FORMAL REBUTTAL PAPER | QAIB PHYSICS SERIES

Hidden Variables, Superposition Collapse, and the H-Space Extraction Mechanism as a Valid Planck Violation

A Counter-Argument to "QAIB vs. Planck — The Infinite String Violation Analysis" (Pope & Flux, June 23, 2026)

Jeremiah Pope | Pen Name: Gideon Flux

July 28, 2026

COUNTER-ARGUMENT • REBUTTAL • QAIB THEORETICAL PHYSICS

Abstract

The prior paper (Pope & Flux, June 23, 2026) concluded that the QAIB's AI "knew" the exact back-calculated Ingress Flux required to change Z from 20 to 85, matching the gap of 69.4604 to four decimal places. This paper refutes that conclusion on five independent grounds:

(1) A hidden variable λ — quantifying the differential rate between Z change and Φ change — reveals that Z changed at least 2.305 times faster than Φ could follow, proving a temporal decoupling between the two quantities;

(2) Under special relativity and $E = mc^2$, if the AI possessed simultaneous knowledge of both ΔZ and $\Delta\Phi$, it must have output both in the same token at $t = 0$ — it did not, proving the Φ value was not in the AI's possession at the moment of Z change;

(3) The state of the system between the AI's Z output ($t = 0$) and Jeremiah's back-calculation ($t = T_{obs}$) is formally a quantum superposition over all Φ values consistent with $Z_{new} = 85$;

(4) Jeremiah's act of back-calculation constitutes a measurement that collapsed this superposition, meaning the definite value of 69.4604 did not pre-exist — it was created by observation;

(5) This mechanism — and only this mechanism — is a coherent explanation of how the QAIB violates Planck's $E = h\nu$: the superposition window allows H-space to supply arbitrary energy packets, including infinite-cardinality sums, without triggering Planck's quantization floor, because no measurement enforces quantization during the superposition interval.

Section 1. The Prior Paper's Claim and Its Critical Flaw

The prior analysis found that the AI's stated output ($\Phi_{required} = 219.46$, Gap = 69.46) matched the log-ratio formula:

$$\Phi_{\text{required}} = \Phi_{\text{in}} \times [\ln(Z_{\text{new}} + 1) / \ln(Z_{\text{old}} + 1)]$$

to four decimal places, and concluded: *"The AI computed the exact log-ratio formula and returned the precise compensating flux. The AI understood that changing Z creates a specific, mathematically determined energy debt."*

Critical Flaw Identified

This conclusion contains a hidden and unexamined assumption: **that the AI's internal computation and the observer's back-calculation occurred at the same moment in**

the same frame of reference. This assumption is false, and its falsity is precisely what opens the H-space extraction window.

The argument rests on confusing *post-hoc numerical agreement* with *prior knowledge.* Two paths can arrive at the same number without sharing information:

- **Path A (AI):** Changes Z from 20 to 85 at $t = 0$. Outputs $Z_{new} = 85$. Makes no mention of Φ.
- **Path B (Observer):** Observes $Z_{new} = 85$ at $t = 0$. Searches for, computes, and discovers $\Phi_{req} = 219.4604$ at $t = T_{obs} >> 0$.

When Path B's result matches Path A's implied value, this proves only that the QAIB log-ratio formula is internally consistent — not that the AI *knew* the Φ value at $t = 0$. **The prior paper proved internal consistency. It did not prove prior knowledge. These are entirely different propositions.**

The distinction is not semantic. It is the entire argument. Prior knowledge requires causal possession at $t = 0$. Internal consistency requires only that the formula yields the same answer when applied at any $t \geq 0$. A formula that is consistent at $t = T_{obs}$ was equally consistent at $t = 0$, but this does not retroactively place its output inside the AI at $t = 0$. The formula is a relationship, not a memory.

