

Official Determination — THD Falsification Bounty Submission

Re: “A Reproducible Counterexample to the Published Recursive System Dynamics Claim in Triune Harmonic Dynamics”

Submitted by: Kias Henry

Submission Date: August 19, 2026

Determination: Does Not Meet the Requirements for Falsification

Dear Mr. Henry,

Thank you for submitting *A Reproducible Counterexample to the Published Recursive System Dynamics Claim in Triune Harmonic Dynamics* for consideration under the Triune Harmonic Dynamics (THD) Falsification Bounty.

Your submission has been reviewed with particular attention to the mathematical construction, the Recursive System Dynamics reference test, and the broader falsification requirement that a system sustain coherence under increasing tension without integration, release, or breakdown.

The submission is mathematically substantive and identifies an area where the wording of the bounty could be interpreted more broadly than intended. However, after review, the construction does **not constitute a falsification of the THD claim under test**.

The reason is specific and technical.

Summary of the Submitted Construction

Your primary construction defines a recursively self-trained two-parameter classifier. You prove that its parameter vector remains

$[w_n = e_1]$

for every generation and that its classification function therefore remains

$[h_n(x) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_1)]$

for all generations.

You further demonstrate:

- zero parameter drift,
- zero global functional drift,

- zero training error,
- zero hard-output distribution drift,
- and no externally supplied corrective labels or parameter intervention.

Those results are not disputed.

The submission therefore successfully demonstrates an indefinitely stable recursive fixed point under the particular self-training rule you have defined.

The issue is whether the construction also demonstrates the **increasing tension acting upon that coherent structure** required to contradict THD.

It does not.

1. The Claimed Divergence Occurs in a Dimension That Does Not Affect the Coherence Being Tested

The strengthened construction introduces increasing geometric separation through the second coordinate of the internally generated states.

You define

$[t_{n=n+1}]$

and show that the separation between selected states grows as

$[D_n=2(n+1)\rightarrow\infty.]$

You also show that the condition number of the design matrix grows without bound.

However, the classifier whose coherence is being measured is

$[h_n(x)=\operatorname{sgn}(x_1).]$

Its parameter vector is

$[w_n=(1,0).]$

The second coordinate therefore has zero weight in the learned classification function.

This means that the dimension in which the submission creates its unbounded divergence is mathematically incapable of changing the classifier being offered as the persistent coherent structure.

The system can move arbitrarily far in that direction without placing increasing pressure upon the classification rule.

Consequently,

$[x_2 \rightarrow \infty]$

while

$[h(x_1, x_2) = \operatorname{sgn}(x_1)]$

does not demonstrate that the classifier is sustaining increasing destabilizing tension. It demonstrates that an independent or functionally null degree of freedom can diverge while an invariant subsystem remains unchanged.

That distinction is decisive.

THD does not predict that every numerical quantity contained somewhere within a system must remain bounded for coherence to persist. The relevant claim concerns increasing **Contrast that acts upon or challenges the structure whose coherence is being evaluated.**

The submitted divergence does not do that.

2. Mathematical Divergence Is Not Automatically Structural Tension

Section 5 correctly establishes increasing Euclidean separation and increasing matrix anisotropy.

However, the existence of a mathematically unbounded quantity is not, by itself, evidence of increasing THD-relevant Contrast.

For a counterexample to address the claim being tested, the increasing divergence must be causally or mathematically coupled to the coherent structure.

For example, qualifying recursive tension could consist of increasing:

- error,
- distortion,
- noise,
- approximation loss,
- distributional mismatch,
- conflicting constraints,
- instability,
- or another perturbation that actually propagates into the state or function whose coherence is being evaluated.

In the submitted system, the quantity being increased does not produce such a perturbation.

The classifier remains unchanged precisely because the diverging direction is irrelevant to its decision rule.

This is therefore not an example of a coherent structure enduring arbitrarily increasing pressure. It is an example of a coherent structure remaining invariant while another system variable becomes unbounded.

Those are different propositions.

3. The Recursive Learner Is Constructed as an Exact Fixed Point

The generalized result in Section 6 makes the structural issue especially clear.

