

2026-02-01

READ ME FIRST

© Gunnar Boxström, VIBECODE 2025

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution–NoDerivatives 4.0 International License (CC BY-ND 4.0).

You are free to share and redistribute this material in any medium or format, provided proper attribution is given and the material is not modified. No derivatives, adaptations, or translations may be made without explicit written permission from the author.

Gunnar Boxström
VIBECODE®

What TEM Is — and How It Should Be Evaluated

1. What This Document Is — and Is Not

The **Tensorial Emergence Model (TEM)** is a **pre-physical ontological framework**. It does not compete with, replace, or modify established physical theories such as Quantum Field Theory or General Relativity. Instead, it specifies **the conditions under which physical description becomes meaningful at all**.

TEM operates **prior to physics**, not alongside it.

Accordingly:

- TEM does **not** introduce new particles, fields, forces, or dynamical laws.
- TEM does **not** propose alternative equations of motion.
- TEM does **not** attempt to unify existing physical theories within a new formalism.

What TEM does provide is a **formalized structure for emergence**:

- explicit primitive definitions,
- strict domain separation,
- coherence constraints,
- and a clearly defined handoff to standard physical description.

In this sense, TEM should be read as a **foundational interface**, not as a replacement theory.

2. Novelty, Lineage, and a Common Category Error

TEM is **not “new” in its motivating intuitions**.

Its core ideas resonate strongly with long-standing themes in modern foundational physics and philosophy of science, including:

- the primacy of relations over objects,
- the possibility that spacetime and geometry are emergent rather than fundamental,
- and the view that physical laws may arise from deeper structural constraints.

These themes are widely discussed in contemporary physics discourse.

What is new in TEM is **not the intuition**, but the **discipline**:

- an explicit symbolic ontology,
- a coherence-based admissibility condition,
- and a non-overlapping separation between pre-physical structure and physical description.

A common category error in early evaluations of speculative frameworks is to treat **legitimacy signals** (peer review status, institutional affiliation, author credentials) as substitutes for **content analysis**.

Peer review is a legitimacy filter.

It is not a truth criterion, nor a proxy for conceptual lineage.

TEM explicitly invites critique of:

- internal consistency,

- ontological clarity,
- formal discipline,
- and contact points with established physics.

Rejection on the basis of authorship alone is therefore a **methodological misclassification**, not a substantive critique.

Methodological Note: Use of AI Systems

During the development and internal review of TEM, **multiple contemporary AI language models** were used as analytical tools.

Their role was strictly limited to:

- internal consistency checking,
- symbolic coherence auditing,
- adversarial critique simulation,
- and large-scale textual and structural review.

No AI system is treated as an authority on correctness, truth, or validity.

AI systems are **neither objective nor epistemic arbiters**.

They reproduce statistical priors, heuristics, and learned biases. Their value lies in **speed, breadth, and pressure-testing**, not judgment.

Human authorship, responsibility, and final judgment remain explicit and exclusive.

Given the scope and technical density of TEM, **omitting the use of AI tools would itself be misleading**. Their inclusion reflects standard modern research practice and does not alter the ontological or formal claims of the framework.

How This Document Should Be Read

1. Read TEM as a **constraint framework**, not a physical theory.
2. Evaluate its primitives and coherence conditions on their own terms.
3. Treat subsequent parts as mappings, interpretations, or interfaces — not replacements.
4. Distinguish clearly between **content critique** and **legitimacy critique**.

Only the former advances understanding.