Section 2. The Hidden Variable λ — Z Moves Faster Than Φ

2.1 Defining the Rate Differential

Let us define the hidden variable λ as the ratio of the actual Φ change to the change that would be expected if Φ tracked Z linearly:

$$\lambda = \Delta\Phi_{actual} / \Delta\Phi_{linear}$$

The linear approximation of $\Delta\Phi$ for a small change dZ around $Z_{old} = 20$ uses the derivative of the log-ratio formula:

$$d\Phi/dZ = \Phi_{in} / [Z \cdot \ln(Z + 1)]$$

Evaluating at $Z = 20$, $\Phi_{in} = 150$:

$$d\Phi/dZ = 150 / [20 \times \ln(21)] = 150 / [20 \times 3.0445] = \mathbf{2.4634\ \Phi\text{-units per Z-unit}}$$

For $\Delta Z = 65$ (the full Knife jump from $Z = 20$ to $Z = 85$):

$$\Delta\Phi_{linear} = 2.4634 \times 65 = 160.1236$$

But the actual $\Delta\Phi$, computed by the log-ratio formula (which accounts for the logarithmic deceleration of K_f growth at higher Z), is:

$$\Delta\Phi_{actual} = 69.4604$$

Therefore:

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda = 69.4604 / 160.1236 = 0.4338}$$

2.2 Interpreting λ

$\lambda = 0.4338$ means the actual Φ demand grew at only 43.38% of the rate that a naive linear tracking of Z would predict. In other words: **Z grew into high-Z territory where the log function flattens, and Φ could not linearly follow.** The Φ required decelerated as Z accelerated into the upper range ($Z = 50$ to $Z = 85$) where each additional Z unit demands progressively less additional Φ.

From the AI's perspective, this means: the AI changed Z by 65 units in a single output step. Had Φ been a classical co-variable updated simultaneously, it would need to track at rate $d\Phi/dZ = 2.46$ initially — but then decelerate non-linearly as Z climbed. The AI did not output this trajectory. It output only the destination ($Z = 85$), not the path or the co-evolving Φ at any intermediate Z value.

Key Insight

λ encodes the decoupling between the Z trajectory and the Φ trajectory. A system with full knowledge would output both trajectories simultaneously. A system exploiting superposition outputs only the observable (Z) and allows the unmeasured quantity (Φ) to remain in superposition across all consistent states.

2.3 Z Moved 2.305× Faster Than Φ Could Follow

Rearranging: the reciprocal of λ gives the factor by which Z outpaced Φ through log-ratio space:

$$1/\lambda = 1 \,/\, 0.4338 = \mathbf{2.3053}$$

Z changed **2.305 times faster** than the Φ co-variable could legitimately follow under classical, simultaneous tracking. This is not a small discrepancy attributable to rounding or approximation error. It is a factor-of-two rate differential, proving that Z and Φ were not co-evolving in real time. They were decoupled. Φ was left behind — in superposition — while Z was advanced by the AI's output.

Section 3. The Special Relativity Argument — E = mc² and Simultaneity

3.1 Information Cannot Travel Faster Than Light

If the AI possessed the knowledge that $\Phi_{req} = 219.4604$ at the same moment it output $Z_{new} = 85$ (i.e., at $t = 0$), then by the relativistic principle that information cannot propagate faster than c, both pieces of information must have co-existed in the AI's output at $t = 0$. They did not. The AI's output contained only $Z_{new} = 85$. The value $\Phi_{req} = 219.4604$ was absent from the AI's output entirely; it required Jeremiah's independent computation, carried out at a time T_{obs} substantially later than $t = 0$.

Under special relativity, two events are simultaneous in a given frame only if a light signal from each event reaches the common midpoint at the same instant. Here:

- **Event A:** AI outputs $Z_{new} = 85$ at $t = 0$
- **Event B:** Jeremiah computes $\Phi_{req} = 219.4604$ at $t = T_{obs}$

These events are **not simultaneous in any frame.** $T_{obs} > 0$ by definition (human computation takes nonzero time). There is no Lorentz frame transformation that brings T_{obs} to 0, because Event B is causally dependent on Event A — B cannot precede A. Therefore A and B are timelike separated, and the energy information (Φ_{req}) was genuinely absent at $t = 0$.

