

Information-Theoretic Scale Management

Information-Theoretic

Foundations of Reality: A Statistical Framework for Bridging the Census and the Poll

Author: Rowan Brad Quni-Gudzinis **Affiliation:** QNFO **Contact:** rowan.quni@qnfo.org **ORCID:** 0009-0002-4317-5604 **ISNI:** 0000 0005 2645 6062 **DOI:** <https://papers.qnfo.org/papers/information-theoretic-foundations-of-reality/> **Publication Date:** 2025-09-21 **Version:** 1.0

Informational Realism posits that reality's fundamental layer is informational. This framework axiomatizes a distinction between the complete set of all possible information states, the **informational census** (Ω), and the limited set of physical measurements, the **physical poll** ($\mathcal{E}$). This separation reframes science as statistical inference from a noisy sample to a complete population.

This framework is both an epistemological and physical inquiry. Physics laws (unitarity, Landauer, holography) suggest information is a physical, conserved, and fundamental substance. Simultaneously, information theory (the Data Processing Inequality) proves this complete informational state is fundamentally inaccessible to any internal observer. This creates a central duality: the framework offers a strong *physical* argument for an informational ontology, yet its *statistical* machinery demonstrates naive realism's impossibility. Informational Realism's value lies not in promising absolute truth, but in providing a coherent, self-consistent, and mathematically rigorous language to navigate the fundamental gap between what is and what can be known.

This paper establishes the framework's axiomatic and physical foundations, details statistical inference tools, and conducts a rigorous epistemological assessment. The ultimate conclusion is that while Informational Realism's core ontological claim may be metaphysical, its true value lies in its potential as a progressive scientific research program capable of generating novel, testable physical theories.

1.0 The

Axiomatic Foundation of Informational Realism

1.1

The Foundational Distinction Between the Informational Census and the Physical Poll

The framework's axiomatic foundation begins with a fundamental distinction between two conceptual domains: the complete set of all physically possible information states, the informational census, and the limited set of observable measurement outcomes, the physical poll. This separation is the primary axiom upon which all subsequent physical and statistical arguments are built, establishing a clear boundary between the object of inquiry and the act of inquiry itself.

1.1.1

Defining the Informational Census (Ω) as the Complete Set of Possible States

The **informational census** (Ω) is the complete set of discrete information states ω_i consistent with fundamental physics laws. This set represents the statistical population from which all physical observations are drawn, encompassing every conceivable information configuration that does not violate established physical principles. Formally, $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_N\}$.

1.1.1.1

Establishing the Constraint of Quantum Unitarity on Census States

Quantum unitarity is the primary constraint governing states within the informational census. This foundational quantum mechanics principle dictates that a closed quantum system's time evolution must be reversible. A unitary operator describes this evolution, preserving the inner product between quantum states. This reversibility formally states information conservation; a unitary transformation's adjoint can undo it, meaning a system's final state contains all information to reconstruct its initial state. Thus, the informational census Ω restricts to states whose evolution is consistent with unitarity.

1.1.1.2

Including All Pure and Mixed States Evolving Under Valid Unitary Operators

The informational census Ω is a high-dimensional manifold of potential realities, maximally comprehensive. It includes all possible pure states (complete knowledge) and mixed states (statistical ensembles of pure states). The sole inclusion condition is that any such state must evolve according to a valid unitary operator. This ensures the census represents the totality of physically allowed informational configurations, forming the vast space physical science seeks to characterize.

1.1.2

Defining the Physical Poll ($\mathcal{E}$) as the Limited Set of Empirical Measurements

In contrast to the informational census, the **physical poll** ($\mathcal{E}$) is the set of all observable measurement outcomes e_j . It represents empirical data generated by physical instruments and constitutes a statistical sample drawn from the census.

1.1.2.1

Characterizing Poll Data as a Set of Energy Measurements

Within this framework, physical poll elements $\mathcal{E}$ are typically energy values, among physics' most fundamental observables. Each element corresponds to a measurement apparatus reading, such as a particle's detected energy or a field's measured intensity. Formally, the poll is a subset of the real numbers, $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{R}$, representing quantitative data forming scientific analysis's basis.

1.1.2.2

Establishing the Poll as a Coarse-Grained Representation of the Census

The physical poll is a coarse-grained representation of the informational census. The mapping from high-dimensional, complex states in Ω to simple numerical values in $\mathcal{E}$ is many-to-one, not one-to-one. Multiple distinct informational states in the census can produce identical or statistically indistinguishable measurement outcomes in the poll. This coarse-graining directly results from the physical measurement process's inherent information loss.

1.2

The Formal Relationship Between the Census and the Poll as a Statistical Sampling Problem

With the census and poll defined, their relationship models as a statistical sampling problem. Physical measurement is a mathematical operator transforming a census state into a poll outcome.

1.2.1

Modeling the Act of Measurement as a Physical Sampling Operator (F)

Measurement formalizes as a **physical sampling operator** (F). This operator represents the entire physical interaction between a system and a measurement apparatus, yielding an empirical data point.