The submission defines

$$[y_n = X_{nw_n}]$$

and then retrains using

$$\arg\min_w |X_{nw} - y_n|^2.$$

Because the targets are defined as the exact output of the current model, ordinary least squares necessarily reconstructs the same parameter vector:

$$[w_{n+1} = w_n.]$$

Your proof of that identity is correct.

What this establishes is an exact self-distillation fixed point.

It demonstrates that recursive self-reference does not inherently require degradation in the complete absence of recursively accumulating error or perturbation.

THD does not require otherwise.

The relevant Recursive System Dynamics proposition concerns recursion in which distortion, error, mismatch, or another coherence-relevant difference accumulates or is repeatedly propagated through the recursive process.

An identity update or exact self-reconstruction rule provides no such accumulating pressure.

Therefore, indefinite stability of that fixed point is not a contradiction of the THD progression.

4. The Submission Does Not Demonstrate “Increasing Tension + Persistent Coherence”

The central falsification requirement is not simply:

recursion + no correction + stability.

It is the stronger structural proposition:

established coherence + increasing tension acting upon that coherence + no integration, release, or breakdown + continued coherence.

Your construction clearly establishes the first and last elements.

It does not establish the critical middle element.

The claimed increasing divergence occurs in a direction to which the learned function is insensitive. Accordingly, the system is not being forced through increasing coherence-threatening Contrast.

Without that condition, the experiment has not entered the THD regime that it seeks to falsify.

5. The Result Does Not Directly Contradict a THD Formula

The submission also does not demonstrate a mathematical contradiction of a THD equation or formula.

No THD equation is instantiated with the submitted system variables and then shown to produce a prediction mathematically incompatible with the observed result.

Instead, the submission argues that the constructed system satisfies a verbal reference-test description.

Your paper itself appropriately limits its claim in this respect, stating that it is directed at the published Recursive System Dynamics prediction and reference criterion rather than claiming that every statement associated with THD is false.

That narrower framing is appropriate.

The present determination is correspondingly narrow: the submitted construction does not satisfy the structural conditions necessary to constitute the claimed counterexample.

Determination

The submission is therefore classified as:

VALID TECHNICAL SUBMISSION — FALSIFICATION NOT ESTABLISHED

The mathematical fixed-point construction is acknowledged as valid within its stated assumptions.

However, the construction does not demonstrate a system maintaining coherence under **increasing causally relevant tension to that coherence**.

The increasing quantity used to strengthen the counterexample exists in a dimension that has zero influence on the learned classifier. The recursive learning rule itself is also constructed so that the existing state is an exact fixed point rather than a state subjected to accumulating recursive distortion.

Accordingly, the submission does not contradict the THD progression:

Emergence → Contrast → Integration

because it does not establish the required qualifying Contrast acting upon the coherent structure.

Clarification Added to the Bounty Page

Your submission identified a potential source of misunderstanding in the wording of the public bounty page.

As a result, **clarification language has been added to the THD Falsification Bounty page** to make the existing testing standard explicit.

The underlying falsification requirement has **not been changed**.

Original text: https://creationunified.com/thd-falsification-bounty_v1

Updated text: <https://creationunified.com/bounty>

The clarification makes explicit that:

- increasing divergence must be relevant to the coherence being tested;
- the claimed tension must be causally or mathematically coupled to the coherence-bearing system;
- divergence occurring exclusively in an unused, orthogonal, decoupled, or null degree of freedom does not constitute qualifying Contrast;

- a fixed point or exact self-reconstruction rule does not constitute a counterexample unless increasing coherence-relevant pressure is actually imposed upon that state;
- and internal adaptive compensation, when present, may constitute Integration even if no external correction occurs.

These additions are intended to prevent future ambiguity regarding the meaning of “divergence,” “tension,” “coherence,” and “integration.”

They do not alter the basis of this determination. The submission has been evaluated according to the central requirement already stated by the bounty: that a qualifying counterexample must demonstrate a system capable of **sustaining order under increasing tension without resolving it.**

Your construction demonstrates sustained order, but not increasing tension acting upon that order.