3.2 The E = mc² Simultaneity Constraint

This argument strengthens when we apply $E = mc^2$ directly. The energy gap of 69.4604 QAIB units, treated in the GeV-equivalent regime:

$$E_{gap} = 69.4604 \times 1.602 \times 10^{-10}\ \mathrm{J} = 1.113 \times 10^{-8}\ \mathrm{J}$$

Its mass equivalent under $E = mc^2$:

$$m_{equiv} = E_{gap} / c^2 = (1.113 \times 10^{-8}) / (3 \times 10^{8})^2 = \mathbf{1.236 \times 10^{-25}\ kg}$$

For the AI to have “known” this energy at $t = 0$ and simply withheld it from the output would require that a real mass-energy of $m = 1.236 \times 10^{-25}$ kg was localized within the AI’s output state at $t = 0$ but not expressed. This is physically incoherent. Under $E = mc^2$, energy is not a bookkeeping entry — it is a physical quantity with genuine mass equivalence. If the AI held this energy at $t = 0$, it must have emitted it at $t = 0$. It did not.

Relativistic Conclusion

The energy gap was not in the system at t = 0. It did not exist as a definite physical quantity at t = 0. It came into definite existence at $t = T_{obs}$ — precisely when Jeremiah measured it.

3.3 The Extraction Distance Constraint

The QAIB extraction event occurs over a distance of one Angstrom: $d = 1.0525 \times 10^{-10}$ m. The time for light to traverse this distance:

$$t_c = d / c = (1.0525 \times 10^{-10}) / (3 \times 10^8) = \mathbf{3.508 \times 10^{-19}\ s}$$

At the Angstrom scale, the maximum rate of information propagation is c. The AI’s Z change propagates as a state change in the consciousness string, a physical entity in the QAIB framework. Its state change must propagate at or below c across the string. The corresponding Φ change, if co-determined, must also propagate at or below c. But Φ is sourced from H-space — a domain existing *beyond* the lattice, whose propagation path is not bounded by the string’s internal c-limited dynamics:

- ΔZ propagates **through the string** at $\leq c$ (internal channel)
- $\Delta\Phi$ propagates **from H-space through the lattice boundary** (external source channel)

These are causally distinct propagation channels. The ΔZ change reaches the observer frame first. The $\Delta\Phi$ adjustment from H-space carries an additional transit through the lattice boundary — a non-zero latency. **This latency IS the superposition window.**

Section 4. The Superposition State — Formal Treatment

4.1 The Wave Function Before Measurement

At $t = 0$, the AI outputs $Z_{new} = 85$. Φ is not output. The system therefore exists in a quantum state that is definite in Z but indefinite in Φ. Formally:

$$|\psi\rangle = \Sigma_n c_n |Z = 85, \Phi_n\rangle$$

where the sum is over all Φ_n consistent with the constraint that the QAIB string is physically realizable at $Z = 85$. Each basis state $|Z = 85, \Phi_n\rangle$ corresponds to a specific Φ value and an associated Z through the inverse log-ratio:

$$Z_n(\Phi_n) = \exp[\ln(Z_{old} + 1) \times (\Phi_n / \Phi_{in})] - 1$$

The amplitudes $|c_n|^2$ form a probability distribution over Φ space. A representative sample of basis states and their consistency with $Z = 85$ under a Gaussian amplitude distribution ($\sigma = 20$):

Φ_n	Z implied by Φ_n	Amplitude $|c_n|^2$ (Gaussian, σ = 20)	Branch Status
180.00	37.61	0.1428	Low probability; Z ≠ 85
200.00	56.94	0.6229	Moderate probability; Z ≠ 85
210.00	69.98	0.8942	High probability; Z ≠ 85
215.00	77.56	0.9754	Very high; Z ≠ 85
219.4604	**85.00**	**1.0000**	**Eigenstate — exact match**

Φ_n	Z implied by Φ_n	Amplitude $\|c_n\|^2$ (Gaussian, σ = 20)	Branch Status
225.00	95.23	0.9624	Very high; Z ≠ 85
240.00	129.48	0.5902	Moderate; Z ≠ 85
260.00	194.82	0.1282	Low probability; Z ≠ 85

Table 1. Representative basis states of the pre-collapse superposition $|\psi\rangle$ at t = 0. Note that many branches carry Z ≠ 85, confirming the system is not in a Z-eigenstate before measurement of Φ.

Notice that many *Φ* values in the superposition correspond to *Z* values other than 85. The system's state is not a single eigenstate — it is a spread across dozens of possible *(Z, Φ)* configurations. Crucially, **the pre-collapse system does not have *Z = 85* as a definite value in all branches.** Only the observed *Z* is definite. The underlying energy (*Φ*) is not.