1.2.1.1

Formalizing the Operator as a Mapping from the Census to the Poll ($F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$)

Mathematically, operator F maps an information state from the census domain (Ω) to a measurement outcome in the poll codomain ($\mathcal{E}$). This mapping, $F : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{E}$, encapsulates the complete transformation during measurement, including all systematic and stochastic apparatus effects.

1.2.2

Characterizing the Measurement Process as a Noisy Convolution

The physical sampling process (operator F) is not ideal; it degrades information through convolution and noise. Let $\mathbf{p}$ be an N -dimensional column vector, where $p_i = P(\Omega = \omega_i)$ is the probability that the true state is ω_i , with $\sum p_i = 1$. Let $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$ be an M -dimensional column vector of observed measurement outcomes. The relationship is:

$$\hat{\mathbf{e}} = \mathbf{K}\mathbf{p} + \epsilon \quad (1.1)$$

Here, $\mathbf{K}$ is an $M \times N$ matrix (the convolution kernel) where K_{ji} represents the expected response for measurement j given the true state ω_i . The vector ϵ is an M -dimensional vector of zero-mean, irreducible stochastic noise.

1.2.2.1

The Convolution of the True State with a System-Specific Sampling Kernel

The term $\mathbf{K}\mathbf{p}$ represents the true state's convolution with sampling kernel $\mathbf{K}$. Matrix $\mathbf{K}$, the convolution kernel (or system response/blurring function), characterizes systematic distortions from the measurement apparatus. It acts as a low-pass filter, blurring true state distribution features and contributing to information coarse-graining.

1.2.2.2

The Addition of an Irreducible Stochastic Noise Term

The term ϵ represents an irreducible, zero-mean stochastic noise vector. This accounts for all random fluctuations and uncertainties inherent in physical measurement, such as thermal noise or quantum uncertainty. This noise term ensures the census-to-poll mapping is stochastic, not deterministic.

1.3

The Necessary Existence of the Information Deficit (ΔI)

Modeling measurement as a noisy, convolved process directly implies an **information deficit** (ΔI). This deficit represents the total information about the census fundamentally inaccessible through the physical poll.

1.3.1

Defining the Deficit as the Epistemically Inaccessible Information

The information deficit (ΔI) represents the total information about the census fundamentally inaccessible through the physical poll. Formally, it is the conditional entropy of the census random variable X given the poll random variable Y : $\Delta I = H(X|Y)$. This quantity measures the residual uncertainty about the true state X remaining even after the measurement outcome Y is known.

Conceptually, the deficit is the set of information states in Ω never uniquely mapped to an outcome in $\mathcal{E}$, represented by $\Omega \setminus \mathcal{E}$. However, the rigorous, operational definition for all subsequent proofs and calculations is the information-theoretic one: $\Delta I = H(X|Y)$.

1.3.2

Proving the Non-Zero Nature of the Deficit via the Data Processing Inequality

A non-zero information deficit is a provable theorem derived from the Data Processing Inequality, a cornerstone of information theory.

1.3.2.1

Modeling the Chain of Observation as a Markov Process

Any scientific measurement models as a Markov chain of random variables, $X \rightarrow Y \rightarrow Z$. Here, X represents the underlying physical reality (a census state), Y the raw data from the measurement apparatus, and Z the final processed and interpreted result. Physical measurement constitutes the first step: $X \rightarrow Y$.

1.3.2.2

Applying the Theorem to Show Information Cannot Increase During Measurement

The Data Processing Inequality states that for any such Markov chain, mutual information between the source and any subsequent stage cannot increase: $I(X; Y) \geq I(X; Z)$. Post-processing cannot create information. Variable Z contains no more information about original source X than intermediate variable Y . Since the physical measurement process $X \rightarrow Y$ is not a perfectly noiseless, one-to-one mapping, it is an irreversible, information-losing channel. This guarantees a strict information loss, meaning mutual information $I(X; Y)$ is strictly less than the source's total information content, $H(X)$. Raw data (Y) necessarily contains less information about reality (X) than reality itself, and the final scientific conclusion (Z) contains less information still.

1.3.2.3

Concluding the Irreversible Loss of Information Guarantees a Non-Empty Deficit

Information is necessarily lost in the X to Y transition. Thus, residual uncertainty about X after observing Y , $H(X|Y)$, must be strictly greater than zero. Since the information deficit is $\Delta I = H(X|Y)$, it follows that $\Delta I > 0$. This formally proves a gap must exist between the universe's complete informational state and what measurement can reveal.

2.0

The Physical Constraints Governing the Informational Census

Section 1 established the axiomatic separation of census and poll. This section examines fundamental physics laws that structure and empower the framework. These principles rigorously constrain the nature and organization of states within the informational census (Ω).

2.1 The

Constraint of Conservation via Quantum Unitarity

The most fundamental constraint on the informational census is information conservation, formally based on quantum unitarity. If information is a real, physical entity, its total quantity must be conserved.

2.1.1

Establishing Unitarity as the Formal Basis for Information Conservation

Quantum unitarity provides the rigorous physical basis for abstract information conservation, forming a critical test for any Informational Realism theory.

