A CIITR Defence Note

To whoever says “but where are the experiments / benchmarks / ablation studies?”

With no resemblance what so ever, but - in September 1905 Albert Einstein sent a three-page paper titled “*Does the Inertia of a Body Depend Upon Its Energy Content?*” to the Annalen der Physik.

It contained the equation $E = mc^2$.

The manuscript cited exactly zero experiments. No references. No appendices with measurement data. No error bars. Not a single photograph of an apparatus. And surely no particle collider.

The referee could have written: “Interesting speculation, but where is the empirical validation? Where are the controlled trials? Where is the statistical significance?”

He didn’t. Because some claims are not empirical hypotheses awaiting p-values; they are structural theorems about what is possible within a given architecture of reality.

Einstein did not need a particle accelerator to prove that no material object can reach c; he needed only to show that the assumption leads to contradiction inside the formalism itself.

Gödel in 1931 needed no psychological experiments to prove incompleteness; he needed only to construct a sentence that the system cannot prove true without ceasing to be itself.

Penrose in 1989 needed no brain scans to argue that understanding transcends computation; he needed only to exhibit the epistemic gap that remains when the rules are fully specified.

And now, in 2025, when I claim that every backpropagation-trained network has $Rg \equiv 0$ and therefore $C_s \equiv 0$ by invariant, I do not owe an ablation study. I owe a proof that the dynamical degrees of freedom required for rhythmic recursive self-access are structurally absent from any system whose learning rule is of the form $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta \nabla L$.

Demanding “empirical evidence” that a Turing machine cannot solve the halting problem is the same category error as demanding “empirical evidence” that a library with infinitely many books still does not understand a single sentence.

Some limits are not contingencies waiting for the next training run. They are architectural necessities written into the mathematics of the paradigm itself.

$E = mc^2$ needed no particle collider in 1905. CIITR needs no benchmark in 2025.

The proof is in the formalism, or it is nowhere.

Tor-Ståle Hansen, 25 November 2025