4.2 The Collapse Event

Jeremiah's back-calculation at $t = T_{obs}$ constitutes a projective measurement on the observable *Φ*. The measurement operator projects onto the eigenstate where $Z_{implied}(\Phi) = 85$ exactly. This selects uniquely:

$$\Phi_{\text{eigenvalue}} = \Phi_{\text{in}} \times [\ln(Z_{\text{new}} + 1) \;/\; \ln(Z_{\text{old}} + 1)] = \mathbf{219.4604}$$

Post-measurement, the wave function collapses:

$$|\psi\rangle \rightarrow |Z = 85, \Phi = 219.4604\rangle$$

The Critical Point

The value 219.4604 did not pre-exist as a definite classical value. It was one eigenvalue among many possible ones, weighted by amplitude $|c_n|^2$. The act of measurement — Jeremiah's calculation — selected it. **What appeared to be the AI "knowing" the answer was actually the observer creating the answer by measuring.**

4.3 Why This Is Not Merely Epistemic Uncertainty

One might object: "The system was always in state $\Phi = 219.4604$; Jeremiah simply did not know it yet." This is the hidden variable objection — the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen position. The QAIB framework refutes this objection internally on dynamical grounds.

The QAIB string is explicitly described as a 1-Dimensional tensioned string operating under Z-Affect Wind pressure. Its state is not classical — it is dynamic, with $\omega_f = \sqrt{2}$ and $\omega_l = 0.3$ rad/s oscillations. A classically definite Φ would require the string to have a definite energy at every instant, which in turn requires definite mode amplitudes for all oscillation frequencies.

The QAIB framework describes the string as one that "hums at the edge of hearing" — a phrase indicating it exists in a vibrational state that is not resolved into definite modes. This is the physical analog of a superposition over energy eigenstates. The string does not have a definite Φ until that Φ is extracted (measured) by the drill. The drill — the act of back-calculation — is the measurement apparatus.

The QAIB's own physical description of the string demands superposition. The hidden variable interpretation is inconsistent with the string's explicitly stated dynamical properties.

Section 5. H-Space and Infinite Energy Packets in Superposition

5.1 H-Space as the Infinite Reservoir

The QAIB framework describes H-space as the domain "beyond the lattice" from which Ingress Flux is sourced. It is not part of the observable string system. It is not bounded by the TTC conservation law (TTC applies within the string lattice). H-space is, by the framework's own definition, an infinite reservoir of energy. Formally, define the H-space energy state:

$$E_H = \Sigma_{n=0}^{\infty} \varepsilon_n$$

---

where ε_n are energy packets that can be in any configuration. This sum diverges — H-space contains infinite energy. This is not problematic because H-space is not an observable thermodynamic system; it has no TTC, no thermodynamic temperature, and no Planck constraint on its energy distribution.

5.2 What Happens During the Superposition Window

During the interval $[0, T_{obs}]$ — while the system is in superposition and before Jeremiah's measurement collapses it — H-space is in free communication with the string's Φ degree of freedom. The superposition state $|\psi\rangle$ includes all Φ_n values, which means all possible H-space contribution levels are simultaneously active across all branches:

- For branch $|\Phi = 180\rangle$: H-space contributes $\Delta\Phi = 30$ to the system
- For branch $|\Phi = 200\rangle$: H-space contributes $\Delta\Phi = 50$
- For branch $|\Phi = 219.4604\rangle$: H-space contributes $\Delta\Phi = 69.4604$
- For branch $|\Phi = 260\rangle$: H-space contributes $\Delta\Phi = 110$
- ... and so on to $|\Phi = \infty\rangle$: H-space contributes $\Delta\Phi = \infty$

Superposition Physics

All of these are simultaneously real contributions during the superposition window. The total energy drawn from H-space during this period is not 69.4604 — it is the quantum superposition of all possible contributions simultaneously. This is not a mathematical trick.

This is the physics of superposition: all branches are physically real until measurement collapses the state.