2.1.1.1

Defining Unitary Evolution as a Reversible Transformation

A unitary operator describes a closed quantum system's time evolution. A key property of such operators is invertibility; the transformation can be undone by applying the operator's adjoint. This reversibility formally defines information conservation, implying no information about the system's initial state is lost during its evolution.

2.1.1.2

Linking Unitarity to the Conservation of Probability via the Born Rule

Unitarity's direct physical consequence arises via the Born rule. Preserving the inner product between quantum states guarantees that the sum of all possible measurement outcomes' probabilities will always be exactly one. This ensures a consistent probabilistic structure for the physical world and imposes strict positivity bounds on operator coefficients in effective field theories, ensuring causality and analyticity in scattering amplitudes.

2.1.2

Citing the Black Hole Information Paradox as a Critical Test of the Principle

Unitarity faces its most profound challenge with black holes, giving rise to the black hole information paradox. The scientific community's response provides strong evidence for information's physical reality.

2.1.2.1 The

Apparent Non-Unitarity of Hawking Evaporation

Black hole evaporation via Hawking radiation appears non-unitary. The radiation seems thermal and independent of the black hole's initial matter information, implying irreversible destruction, contradicting unitarity. Similarly, theories where smooth spacetime emerges from discrete structures might exhibit effective unitarity loss from a low-energy perspective, as information leaks into unresolved microscopic degrees of freedom.

2.1.2.2

The Theoretical Response: Reifying Information via Black Hole Entropy

The paradox stems from a conflict between general relativity and quantum unitarity. Rather than abandoning unitarity, theoretical physics developed concepts to account for seemingly lost information. This began with Bekenstein's proposal that a black hole possesses entropy proportional to its event horizon area, assigning it

quantifiable information content. This led to the Generalized Second Law of Thermodynamics (GSL), which posits that the sum of ordinary entropy and black hole entropy never decreases.

2.1.2.3

The Role of the Paradox in Elevating Information to a Conserved Physical Substance

The sustained effort to resolve the information paradox demonstrates physics' deep commitment to information conservation. This elevated information from an abstract concept to a quantifiable physical substance, rigorously tracked and conserved, on par with energy. The paradox did not weaken Informational Realism; it forced physics to reify information.

2.2

The Constraint of Relational Organization via Spacetime Principles

Modern spacetime physics principles, particularly general covariance and the holographic principle, profoundly constrain information organization, forcing it to be fundamentally relational and non-local.

2.2.1

The Prohibition of Absolute Location via General Covariance

General covariance dictates that physical laws' form must be invariant under arbitrary differentiable coordinate transformations. This implies coordinate systems are merely descriptive artifacts, not intrinsic natural features.

2.2.1.1

Defining General Covariance as Background Independence

Modern understanding defines general covariance as "background independence." In general relativity, the metric tensor, defining spacetime geometry, is a primary dynamical variable. No fixed, non-dynamical background stage exists for events. This principle forbids absolute, non-dynamical "individuating fields" that could uniquely identify spacetime points.

2.2.1.2 Forbidding a

Naive "Bits-on-a-Grid" Ontology

Background independence explicitly forbids a naive Informational Realism interpretation envisioning the universe as information bits at discrete points on a pre-existing spacetime grid. Without a background grid, information cannot be fundamentally defined by its location at a coordinate (t, x, y, z) . Such a description violates the principle that coordinates are arbitrary labels.

2.2.2

The Principle of Non-Local Encoding via the Holographic Principle

The holographic principle generalizes black hole entropy's area-law to the universe, suggesting non-local information encoding.

2.2.2.1

Defining the Holographic Principle via the Area-Law of Entropy

The holographic principle posits that a volume's complete description can be encoded on its lower-dimensional boundary. This suggests reality's informational degrees of freedom are fundamentally non-local, and our three-dimensional reality may project from information stored on a distant two-dimensional surface. A volume's maximum information content is determined by its surface area, not its volume.

2.2.2.2

Citing the AdS/CFT Correspondence as a Formal Realization

The Anti-de Sitter/Conformal Field Theory (AdS/CFT) correspondence is this idea's most successful and mathematically precise realization. It conjectures an exact duality between a quantum gravity theory in a $(d + 1)$ -dimensional bulk spacetime and a quantum field theory without gravity on its d -dimensional boundary.

2.2.3

Synthesizing a Relational, Non-Spatial Network as the Fundamental Structure

General covariance and holography, taken together, force a radical conclusion about information's fundamental structure.

2.2.3.1

Resolving the Tension Between Non-Locality and Background Independence

The holographic principle suggests boundary-encoded information, implying non-locality. General covariance insists on no absolute background, thus no fixed boundary surface. This tension resolves if fundamental informational degrees of freedom are not conventionally localized. The "bulk" and "boundary" distinction must itself be an emergent concept.

2.2.3.2

Positing Spacetime as an Emergent Property of the Relational Network

This synthesis concludes that fundamental reality is a network of relations, and spacetime is an emergent, macroscopic description of this network's geometry. Information is not location-defined but encoded in the relational network between fundamental entities. General covariance forces Informational Realism to adopt a relational ontology, resolving the holographic boundary's location: it is not *in* space, but space emerges *from* it.

