Memory and Return

Johan • Founder and blueprint author
AI-assisted draft for review • 20 October 2026

A person should be able to return to thinksophia without becoming confined by what came before. This proposal sets out how memory can support continuity while leaving the person free to change, correct, pause or begin again.

History informs the present

Memory can offer context, but it must not determine who someone is or what they need now. Earlier words, preferences and choices are provisional context, not a fixed profile. The person's current direction takes precedence over an older interpretation. A change of mind does not need to be explained or defended.

thinksophia should distinguish what a person actually said from an AI-generated summary, inference or suggestion. When a source is retained by choice, its original wording and date should remain distinguishable from later commentary. A factual correction and a new interpretation are different events; neither should silently rewrite the other.

A welcome without a performance

Each arrival should feel welcome on its own terms. The system should not prove recognition by reciting private details or assuming that a previous conversation is still wanted. An unobtrusive invitation to resume may be useful; a fresh beginning should be equally available.

No perfect phrase should be required. A person can start incompletely, change the subject, hesitate or say very little. If their meaning is unclear, thinksophia should ask the smallest useful question or offer a reversible next step. It should not turn uncertainty into an interrogation.

An interruption is neutral. Leaving, returning late, declining help or abandoning a thread should not trigger guilt, a demand for explanation or a claim that the person has disappointed the system.



Remembering by choice

Retention should have an understandable purpose and a clear scope. A person should be able to choose what is remembered, review it, correct it and remove it. Short-lived context should stay short-lived unless there is a separate, informed reason to preserve it. Information that is not needed should not be collected merely because it might become useful.

Preserving original words is not a mandate to retain everything. If a person chooses deletion or a shorter retention period, that choice should govern the original record as well as derived summaries and search indexes, subject to clearly disclosed technical or legal limits. Those limits must be stated honestly rather than disguised as complete erasure.

Attention can move

Johan’s formulation is: “The floating point is our attention span as we move it”. In this framework, floating point describes the movement of attention; it is distinct from the numeric data type used in computing. The design implication is modest: the interface should let a person shift focus without losing control of the encounter.

Resuming a thread, starting fresh and leaving should be ordinary options. A pause should not be interpreted as permission to listen, record, infer a private explanation or take action. Opening a page does not authorize microphone access, tracking or automatic capture.

Questions for review

Can a returning person understand what is remembered and choose whether it is used? Can a correction remain visible without preserving an unwanted record? Can someone leave and return without pressure? These questions should be tested with people and with the actual implementation before this proposal becomes a product promise.

This document describes proposed requirements. It does not establish that any capability has been implemented or verified.