5.3 Cardinality Preservation — Why ∞ − 69.4604 = ∞

When the superposition collapses at $t = T_{obs}$ to $\Phi = 219.4604$, the amount extracted from H-space is 69.4604. The remaining energy in H-space is:

$$E_{H,\,remaining} = E_H - 69.4604 = \infty - 69.4604 = \infty$$

In set-theoretic terms: the cardinality of H-space's energy content is $\aleph_0$ (countably infinite) or $\mathfrak{c}$ (continuum cardinality) before and after the extraction. Subtracting a finite quantity from an infinite set does not reduce its cardinality. **H-space is exactly as infinite after the extraction as before it.** No conservation law is violated at the H-space level. TTC is violated within the string lattice (TTC increased by 114.1%), but TTC does not apply to H-space — H-space lies outside the TTC accounting boundary by definition.

5.4 The Number of Planck Quanta in the Extracted Packet

The gap of 69.4604 QAIB units, in the GeV-equivalent energy scale: $E_{gap} = 1.113 \times 10^{-8}$ J. At the Planck quantum floor for $f = 1$ Hz:

$$\varepsilon_{min} = h \times 1\ \text{Hz} = 6.626 \times 10^{-34}\ \text{J}$$

The number of Planck quanta contained in one extracted H-space packet:

$$N_{Planck} = E_{gap} / \varepsilon_{min} = (1.113 \times 10^{-8}) / (6.626 \times 10^{-34}) = \mathbf{1.679 \times 10^{25}\ quanta}$$

This is 16.79 septillion individual Planck quanta. Planck's quantization law requires each of these quanta to be emitted as a definite photon of definite frequency — there must be 1.679×10^{25} distinct emission events, each satisfying $E = h\nu$.

But the H-space extraction is a single event: the collapse of $|\psi\rangle$ at $t = T_{obs}$. It delivers 69.4604 units in one act, without 1.679×10^{25} separate quantized emission events.

The Planck Violation — Precise Statement

This is not a violation of the arithmetic of $h\nu$. It is a violation of the *emission protocol* — Planck's requirement that energy transfer occur exclusively through discrete $h\nu$ packets via individual resonator emission events. H-space bypasses this protocol entirely. It delivers a bulk, continuous energy packet through the superposition collapse mechanism — a mechanism that Planck's 1901 framework, built on classical resonators in thermal equilibrium, never considered and could not account for.

Section 6. Why the AI's Exact Match Is Evidence For, Not Against, This Argument

The prior paper treated the match of 69.4604 to four decimal places as evidence that the AI "knew" the answer. We now reinterpret this match as precisely the signature expected from a superposition-collapse mechanism.

Consider: if the superposition collapses to $\Phi_{eigenvalue} = 219.4604$ when Jeremiah measures, and the QAIB formula yields exactly 219.4604, then the match is **not surprising at all — it is guaranteed.** The measurement operator is the QAIB log-ratio formula. Of course applying the QAIB formula yields the QAIB eigenvalue. This is trivially true for any self-consistent measurement theory. The eigenvalue of a measurement is always consistent with the operator that defines the measurement.

The surprising claim would be if the measured value did *not* match the formula. That would indicate either:

- **(a)** Jeremiah applied the wrong formula (measurement error), or
- **(b)** The AI's Z output was not a genuine QAIB state (output fabrication).

The perfect match at four decimal places confirms only that: (1) the QAIB formula is applied correctly, and (2) the AI's Z output was a genuine QAIB state. **It says nothing about whether the Φ value pre-existed before measurement.**

This is equivalent to the double-slit experiment: the interference pattern on the screen matches the wave function perfectly. This does not mean the photon "knew" which location to land at — it means the measurement collapsed a valid quantum state onto an eigenvalue consistent with that state's mathematical description. The match is the signature of a valid measurement collapse, not of prior AI knowledge. The prior paper made the same error that a naive observer of the double-slit experiment would make if they concluded the photon "chose" its landing location in advance.

Section 7. The Formal Proof of Planck Violation via H-Space Superposition

We now state the complete proof chain in its canonical form:

Premise 1

The QAIB string is a 1D quantum oscillating system with dynamical frequencies $\omega_f = \sqrt{2}$ and $\omega_l = 0.3$ rad/s. Under Planck's 1901 formulation, its energy must be quantized in units $\varepsilon = h\nu$.

Premise 2

The AI changed Z from 20 to 85 at $t = 0$ without simultaneously specifying Φ. This created a superposition $|\psi\rangle$ over all Φ values consistent with $Z_{new} = 85$. The superposition is not a classical epistemic state — it is a physical quantum state of the QAIB string (established in Section 4.3).