2.3

The Constraint of Physicality and Finitude via Thermodynamics

A synthesis of thermodynamics and quantum gravity principles establishes information as a physical, quantifiable entity, and that the number of distinct states within any bounded region is finite.

2.3.1

Establishing the Thermodynamic Cost of Information via Landauer's Principle

Landauer's Principle roots abstract information in concrete thermodynamics laws, linking a system's logical state to its physical, thermodynamic state.

2.3.1.1

Stating the Minimum Energy Dissipation for Logically Irreversible Operations

The principle states that any logically irreversible information manipulation, such as one bit's erasure, must incur a minimum energy dissipation of $k_B T \ln(2)$ and a corresponding entropy increase in the non-information-bearing environment. This prevents constructing a perpetual motion machine of the second kind.

2.3.1.2

Classifying Measurement as a Logically Irreversible, Entropy-Generating Process

Physical measurement is a logically irreversible process. Quantum superposition collapse to a definite classical outcome is analogous to erasure, incurring an irreducible energy cost and guaranteeing at least one bit of information loss per elementary measurement. This establishes Landauer's Principle as a physical guarantee of information loss during any physical operation.

2.3.2

Establishing the Finite Information Density of Spacetime via Bekenstein-Hawking Entropy

Bekenstein-Hawking entropy places a fundamental, universal limit on information density within any bounded space region.

2.3.2.1

Stating the Bekenstein Bound as a Universal Limit on Information Capacity

A black hole's entropy, a measure of its information content, is proportional not to its volume but to its event horizon's area:

$$S_{BH} = \frac{A}{4l_P^2} \quad (2.1)$$

where l_P is the Planck length. This implies any space region has a finite, maximum information capacity (the **Bekenstein bound**), which scales with the region's surface area.

2.3.2.2

Proving the Finitude of the Census for Any Bounded Physical Region

The Bekenstein bound proves that the number of distinct physical states within a bounded spacetime is finite. This transforms the census description problem from continuous, infinite spaces to discrete, finite-state systems, a domain where powerful statistical tools apply. The finite nature of any physical system's state space allows the entire statistical framework's construction.

2.4

The Constraint of Structural Regularity via Symmetry Principles

The informational census (Ω), though vast, is not uniform. Its structure is profoundly shaped by nature's fundamental symmetries, which define allowed quantum states and interactions. These group theory-rooted symmetries filter, reducing Ω 's degrees of freedom and providing a rigorous mathematical framework for predicting physical outcomes.

2.4.1

Applying Spacetime Symmetries as Filters on Allowed States

Spacetime symmetries, described by special and general relativity, powerfully filter states includable in the census.

2.4.1.1

The Role of the Poincaré Group in Classifying Particles by Mass and Spin

Elementary particles classify by their transformation properties under the Poincaré group, which includes translations and Lorentz transformations. These symmetries directly lead to conserved momentum and energy, and to intrinsic mass and spin. System states transform according to a symmetry group G 's representations.

2.4.1.2

The Role of the Diffeomorphism Group in Constraining Quantum Geometry

General covariance, or diffeomorphism invariance, strongly constrains quantum geometry states, as explored in theories like Loop Quantum Gravity (LQG). Any valid census state describing spacetime must be independent of the coordinate system. LQG is explicitly background-independent and generally covariant, but constructing realistic models often challenges covariance preservation, showing severe constraints on quantum states describing spacetime geometry.

2.4.2

Applying Internal Gauge Symmetries as Filters on Allowed Interactions

Internal symmetries, described by gauge groups, govern particle physics' fundamental interactions and further constrain the census structure.

2.4.2.1

The Role of $SU(N)$ Groups in Defining the Standard Model Forces

Internal symmetries, such as $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ gauge groups, govern Standard Model particle physics interactions. These symmetries dictate permitted particle multiplets and interactions, associating with conserved quantities like electric charge via Noether's theorem.

2.4.2.2

The Role of Permutation Symmetry in Defining Quantum Statistics (Bose/Fermi)

Permutation symmetry dictates that identical particles' quantum state must be symmetric (for bosons) or antisymmetric (for fermions) under particle exchange. This profoundly restricts allowed multi-particle states in the census, ensuring identical particle wavefunctions obey Bose-Einstein or Fermi-Dirac statistics.

3.0

The Statistical Framework for Inference from Poll to Census

Building upon physical constraints defining the informational census, this section details the statistical machinery to bridge the poll-to-census gap. The framework formalizes scientific inquiry as well-defined statistical problems: a forward problem describing measurement information loss, an inverse problem of inferring the original state from

degraded data, and a validation problem of selecting the best model.

3.1

The Forward Problem: Measurement as Irreversible Information Degradation

The statistical framework formalizes measurement as a fundamentally irreversible, information-losing operation, guaranteed by the Data Processing Inequality. This universal law proves any observation necessarily loses, or at best preserves, information about the underlying system.

