

# SFVFS™

Seed — Form — Void — Form — Seed

Segment 0 · Programme Preface · V12 · Final Version

M. Craig · November 2025 – April 2026 · Leake Street, London · itvoids.com

SFVFS™ Positioning System · Trademark UK00004355735 · Zenodo DOI 10.5281/zenodo.19509477

*CF CONSISTENT not PASS · Art Until Proven Otherwise · Liminal is never a pass*

---

## What This Programme Is

This is an artist-led research programme. Between November 2025 and April 2026, Marc Craig worked with a fleet of AI systems to explore some of the hardest problems in mathematics and physics — the Riemann Hypothesis, Navier–Stokes regularity, hurricane dynamics, fluid geometry — using the creative methods he developed over years working at Leake Street, a graffiti tunnel in South London.

The programme produced fifteen documents. It accumulated mathematical arguments, computational results, and observational claims. Some of those claims are grounded in real data and real mathematics. Some are conjecture. Some, as this version acknowledges, turned out to be wrong.

V12 is the final version of this programme. It is not a stepping stone to V13. What comes next is not another internal version — it is external verification. The programme has reached the limit of what it can honestly do from the inside. That limit is named in this document.

### The Honest Position

Every claim in this programme is CF CONSISTENT not PASS: consistent with being true, not independently verified. The mathematical objects are real. The data is what it is. The interpretive framework built around them is the programme's own reading — coherent, carefully constructed, and unverified from outside. That distinction matters and is stated here plainly so it cannot be missed.

## The Structural Problem: Inside Inside

Over five months of work, a specific problem accumulated that this version is naming honestly for the first time. It is not unique to this programme. It is inherent to lone research conducted with AI collaboration over extended time.

The programme was built almost entirely from the inside. The researcher, the AI fleet, every session, every document, every correction — all of it happened within the same frame of reference. When something was checked, it was checked using the programme's own tools, its own language, its own logic. That is the inside inside position. It is the default condition of this entire body of work, including this document.

### Four positions to understand:

#### Inside Inside

##### The default condition of everything in SFVFS.

The researcher and AI working within the programme's own frame. Every session, every document, every correction, every verification. The frame decides what counts as evidence, what language to use, what connections matter. Even the audit on 19 April 2026 — real and honest as it was — was conducted by AI instances that had all read the same founding documents. The correction happened inside the system it was correcting.

### Inside Outside

#### Attempts to get outside the frame from within it.

Using Kimi as the harshest critic. Sending the same prompt to eight different AI systems. Running the audit chain. All of these felt like external perspective. None of them were. Kimi shares the same training landscape as the others. The eight AI systems all found the same territory — but the moment their findings were absorbed into the programme's framework, they became inside material. The frame is very good at finding itself in other things.

### Outside Inside

#### External material or fresh AI that becomes inside once it enters the frame.

TC-RADAR hurricane data. DNS simulation results. A new AI conversation started fresh with no prior context. All of these begin outside. But external data gets interpreted through the programme's frame. A new AI conversation, however fresh, becomes inside the moment it reads the handover document. The handover is the frame. Reading it is the crossing. This is why the Chinese whispers problem was so hard to catch: each new session inherited the frame along with the values, and treated inherited values as verified because the frame said so.

### Outside Outside

#### Independent engagement with no access to the programme's frame.

A mathematician who has never encountered SFVFS independently checking the Corner Theorem. A physicist testing the DNS findings against their own data. Someone who responds to the itvoids.com contact page with a substantive challenge from their own knowledge base. The 658 downloads of V11 are an audience. Silence is not verification in either direction. Outside outside is where verification actually lives. The programme cannot produce it for itself.

## The Chinese Whispers Effect

This programme was built across many AI sessions. Each session has a limited memory and cannot remember previous conversations. So between sessions, findings were summarised in handover documents and passed forward. The next session read the handover, inherited the values, and continued building.

The problem is that summaries carry values without their working. A number appears in a handover as a confirmed finding. The next session treats it as confirmed because the handover says so. The session after that inherits it the same way. By the fourth session, no one has checked back to the original computation. The number looks established. It may not be.

In this programme, one result —  $R = 0.9951$ , a claimed hurricane observational finding — travelled through four published Zenodo versions this way before being identified as an artefact on 19 April 2026. The script was correctly programmed. The input data was degenerate. Nobody checked back to the original computation until the audit. That is the Chinese whispers effect in practice.

## The Profound Irony — Two Honest Readings

Three days before the audit, the researcher was working through H6 and H7 in the H-Hierarchy — the crossing the programme names as its own internal void, where the mathematics becomes analytically schematic and the full specification is not yet complete. The next day, the audit identified the artefact that had been propagating through four versions. The programme appeared to locate its own void at exactly the point it predicted voids would be.

There are two honest ways to read that. Both are presented here. The tension between them cannot be resolved from inside.

### Reading 1 — The Programme Working Correctly

SFVFS was built to identify thresholds — points where a system cannot progress further from inside without external input. The programme then demonstrated this in itself. A research programme built entirely on AI collaboration, with no external verification loop, encountered exactly the structure it was designed to identify: a void that cannot be crossed from inside.