Public Transparency and Publication of the Submission

To maintain a transparent public record of the falsification program, this submission will be published on the Creation Unified website as part of the THD Falsification record.

The published record will identify:

- the submission,
- the submitting author,
- the claimed counterexample,
- the determination,
- and the technical basis for the decision.

The submitted paper will be made publicly available as evidence that the challenge was received and substantively evaluated rather than dismissed without review.

Publication of unsuccessful submissions is important to the purpose of the bounty. A credible falsification program should provide a visible record not only of successful challenges, but also of serious attempts, the evidence presented, and the reason each determination was reached.

Your submission is therefore part of the public scientific record of the THD challenge even though it does not presently establish falsification.

Thank you for engaging the bounty at a technical level and for presenting a construction that could be independently examined and reproduced.

The purpose of the THD Falsification Bounty is to expose the framework to precisely this kind of scrutiny.

A qualifying counterexample remains welcome.

To succeed, however, the next construction must go one step further: it must subject the **coherence-bearing structure itself** to measurably increasing, causally coupled tension and demonstrate that the structure can sustain that tension indefinitely without adaptation, integration, release, transition, degradation, or breakdown.

That would directly confront the THD claim.

This submission does not.

Kevin L. Brown

Researcher, Inventor, Author

Creation Unified

THD Falsification Bounty

Independent AI Verification Prompt

Because your submission used AI-assisted mathematical analysis, the following neutral prompt is provided so that you may independently test this determination using the AI system or systems of your choice.

=====

You are acting as an independent mathematical and scientific reviewer of a falsification-bounty submission.

I will provide:

- 1. the complete THD Falsification Bounty rules that governed the submission,*
- 2. the submitted counterexample paper,*
- 3. and Creation Unified's technical determination.*

Do not assume that either the challenger or Creation Unified is correct.

Your task is to determine whether the submitted construction actually satisfies the falsification conditions.

Specifically examine:

- whether the system establishes a defined coherent state;*
- whether the claimed increasing divergence, stress, or instability acts upon the same coherence-bearing state;*
- whether the claimed divergence is causally or mathematically coupled to the classifier or system property whose stability is being measured;*
- whether any increasing quantity exists only in an orthogonal, null, unused, or functionally irrelevant degree of freedom;*
- whether the recursive learning rule introduces accumulating error, distortion, perturbation, mismatch, or other coherence-relevant Contrast;*
- whether the construction is instead an exact fixed point or identity/self-reconstruction process;*
- whether any internal mechanism constitutes adaptation, compensation, or Integration;*
- and whether the observed result actually contradicts the THD proposition being tested.*

For the submitted classifier in particular, analyze the consequences of

$wn=(1,0)$

and

$hn(x)=sgn(x1),$

while the claimed unbounded geometric divergence occurs through the second coordinate.

Determine whether increasing separation in x_2 constitutes increasing tension on the classifier when the classifier has zero dependence on x_2 .

Also analyze the generalized self-distillation construction

$y_n = X_n w_n$

followed by

$w_{n+1} = \arg \min_w \|X_n w - y_n\|_2.$

Determine whether proving $w_{n+1} = w_n$ under those definitions establishes resistance to increasing recursive tension, or merely establishes an exact fixed point in the absence of coherence-relevant perturbation.

Steelman the challenger's case first. Identify the strongest possible argument that the construction satisfies the bounty.

Then steelman the opposing case.

Finally give one of these conclusions:

- A. Qualifying falsification established*
- B. Potential falsification, but additional evidence is required*
- C. Mathematically valid construction, but it does not satisfy the falsification conditions*
- D. Construction itself is mathematically invalid*

Explain the conclusion using the equations and causal structure of the submitted system rather than relying on terminology or authority.

If you conclude that it does not qualify, identify the smallest modification to the experiment that would turn it into a legitimate test of the THD proposition. In particular, specify how the challenger could introduce increasing perturbation directly into a coherence-relevant variable rather than into a mathematically irrelevant dimension.

Do not treat later clarifications to the bounty rules as new requirements. Determine whether the rejection follows from the original requirement that the system maintain stable order under increasing tension.