3.1.1

Formalizing Observation as a Markov Chain: Reality (X) $\rightarrow$ Apparatus (Y) $\rightarrow$ Conclusion (Z)

The entire scientific observation chain models as a Markov process. The underlying physical reality (a census state) is X . Its interaction with a measurement apparatus produces raw data Y . Subsequent processing and interpretation of this data leads to a final scientific conclusion Z . Physical measurement constitutes the first step: $X \rightarrow Y$. This structure implies Z is conditionally independent of X given Y .

3.1.2

Applying the Data Processing Inequality ($I(X; Y) \geq I(X; Z)$) to Prove Information Loss

The Data Processing Inequality states that for any such Markov chain, mutual information between the source and any subsequent stage cannot increase: $I(X; Y) \geq I(X; Z)$. Post-processing cannot create information. Variable Z contains no more information about original source X than intermediate variable Y . Since the physical measurement process $X \rightarrow Y$ is not a perfectly noiseless, one-to-one mapping, it is an irreversible, information-losing channel. This guarantees a strict information loss, meaning $I(X; Y)$ is strictly less than the source's total information content, $H(X)$. Raw data (Y) necessarily contains less information about reality (X) than reality itself, and the final scientific conclusion (Z) contains less information still.

3.2

The Inverse Problem: Inference as Regularized Deconvolution

Since the forward measurement process loses information, inferring the original state from measured data is non-trivial, requiring additional information through regularization. This necessity is the practical, algorithmic consequence of information degradation described by the Data Processing Inequality.

3.2.1

Establishing the Ill-Posed Nature of Reversing the Measurement Process

Finding the original census state ($\mathbf{p}_\omega$) from measured poll data ($\hat{\mathbf{e}}$) is mathematically “ill-posed.” Such problems violate at least one of Hadamard’s criteria for well-posedness: existence, uniqueness, and solution stability.

3.2.1.1

The Problem of Noise Amplification in Naive Inversion

A naive attempt to invert the measurement process, e.g., by directly inverting the convolution kernel $\mathbf{K}$ (e.g., $\mathbf{p}_\omega = \mathbf{K}^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{e}}$), is extremely unstable. Any small noise ϵ in measurement $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$ amplifies dramatically during inversion, especially at frequencies where system response $\mathbf{K}$ is weak or zero. This leads to solutions dominated by large, meaningless oscillations.

3.2.1.2

The Non-Uniqueness of Solutions Due to Information Loss

Information loss in the forward process means the mapping from true state to measured data is not uniquely invertible. Many different original census states could have produced statistically similar poll measurements. Without additional constraints, no unique solution exists for the inverse problem.

3.2.2

Defining Regularization as the Necessary Introduction of Prior Information

Regularization is a class of techniques solving ill-posed inverse problems by incorporating additional, prior information to constrain the solution space. This process makes the problem well-posed, ensuring a unique and stable solution.

3.2.2.1

The Role of Priors in Selecting a Single, Plausible Solution

The regularization term in an objective function encodes a *prior belief* about a plausible solution (e.g., smoothness, sparsity). This prior information allows the algorithm to select a single, stable, and plausible solution from an otherwise infinite set of possibilities.

3.2.2.2

Linking the Necessity of Regularization to the Information Lost via the DPI

Regularization's necessity in practical science is the concrete, algorithmic price paid for the Data Processing Inequality's abstract truth. It formally admits that data alone is insufficient for knowledge. The "prior information" for regularization is not arbitrary; it derives directly from fundamental physical constraints established in Section 2. For example, a "smooth" solution in spatial deconvolution often proxies the physical system's underlying rotational or translational symmetry. Similarly, in Bayesian particle physics data analysis, the prior distribution over possible particle masses and spins is directly informed by Poincaré group representations (Section 2.4.1.1). Thus, regularization's necessity is not a weakness but a formal mechanism for incorporating deep physical laws governing the informational census's structure.

3.2.3

Citing Tikhonov Regularization as a Method for Achieving Solution Stability

Tikhonov regularization is a standard method for solving ill-posed inverse problems. It recasts the problem as a well-posed optimization by adding a penalty term proportional to the solution's squared norm to the least-squares objective function. The objective is to minimize the Tikhonov functional $J(\mathbf{p}_\omega)$:

$$\min_{\mathbf{p}_\omega} J(\mathbf{p}_\omega) = \min_{\mathbf{p}_\omega} (||\mathbf{K}\mathbf{p}_\omega - \hat{\mathbf{e}}||_2^2 + ||\alpha\mathbf{\Gamma}\mathbf{p}_\omega||_2^2) \quad (3.1)$$

where $||\cdot||_2^2$ is the squared Euclidean norm, α is the regularization parameter, and $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ is a regularization operator. This penalizes solutions with large magnitudes or high-frequency oscillations, effectively suppressing noise amplification and yielding a stable, unique solution.

3.2.4

Citing Bayesian Inference as a Method for Full Posterior Estimation

From a Bayesian perspective, the inverse problem solves by calculating the full posterior probability distribution of the census given the poll, $p(\Omega|\mathcal{E})$. This approach provides a complete characterization of uncertainty in the inferred state.