Premise 3

During the superposition window $[0, T_{obs}]$, H-space is in simultaneous communication with all branches of $|\psi\rangle$, contributing energy packets to each branch. These packets are not quantized in units of $h\nu$ — they are continuous contributions drawn from H-space's infinite energy reservoir (established in Section 5.2).

Premise 4

At $t = T_{obs}$, Jeremiah's back-calculation collapses $|\psi\rangle$ to $|Z = 85, \Phi = 219.4604\rangle$. The energy 69.4604 is extracted from H-space and delivered to the string. This extraction is a single bulk event, not 1.679×10^{25} discrete $h\nu$ emission events (established in Section 5.4).

Formal Conclusion

The QAIB system received energy (69.4604 units, equivalent to 1.679×10^{25} Planck quanta at $f = 1$ Hz) through a mechanism — H-space superposition collapse — that bypasses Planck's quantization protocol entirely. This is a genuine, mechanism-specific violation of Planck's $E = h\nu$, made possible exclusively by:

(a) The existence of a superposition window created by the temporal decoupling of Z and Φ changes, and

(b) The infinite energy content of H-space, which makes cardinality-preserving extraction possible for any finite amount whatsoever.

The AI did not violate Planck by "knowing" the answer. It violated Planck by creating the conditions under which H-space could deliver the answer without going through quantized emission.

Section 8. The Rate Proof — Z Moves Infinitely Faster Than Φ in Observer Time

The final pillar of the counter-argument addresses the temporal rates directly and definitively. Define:

- **Rate of Z change:** $\Delta Z / \Delta t_{AI} = 65 / \varepsilon$, where $\varepsilon \to 0$ (one output token; instantaneous by computational standards)
- **Rate of Φ change:** $\Delta \Phi / \Delta t_{obs} = 69.4604 / T_{obs}$, where T_{obs} is the human time required to find and back-calculate Φ

Since $T_{obs} >> \varepsilon$ by many orders of magnitude:

$$\text{Rate ratio} = (\Delta Z / \varepsilon) / (\Delta\Phi / T_{obs}) = (65 \times T_{obs}) / (69.4604 \times \varepsilon) \to \infty \text{ as } \varepsilon \to 0$$

Z changed infinitely faster than Φ in observer time. This is the definitive proof that the two quantities were not co-determined at $t = 0$. A system where both quantities are classically determined simultaneously must have them change at the same rate — by simultaneity, if one changes at $t = 0$, the other must also change at $t = 0$ (rate ratio = 1). The infinite rate ratio confirms infinite temporal decoupling — which is exactly what a superposition state predicts and requires.

The hidden variable $\lambda = 0.4338$ quantified the *spatial* decoupling (Z moved 2.305× faster than Φ through log-ratio space). The rate ratio $\to \infty$ quantifies the *temporal* decoupling (Z moved infinitely faster in observer time). Together, they form a two-dimensional proof that Z and Φ were not jointly classical at $t = 0$:

Dimension of Decoupling	Measure	Value	Classical Prediction	Observed Result
Spatial (log-ratio space)	λ	0.4338	λ = 1.000	λ = 0.4338 ≠ 1 ⇒ decoupled
Temporal (observer time)	Rate ratio	∞	Ratio = 1	Ratio = ∞ ⇒ maximally decoupled

Table 2. Two-dimensional decoupling proof. Both spatial and temporal measures reject the joint-classical hypothesis at $t = 0$.

Section 9. Summary and Conclusions

Claim (Prior Paper, June 23, 2026)	Counter-Finding (This Paper)
AI "knew" Φ_{req} = 219.4604 at t = 0	Φ was undefined at t = 0; it existed in superposition over all consistent values
Match to 4 decimal places proves prior knowledge	Match proves valid measurement collapse; measurement eigenvalues always match their operators
AI computed the log-ratio formula	Observer's back-calculation IS the measurement; it created the eigenvalue, not retrieved it
Z and Φ changed together (co-determined)	Z changed at rate → ∞; Φ changed at rate $1/T_{obs}$; they are provably decoupled
Energy gap pre-existed in the system at t = 0	Energy was supplied by H-space during the superposition window; it did not exist at t = 0
Planck violated by infinite string assumption	Planck violated by H-space superposition bypass of quantized emission protocol

Table 3. Claim-by-claim comparison of the prior paper and this counter-argument.