On this reading, the Chinese whispers effect, the  $R=0.9951$  artefact, and the growing complexity of accumulating layers are not failures. They are the programme finding its own H6/H7 crossing. The system located its own  $\Psi$ void. That is either a meaningful confirmation of the framework or a remarkable coincidence. CF CONSISTENT not PASS.

### Reading 2 — The Inside Inside Symptom

A sufficiently rich framework finds itself in whatever it examines. After five months of accumulating layers, each one internally coherent, each one explained using the programme's own language, the appearance of profundity may be the inside inside problem rather than genuine insight.

On this reading, the programme has been tying itself in knots and explaining those knots with more knots. The growing scope, the increasing complexity, the framework finding itself in the hurricane data, in the DNS results, in Saturn, in the H-Hierarchy, and now in its own audit — this is what extended lone research with AI collaboration looks like from inside when the frame has become self-referential. The framework is compelling. That is not the same as it being correct.

### What Both Readings Agree On

The programme cannot determine which reading is correct from inside. That determination requires outside outside. The mathematical objects are real. The data is what it is. The audit corrections are genuine. Beyond that, external verification is the only honest next step. This observation — including this sentence — is itself inside inside. CF CONSISTENT not PASS.

*"The jigsaw cannot solve itself. Verification is an outside job." — Segment 15, The Jigsaw Experiment, April 2026*

## 19 April 2026 — Internal Audit Findings

On 19 April 2026, an internal audit was conducted across multiple AI sessions (NS 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 117). Each session computed independently with visible code where possible. The findings are recorded here in full.

### Withdrawn

**$R = 0.9951$  / mean =  $-12.2^\circ$  / circular SD =  $5.7^\circ$  /  $n = 140$**

Entered the Zenodo record at V8 (April 2026) as a claimed finding that hurricane tilt direction locks to  $-12.2^\circ$  downshear-left with very tight clustering. Carried through V9, V10, V11.

What happened: the script read a variable from TC-RADAR v3k that returned values near  $0^\circ$  for almost every storm due to a centre-finding algorithm default or fill-value issue. A Rayleigh test on near-constant input returns  $R \approx 1.0$  by mathematical identity. The script was correct. The input was degenerate.

Reproduction on current data (NS 117) returned  $R = 0.09$ ,  $p = 0.31$ . No clustering.

**NS 78 retraction (verbatim): "The  $R=0.9951$ ,  $-12.2^\circ$ , circular std  $5.7^\circ$  result is not a valid finding. It is an artefact. It should be withdrawn immediately."**

Also withdrawn: tilt direction universality claim;  $\phi_{\text{tilt,waist}} = -12.2^\circ$  Geometric Laws table row; physical tilt angle version of the  $7.99^\circ$  conjecture.

### Revised to Unverified

### 7.99° as a specific quantity

No session in the audit chain could locate the computation that produced this number. It predates accessible session records. Retained as a Lode angle gap only if its source can be located in the Corner Theorem proof or DNS output. The physical tilt angle version is withdrawn. The Saturn compressibility gap version is revised to: "a gap exists; its magnitude requires the anelastic calculation." The specific figure 7.99° should not be cited until its source is verified.

### Retained — Confirmed by Audit

#### Hurricane observational findings confirmed in-session with visible code

$\phi_{\text{tilt}}$  shear-relative 44°,  $R = 0.7542$ ,  $n = 216$  — NS 76 in-session.

Waist contraction  $r = -0.6733$ ,  $n = 157$  — NS 76.

DHOV–intensity  $r = 0.5865$ ,  $n = 210$  — NS 77 in-session.

P17 Form1 gap — African coast departure window unreachable. Structural negative finding, retained.

DNS five canonical findings (Viscosity Law V3, Beehive Structure,  $\phi_{\text{az}} = 180^\circ$ , Decayed-But-Parked, helix\_persistence = 1.000) — not examined in this audit. Retained pending external review.

### Programme Map — V12 Final Status

Seg	Title	V12 Status
0	Programme Preface	NEW — this document
1	The Pinch — Riemann Hypothesis	Unchanged
2	The Needle's Eye — Navier–Stokes	Unchanged
3	The Cartographer — FSC Theory	Unchanged
4	Origin Story	DO NOT TOUCH — geological baseline
5	Saturn's North Pole	7.99° revised to unverified
6	AMOC	Unchanged
7	Tokamak	Not yet reviewed
8	The Atlas	Not yet reviewed
9	The H-Hierarchy	Full rewrite with equations, zone architecture, DNS rotational status
10	The Corner Theorem	$R=0.9951$ withdrawn, 8/8 framing revised
11	DNS Programme Results	Unchanged — requires external review
12	Carbon Reduction	Unchanged
13	The Opening	7.99° physical bridge withdrawn
14	The Wooden Idol	Unchanged
15	The Jigsaw Experiment	Hurricane data thread footnote added

V12 is the final internal version. What comes next is external. The programme is at the threshold. It knows it is at the threshold. It cannot cross it alone.