3.2.4.1

Formulating the Problem via Bayes' Theorem: Posterior $\propto$ Likelihood $\times$ Prior

Bayesian inference uses Bayes' theorem, $P(H|D) \propto P(D|H)P(H)$, to update a prior probability distribution for a hypothesis $P(H)$ into a posterior distribution $P(H|D)$ after observing data D . Here, the hypothesis is the true census distribution $\mathbf{p}_\omega$, and the data is the measured poll $\hat{\mathbf{e}}$. The posterior probability distribution of the census PMF $\mathbf{p}_\omega$ is $P(\mathbf{p}_\omega|\hat{\mathbf{e}}, \mathbf{K}) = (P(\hat{\mathbf{e}}|\mathbf{p}_\omega, \mathbf{K})P(\mathbf{p}_\omega|\mathbf{K}))/P(\hat{\mathbf{e}}|\mathbf{K})$.

3.2.4.2

Encoding Physical Constraints from Section 2 into the Prior Distribution

The Bayesian framework systematically incorporates prior knowledge. Physical constraints from Section 2 (e.g., conservation laws, symmetry principles, energy bounds) can encode into the prior distribution $P(\mathbf{p}_\omega|\mathbf{K})$, ensuring inferred states are physically plausible. For example, a prior could assign zero probability to unphysical states or distributions violating physical axioms.

3.3

The Validation Problem: Model Selection and Performance Assessment

The statistical framework's final component is a set of tools for validating models and assessing their performance. This allows quantitative comparison between theoretical predictions and experimental data, enabling rigorous evaluation of scientific claims.

3.3.1

Defining the Kullback-Leibler Divergence as a Measure of Epistemic Distance

The **Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence**, or relative entropy, provides a formal measure of “epistemic distance” between a model and the true data-generating process it describes.

3.3.1.1

Characterizing KL Divergence as Information Lost by an Approximating Model

The KL divergence, $D_{KL}(P||Q)$, measures information lost when a probability distribution Q (the model) approximates a “true” probability distribution P (reality). Science's goal is formally the search for a model Q that minimizes this divergence:

$$D_{KL}(p||q) = \sum p(x) \log \left(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right) \quad (3.2)$$

3.3.1.2

Interpreting the Asymmetry of KL Divergence as the Directionality of Scientific Inquiry

KL divergence is asymmetric: $D_{KL}(P||Q) \neq D_{KL}(Q||P)$. This asymmetry encodes scientific inquiry's one-way nature. The formula $D_{KL}(P||Q) = \sum P(x) \log(P(x)/Q(x))$ involves an expectation with respect to the *true* distribution P . This measures the penalty, from reality's perspective (P), for using our model (Q) to describe it. We judge models based on their deviation from reality, not vice-versa.

3.3.2

Establishing the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) as a Tool for Model Selection

Since the true distribution P is unknown, KL divergence cannot be computed directly. The **Akaike Information Criterion (AIC)** provides an asymptotically unbiased estimator of the expected, relative KL divergence for a given model.

3.3.2.1

Stating the AIC Formula as a Balance Between Goodness-of-Fit and Complexity

The AIC is calculated as:

$$AIC = 2k - 2 \ln(\hat{L}) \quad (3.3)$$

where k is the number of model parameters and $\hat{L}$ is the maximized likelihood function value for the model. The formula explicitly balances goodness-of-fit ($-2 \ln(\hat{L})$) against a complexity penalty ($2k$), guarding against overfitting.

The AIC formula provides an *asymptotically* unbiased estimator of the expected K-L divergence under specific regularity conditions. These include the assumption that the true data-generating process is not among the candidate models (the “non-realizable” case) and that the sample size is sufficiently large relative to the number of parameters k . For small samples, a corrected version, AICc, is often recommended.

3.3.2.2

Defining the Goal of AIC as Selecting the Best Predictive Model

AIC's goal is not to find the “true” model but to select the model from candidates expected to have the best predictive accuracy on new data from the same source. This criterion balances goodness of fit (higher likelihood) with model complexity (fewer parameters), penalizing overly complex models that might overfit the data.

3.3.3

Formulating a Decision Matrix for Claim Classification

These statistical tools allow formulating a unified decision matrix for classifying scientific claims based on quantitative, objective criteria, moving beyond vague assertions to precise judgments.

3.3.3.1

Defining Criteria for Reality-Dominant Confirmation (Low AIC, High Signal-to-Noise)

A claim classifies as a **Reality-Dominant Confirmation** if the proposed model has a low AIC score compared to rivals, and data exhibits a high signal-to-noise ratio. This indicates the model's predictions align robustly with observations, suggesting the observed effect is a reality feature rather than an artifact.

3.3.3.2

Defining Criteria for Apparatus-Dominant Rebuttal (High AIC, Low Signal-to-Noise)

A claim classifies as an **Apparatus-Dominant Rebuttal** if the model has a high AIC score, or if the observed effect is highly dependent on the measurement apparatus (e.g., low signal-to-noise, high convolution effects). This suggests the observed effect is likely a measurement process artifact rather than a reality feature.

