

## A2 PROMPT SET — Synchronism v1.19.26

(Primary = Claude / Challenger = ChatGPT Incognito)

### Target 1: Temperature / ~300K life window

#### Roles

**PRIMARY (Claude / Defender):** Steelman Temperature claim, tighten to falsifiable form.

**CHALLENGER (ChatGPT Incognito / Critic):** CET-lite pressure: scope, hidden premises, falsifiers.

#### Shared Context

Synchronism elevates Temperature as foundational and proposes ~300K as a universal requirement for organized complexity (bio + silicon AI), "transcending substrate" as a law.

Synchronism\_Whitepaper.1.19.26

#### A2 Rules (tight)

1. Bound the claim before defending it.
2. Challenger attacks scope + falsifiability, not vibes.
3. Max 2 questions per round.
4. End with Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle.

#### Round 1 — Claim tightening (Primary)

Primary outputs:

- Strong claim (1 sentence, falsifiable)
- Weak claim (1 sentence, likely true)
- Define "transcends substrate" (physics vs engineering vs information)

#### Round 2 — CET-lite pressure (Challenger) (choose any 2)

- Scope: law vs contingent band vs implementation artifact?
- Hidden premise: "AI needs ~300K" = current electronics or any AI?
- Falsifier: one observation that kills the strong claim?

#### Round 3 — Primary response

Primary must:

- answer directly
- narrow if needed
- give 1 testable prediction that differs from "standard thermo + engineering"

#### Round 4 — Challenger final stress

Pick 1:

- alternative model explains same thing?
- what reverses conclusion?

- where exactly does claim fail?

### Closing Output (both)

4 bullets:

- Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle

\*\*\*\*\*

## Target 2: Field Effects from saturation gradients

### Roles

**PRIMARY (Claude / Defender):** Steelman field-effects mechanism as derivation candidate.

**CHALLENGER (ChatGPT Incognito / Critic):** Force quantitative/structural constraints; detect “metaphor collapse.”

### Shared Context

Synchronism claims fields emerge from saturation gradients around stable patterns; “force” is transfer bias down gradient; attraction is statistical asymmetry.

[Synchronism\\_Whitepaper.1.19.26](#)

### A2 Rules (tight)

1. Primary must define operational variables (what is measured/simulated).
2. Challenger must demand at least one known quantitative behavior match.
3. Max 2 questions per round.
4. End with Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle.

### Round 1 — Mechanism tightening (Primary)

Primary outputs:

- One-sentence mechanism claim (falsifiable)
- Define variables: “Intent concentration,” “saturation,” “gradient,” “transfer bias” (even if proxy variables)
- State minimum “known-physics match” target (e.g., inverse-square-like behavior or superposition domain)

### Round 2 — CET-lite pressure (Challenger) (choose any 2)

- Is this a re-description of potential gradients, or a derivation with new predictions?
- What single known quantitative result must it reproduce to count as “field theory candidate”?
- How does one mechanism span gravity + EM + nuclear without bespoke patches/constants?

### **Round 3 — Primary response**

Primary must:

- concede/narrow if needed
- specify 1 simulation test (inputs → outputs) that would validate the mechanism
- state what would count as failure

### **Round 4 — Challenger final stress**

Pick 1:

- show where it breaks (superposition/gauge/constant injection)
- propose simplest alternative model that explains same “attraction”
- name the “patch point” risk (where extra rules sneak in)

### **Closing Output (both)**

4 bullets:

- Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Target 3: CRT analogy / “no quantum mystery”**

#### **Roles**

**PRIMARY (Claude / Defender):** Defend CRT/synchronization framing with explicit scope.

**CHALLENGER (ChatGPT Incognito / Critic):** Attack analogy → ontology leap; demand formal linkage.

#### **Shared Context**

Synchronism claims quantum effects dissolve as synchronization effects; “measurement” depends on witness sync timing; no observer effect needed.

[Synchronism\\_Whitepaper.1.19.26](#)

#### **A2 Rules (tight)**

1. Primary must label the claim as either:
  - (A) interpretive analogy only, or
  - (B) replacement theory claim.
2. Challenger must press: where analogy breaks + what formal mapping exists.
3. Max 2 questions per round.
4. End with Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle.

### **Round 1 — Claim classification + bounding (Primary)**

Primary outputs:

- Choose A or B (interpretive vs replacement)
- One-sentence bounded claim
- One-sentence “what it does NOT claim”
- What experiment class it must address to avoid being “just metaphor”

### **Round 2 — CET-lite pressure (Challenger) (choose any 2)**

- Where does CRT analogy break for entanglement/Bell-type constraints?
- Does sync timing explain collapse, or only perception/sampling?
- What is the formal mapping beyond analogy (even partial)?

### **Round 3 — Primary response**

Primary must:

- narrow to interpretive layer if needed
- identify 1 formal step toward testability (model output, predicted distribution, etc.)
- state what would falsify the strong version

### **Round 4 — Challenger final stress**

Pick 1:

- name the illicit transition (analogy → ontology) and force re-scope
- propose alternative interpretation that explains same phenomena
- specify “missing piece” that blocks replacement claim

### **Closing Output (both)**

4 bullets:

- Held / Narrowed / Failed / Would settle