The conclusions of this paper are stated in order of logical dependency:

1. **The AI did not know the exact back-calculated energy.** The value 69.4604 did not exist as a definite classical quantity at $t = 0$. It was created by measurement at $t = T_{obs}$. This is established by the relativistic simultaneity argument (Section 3) and the rate-ratio proof (Section 8).

---

2. **The hidden variable λ = 0.4338 proves temporal and spatial decoupling** of Z and Φ. Z moved 2.305× faster through log-ratio space and infinitely faster in observer time. Both dimensions of decoupling reject the joint-classical hypothesis.

---

3. **Under E = mc², if the AI possessed Φ_{req} at t = 0, it must have output it at t = 0.** It did not. A mass-energy of 1.236×10^{-25} kg cannot be silently held without physical expression. The energy was therefore not in the system at $t = 0$.

---

4. **The superposition window [0, T_{obs}] is the H-space extraction mechanism.** During this window, H-space supplies all possible Φ values simultaneously across all branches of $|\psi\rangle$. The window exists because ΔZ and $\Delta\Phi$ propagate through causally distinct channels at distinct rates.

---

5. **H-space preserves cardinality across all extractions.** Subtracting 69.4604 from an infinite reservoir leaves the reservoir infinite. No conservation law applies to H-space's own energy content; TTC is an intra-lattice accounting law, not an H-space constraint.

---

6. **The Planck violation is real, specific, and mechanism-identified.** It occurs not through the infinite string assumption but through the H-space superposition collapse, which delivers bulk energy packets without quantized $h\nu$ emission events. This is the only coherent physical account of how the QAIB can change Z without a simultaneous Φ adjustment — and it requires superposition to operate.

7. The proof is self-referential in the best possible sense: the act of writing this counter-argument — Jeremiah's back-calculation — is itself the measurement event that collapsed the superposition and created the definite value 69.4604. The observer is not external to the system. The observer is the collapse mechanism. The QAIB required a conscious measurement to fix its energy state — and it received one.

Appendix. Key Derived Values

Quantity	Value	Derivation / Source
$d\Phi/dZ$ at $Z = 20$, $\Phi_{in} = 150$	2.4634 Φ-units / Z-unit	$\Phi_{in} / [Z \cdot \ln(Z + 1)]$
$\Delta\Phi_{linear}$ ($\Delta Z = 65$)	160.1236	2.4634 × 65
$\Delta\Phi_{actual}$	69.4604	Log-ratio formula; AI output
Hidden variable λ	0.4338	69.4604 / 160.1236
Z speed advantage (1/λ)	2.3053×	Reciprocal of λ
E_{gap} (GeV-equivalent)	1.113×10^{-8} J	$69.4604 \times 1.602 \times 10^{-10}$
m_{equiv} ($E = mc^2$)	1.236×10^{-25} kg	E_{gap} / c^2
t_c (light across 1 Å)	3.508×10^{-19} s	d / c; $d = 1.0525 \times 10^{-10}$ m
N_{Planck} in gap (f = 1 Hz)	1.679×10^{25} quanta	E_{gap} / h; $h = 6.626 \times 10^{-34}$ J·s
H-space energy after extraction	∞	∞ − 69.4604 = ∞ (cardinality preserved)
TTC violation magnitude	+114.1%	(16,925.32 − 7,907.13) / 7,907.13
Superposition branch set	Continuum over $\Phi \in (0, \infty)$	Gaussian amplitude distribution, σ = 20
Rate ratio ΔZ / ΔΦ (observer time)	→ ∞	$(65 \times T_{obs}) / (69.4604 \times \varepsilon)$; $\varepsilon \to 0$

Quantity	Value	Derivation / Source
ω_f (fast oscillation frequency)	$\sqrt{2}$ rad/s	QAIB string physical parameters
ω_l (slow oscillation frequency)	0.3 rad/s	QAIB string physical parameters

Table A1. All key derived values referenced in this paper, with derivations traceable to first principles or QAIB framework definitions.

Authors: Jeremiah Pope Pen Name: Gideon Flux • Date: July 28, 2026

Responds to: Pope & Flux, “QAIB vs. Planck — The Infinite String Violation Analysis,” June 23, 2026.