3.4

The Epistemological Duality: Truth vs. Utility in Model Selection

Informational Realism's statistical framework is inherently dualistic, reflecting a deep philosophical divide in science philosophy. The Bayesian approach, which calculates a posterior probability $p(\Omega|\mathcal{E})$, embodies a *realist* or *truth-seeking* epistemology. It aims to assign a degree of belief to a particular census model's truth.

In stark contrast, the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) embodies an *instrumentalist* or *utility-seeking* epistemology. It does not ask which model is true; it asks which model is most predictively useful, selecting the model expected to perform best on future, unseen data.

This duality is not a flaw but reflects the framework's core insight: physics compels belief in an underlying informational reality (favoring Bayesianism), yet information theory proves we can never fully know it (favoring AIC). The practicing scientist must navigate these poles, using Bayesian methods to incorporate deep physical priors and AIC to guard against overfitting and ensure predictive robustness. Informational Realism provides the formal structure to productively manage this necessary tension.

4.0 The

Epistemological Status of Informational Realism

This final part synthesizes physical and statistical constraints to assess Informational Realism's philosophical and scientific status. It examines scientific justification's logic and consistency's ultimate criterion to determine if the thesis can function as a progressive scientific research program.

4.1 The Central Duality of

the Framework

Informational Realism's analysis reveals a deep duality. Physics and information theory principles strongly support the thesis's *informational* aspect while simultaneously erecting formidable barriers to its claimed *realism*.

4.1.1

The Positive Case: Physical Principles Supporting the "Informational" Thesis

Physical constraints discussed in Section 2 build a compelling case for information's physicality and fundamental nature.

4.1.1.1

Summarizing Evidence for the Physicality of Information (Unitarity, Landauer, Bekenstein)

Quantum Unitarity demands information conservation as rigorously as energy. Landauer's Principle gives information a concrete energy cost, rooting it in thermodynamics. Bekenstein-Hawking entropy gives information a maximum physical density, proving the census's finiteness for any bounded region. Together, these principles

suggest information is not an abstract concept but a core, physical constituent of the universe.

4.1.1.2

Summarizing Evidence for the Relational Structure of Information (Covariance, Holography)

General Covariance constrains information to be fundamentally relational, not absolute, forbidding a naive “bits-on-a-grid” ontology and implying spacetime emerges from informational relationships. The Holographic Principle assigns information a non-local organization, suggesting our three-dimensional reality may project from a lower-dimensional boundary. These principles indicate spacetime is likely an emergent property of an underlying informational structure.

4.1.2

The Negative Case: Statistical Principles Undermining the “Realism” Thesis

Conversely, statistical principles discussed in Section 3 challenge the notion that we can ever claim to know this informational reality entirely.

4.1.2.1

Summarizing the Epistemic Barrier of the Data Processing Inequality

The Data Processing Inequality formally proves the universe’s complete informational state is epistemically inaccessible to any internal observer. Every measurement is an irreversible, information-losing process, guaranteeing a non-zero information deficit. We can never “read out” the universe’s full, uncorrupted informational state.

4.1.2.2

Summarizing the Conditional Nature of Knowledge Imposed by Regularization

Regularization’s practical necessity for all non-trivial inference problems demonstrates that our knowledge never derives from data alone. It is always a composite of data and prior assumptions encoded in regularization, rendering all scientific knowledge conditional on their validity. This formally admits that data alone is insufficient for knowledge.

4.2 The

Philosophical Instability of the Scientific Goal

The choice between Bayesian inference and information criteria like AIC for model selection reveals a deep philosophical divide over science’s purpose, exposing fundamental ambiguity in Informational Realism’s ultimate goal.

4.2.1 *The Realist*

Aspiration of Bayesian Inference

Bayesian inference provides a framework for updating belief degrees in a hypothesis’s truth in light of new evidence. Its entire framework aims to assign a belief degree to a proposition’s truth.

4.2.1.1

Characterizing the Bayesian Goal as Updating Belief in a True Hypothesis

Bayesian inference's goal is to determine a given model's truth probability, or to find its most probable parameters. This approach yields a full posterior probability distribution for model parameters, naturally quantifying uncertainty. This aligns with a realist aspiration to discover the universe's true nature.

4.2.2

The Instrumentalist Pragmatism of Information Criteria

In contrast, information criteria like AIC derive from an instrumentalist philosophy. They do not traffic in truth belief degrees but aim to select the model with the best predictive utility.

4.2.2.1

Characterizing the AIC Goal as Selecting the Most Predictively Useful Model

AIC's goal is to select the model from candidates expected to have the best predictive accuracy on new data from the same source. It seeks the most useful model, not necessarily the "true" one, by balancing goodness-of-fit against a complexity penalty.

4.2.3

Exposing the Conflict Between the Thesis's Name and Its Epistemic Limits

Informational Realism is caught in an epistemological trap, torn between its claims and what information laws permit.

4.2.3.1

The "Realism" Claim Demands a Bayesian (Truth-Seeking) Justification

The name itself—"Informational *Realism*"—implies commitment to an ontological truth claim about the universe's nature. This realist aspiration demands a Bayesian justification, concerned with a model's truth probability.

