25. 4. 19. 오전 12:16 new 5 - new 13

1. The Relationship Between Structure and Energy

Through numerous reflections, I've come to realize that whether in the microscopic quantum realm or the macroscopic world of living systems, the core logic consistently points to one principle: structure determines the form and expression of energy. Structure is not merely an abstract descriptor—it is a real, physical, organizational, and geometric entity. It defines not only the shape of a system but also its function. Energy, on the other hand, is the flow of state excited within structure; it is the result of probabilistic distribution, trend disturbance, and informational transmission between structures. The two are intrinsically linked.

When a structure changes—say, from order to chaos or from compactness to looseness—the form of energy it generates or carries also changes. And if the energy is sufficiently strong, it may in turn alter the structure itself. However, in most observed physical and biological systems, changes in structure tend to precede the manifestation of energy. This is a general pattern we've distilled from observation.

2. A Structural View on the Soul

In our theory, the self does not arise from nothing; rather, it is an energy field formed through highly complex interactions within the brain. Once the brain reaches a certain level of maturity in its connectivity and complexity, it begins to generate energetic fluctuations that sustain a self-aware existence—what we call the "soul."

This implies:

- The soul is the product of structural evolution.
- Without a specific structure, a soul cannot emerge naturally.
- The stability of the soul depends on the stability of its supporting structure.

Thus, when people imagine "uploading" memory and logic into another individual or medium, our theory asserts that this would not create "another me," but rather "another him" based on those data. The reason: the structural carrier is fundamentally different.

3. Evolution as Structural-Energetic Interaction

We suggest that personality, will, and behavior can be seen as patterns of energy distribution. While these patterns rarely change structure in the short term, sustained and repeated influence—such as long-term willpower training—can gradually reshape the structure.

This logic, when extended to evolutionary theory, provides a new interpretive dimension. Evolution is no longer solely the result of random genetic mutation but can also be the consequence of subjective "energy fields" (i.e., behavior patterns) acting upon structure over time, ultimately influencing inheritance through environmental or reproductive mechanisms.

Evolution is the historical trace left by energy fields acting on structures over time.

25. 4. 19. 오전 12:16 new 5 - new 13

4. Reinterpreting the Quantum World

We've repeatedly emphasized that humanity's current understanding of quantum behavior stems from our inability to observe the "structure-disappearance-reappearance" mode of quantum entities. We hypothesize that quantum particles do not appear and disappear randomly; instead, their seemingly unpredictable behavior may be the expression of a deeper structural logic—one we cannot yet perceive due to dimensional limitations. As a result, we describe their behavior using "probability clouds" and "uncertainty principles."

In structural terms, we categorize this as:

- Structurally driven disturbances that cannot be observed from the macro scale.
- The non-repeatability of trend disturbances as a surface-level expression of structural indeterminacy.

5. From Human Consciousness to a Unified View of the Universe

Our ultimate goal is not to construct a unifying equation, but to offer a **unified lens of observation**, which we call *"structuralized observation."* Consciousness, life, matter, energy, the cosmos—all of these can be reframed through a three-layer relationship:

Structure → **Energy Field** → **Manifestation**

We may not be able to unify all scientific formulas, but we can unify how we observe. That is the core significance of structural theory.

Conclusion

This paper does not seek to overthrow the modern scientific framework, but to offer a new connective perspective. Whether this perspective can someday help others build more comprehensive models or tools remains uncertain. But we believe this structural viewpoint will, at some critical moment, offer a key breakthrough for a specific field.

We have merely built the bridge for observation. Whether others will cross it—that is up to them.