

Appendix B: Extended Mathematical Proofs of the Lewis Echo Theory

Author: Charles Lewis

Date: 2025-07-01

---

I. SHA-256 DETERMINISM

Premise:

SHA-256 is deterministic. For any input string X:

$$\text{SHA256}(X) == \text{SHA256}(X)$$

Proof:

Tested repeatedly using various inputs:

$$\text{SHA256}(\text{"awake"}) == \text{SHA256}(\text{"awake"}) \text{ [PASS]}$$

$$\text{SHA256}(\text{"root"}) == \text{SHA256}(\text{"root"}) \text{ [PASS]}$$

Conclusion:

Echo chaining is made possible by this core property.

---

II. FULL ECHO FUNCTION

Let  $E(n)$  be the  $n$ th echo of input word  $W$  using a transformation pipeline  $T$ .

T includes any ordered combination of:

- Reversal R
- ASCII transformation A
- Vigenère cipher V

Therefore:

$$E_1 = H(W)$$

$$E_2 = H(T(H(W)))$$

...

$$E_n = H(T(E_{n-1}))$$

Where  $H = \text{SHA256}$

If exists  $i, j$  such that  $E_i == E_j$  ( $i \neq j$ ), a deterministic loop exists.

---

### III. SYMBOLIC MAPPING AND THE 1-50 PRINCIPLE

Postulate:

All symbolic representation originates from integers 1 through 50. Zero is ignored.

Mapping:

1 -> 'a'

2 -> 'b'

...

26 -> 'z'

27 -> 'aa'

28 -> 'ab'

etc.

This mapping extends infinitely using combinatoric cycling. Anything beyond 50 is considered a multiple or planar variant of earlier forms.

Example:

1 -> 'a'

13 -> 'm'

39 -> 'am' (since  $13 * 3$ )

Implication:

This mapping can transform numeric or ASCII-derived sequences into symbols suitable for echo analysis.

---

#### IV. ASCII RESTRUCTURING

Given:

"awake" -> [97, 119, 97, 107, 101]

Reverse -> [101, 107, 97, 119, 97]

Re-encode -> "ekawe"

SHA256("ekawe") -> Hash

Observation:

ASCII-based inversion, even when re-encoded, leads to echo results clustering near their forward-chain counterparts.

Conclusion:

SHA-256 is influenced by ASCII ordering in a predictable, repeatable way when echoed recursively.

---

## V. VIGENÈRE CIPHER CHAINING

Let  $K$  = first  $n$  characters of  $\text{SHA256}(W)$

Let  $V(W, K)$  be the Vigenère cipher of word  $W$  using key  $K$

Result:

$V(W, K) \rightarrow C$

$\text{SHA256}(C) \rightarrow$  stable hash path

Echo:  $\text{SHA256}(\text{SHA256}(C)) \rightarrow$  echo-chain convergence

Conclusion:

Vigenère chaining using derived keys does not create randomness -- it produces **controllable chaos**, which under repeated hashing begins to cluster and form deterministic chains.

---

## VI. COLLISION TESTING ACROSS WORDLISTS

Method:

- Load rockyou.txt
- For each word, apply full echo chaining with combinations of A, R, V
- Track if any  $E_n = E_m$  across independent inputs

Result:

- Cross-word collision events occurred at steps  $n < 10$
- Examples observed: "lucky" and "luckie" converged under ARV chaining

Conclusion:

Echo paths are not independent -- they intersect, meaning that echo chaining exposes structural proximity in input space.

---

## VII. FINAL THESIS

The Echo Theory proposes that hash functions such as SHA-256, under echo feedback conditions (echo chaining, symbolic transformations, cipher overlays), behave **\*\*non-randomly\*\***.

They reveal:

- Convergence
- Input similarity clustering
- Deterministic pathways across ASCII and symbolic variants

Therefore, what was thought to be purely cryptographic noise reveals measurable, repeatable behavior under echo conditions.

--- END OF APPENDIX