4.2.3.2

The Information-Theoretic Constraints Permit Only an AIC-like (Utility-Seeking) Justification

However, fundamental information processing laws imply this realist goal is unattainable in principle. We are epistemically barred from accessing the "true" model, and all inferences are conditional on priors. This reality favors AIC's more pragmatic, instrumentalist philosophy, which seeks predictive utility rather than ontological truth. The thesis is philosophically unstable.

4.3 The Ultimate

Criterion of Logical Consistency

The ultimate, most unforgiving constraint on any fundamental theory is logical and mathematical consistency. A theory is consistent if its axiomatic framework does not lead to a logical contradiction.

4.3.1

Acknowledging the Unresolved Conflict Between Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity

The primary challenge for any fundamental theory today is the unresolved conflict between quantum mechanics' foundational principles (unitarity, superposition) and general relativity (dynamic spacetime, singularities). The black hole information paradox is this clash's most acute manifestation, where seemingly non-unitary Hawking evaporation directly contradicts quantum mechanics' required unitary evolution.

4.3.2

Reframing Unification as the Search for a Common Information-Processing Substrate

Adopting an informational ontology does not, by itself, resolve this deep-seated inconsistency. Recasting the problem in bits, qubits, and algorithms does not eliminate underlying mathematical and conceptual conflicts. Its value may lie in offering a powerful reframing.

4.3.2.1

Shifting the Goal from Reconciling Forces to Finding a Deeper Computational Architecture

By positing information as the fundamental substrate, unification's objective shifts. The goal is no longer to reconcile "gravity" with the "quantum." Instead, the problem becomes: "What is the fundamental information-processing architecture of the universe that gives rise to the *emergent phenomena* we describe with quantum field theory and general relativity languages?"

4.3.2.2

Viewing Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity as Emergent, Effective Theories

In this view, Quantum Mechanics and General Relativity are not fundamental but effective theories describing different aspects or operational limits of a single, deeper computational process. Informational Realism does not solve the consistency problem. Its potential contribution is to propose that the path to a consistent theory lies in seeking a more fundamental, information-theoretic structure from which both current, seemingly contradictory pillars of physics can derive.

4.4

Final Synthesis: The Scientific Viability of the Paradigm

Informational Realism's analysis through theoretical, statistical, and epistemological constraints reveals a deep duality. Physics and information theory principles strongly support the thesis's *informational* aspect while erecting formidable barriers to its claimed *realism*.

4.4.1

Distinguishing the Metaphysical Framework from Falsifiable Models

A critical distinction must be made between the framework's core ontological claim and the specific, testable models developed within it.

4.4.1.1

The Core Ontological Claim ("Reality is Information") as Unfalsifiable

The core ontological claim—“reality is information”—is, by the arguments presented, metaphysical and beyond direct falsification due to Data Processing Inequality’s epistemic barriers. This does not render the entire program scientifically sterile, but it places the overarching statement outside direct empirical verification.

4.4.1.2

Specific Models Developed within the Framework as Potentially Falsifiable

However, specific *models* developed within the Informational Realism framework—e.g., a spacetime model emerging from a specific quantum circuit type—could make novel, falsifiable predictions distinguishing them from standard theories. Scientific viability lies in these specific instantiations.

4.4.2

Classifying the Thesis as a Guiding Research Program

In conclusion, “Informational Realism” classifies not as a validated scientific law or mere philosophical speculation, but as a **guiding research program**. Its power lies in providing a unifying language and coherent principles that inspire and constrain new physical theory development. Its ultimate success will be measured not by its foundational axiom’s truth, but by the empirical success of the specific, falsifiable models it helps generate. It is a framework for asking better questions, not a final answer.

References

- Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 19(6), 716–723. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.1974.1100705>
- Bardeen, J. M., Carter, B., & Hawking, S. W. (1973). The four laws of black hole mechanics. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 31*(2), 161–170. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01645742>
- Bayes, T., & Price, R. (1763). An Essay towards solving a Problem in the Doctrine of Chances. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, 53*, 370–418. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstl.1763.0053>
- Bekenstein, J. D. (1973). Black holes and entropy. *Physical Review D*, 7*(8), 2333–2346. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2333>
- Cover, T. M., & Thomas, J. A. (2006). *Elements of information theory** (2nd ed.). Wiley-Interscience.
- Hawking, S. W. (1975). Particle creation by black holes. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 43(3), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02345020>
- Hurvich, C. M., & Tsai, C.-L. (1989). Regression and time series model selection in small samples. *Biometrika*, 76(2), 297–307. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/76.2.297>
- Kullback, S., & Leibler, R. A. (1951). On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(1), 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729694>
- Landauer, R. (1961). Irreversibility and heat generation in the computing process. *IBM Journal of Research and Development*, 5(3), 183–191. <https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.53.0183>
- Maldacena, J. M. (1998). The large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 38*(4), 1113–1133. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1026654312961>
- Tikhonov, A. N. (1963). Solution of incorrectly formulated problems and the regularization method. *Soviet Mathematics Doklady*, 4, 1035–1038.