural signal: the point at which a VPR description reaches the boundary of the ISR. And it has applied the ISR/VPR framework to each of the five problems, introducing symbolic interface terms whose explicit forms are left as open questions for theoretical physicists.

It has assessed the position of AI in physical inquiry. AI has become the ultimate describer of the VPR. Within the VPR, the human physicist will not surpass it. What AI cannot do is cross the boundary at which ∞ appears. The ISR is not in its training data. The source domain cannot be reached by processing phenomenal data more precisely. This is a structural boundary, not a temporary computational limitation.

What remains for the human is not calculation. It is sensing — the capacity to receive information from the ISR in forms that precede VPR language: image, intuition, direct knowing. AI's emergence as the primary describer of the VPR does not diminish this capacity. It clarifies it — by making visible, for the first time, exactly what human sensing is and is not.

On the Source

The ISR/VPR framework originates in Katakamuna. The 48 Sonic Elements of that system may encode, in geometric form, what AI is beginning to identify as unnamed variables in the raw data of the phenomenal world. Whether this correspondence holds is the most consequential open question this paper raises. It is not answered here. It is placed here, as a question, for those whose inquiry it reaches.

On What This Paper Does Not Claim

This paper does not claim that the ISR exists in a manner currently verifiable by physical instrumentation. It does not claim that the interface terms introduced in Section 4 are correct. It does not claim that Katakamuna's 48 Sonic Elements are a complete or error-free description of the ISR/VPR interface.

What it claims is narrower and more durable: that the class of problems described in Section 3 requires a term that VPR-only frameworks do not contain; that the ∞ appearing at the boundary of those frameworks deserves a structural reading as well as a mathematical one; and that a framework which has carried a descrip-

tion of that boundary for an undetermined span of time warrants serious structural investigation — regardless of the form in which it has been preserved.

On the Position of the Author

Jinco K.'s commitment in this research is not to the vindication of Katakamuna. It is to the pursuit of where the Katakamuna framework breaks down — where its logic fails, where its structural claims do not hold, where the correspondence between its geometric encoding and physical phenomena cannot be sustained. A framework that resists all attempts at falsification is not a scientific framework. Katakamuna is treated here as a framework, and the research programme it anchors is oriented toward its limits as much as its correspondences.

A Final Observation

AI has surpassed the human physicist in the description of the VPR. That much is now visible.

What is also now visible — precisely because AI has made it visible — is the boundary AI cannot cross.

On one side of that boundary: unnamed variables, divergent equations, unresolved constants, the 120-order abyss between theory and observation.

On the other side: the source.

The question of what lies there — and how to read it — is not a question for AI. It is the question that remains for us.

Jinco K.

Lead Researcher, J-Katakamuna Research

<https://j-katakamuna.com/>

in collaboration with Claude (Anthropic)

<https://www.anthropic.com/>