FORMAL RECORD 11

# The GBSH Correspondence

*Gildenston — Bell — Sapolsky — Hoffman*

*On the Closure Condition for Sovereign Governance Under Contestation*


| | |
|---|---|
| **Author:** | Stacy Gildenston |
| **Affiliation:** | 3primitives.io |
| **Version:** | v2.0 \| May 2026 |
| **License:** | CC BY 4.0 \| https://3primitives.io/formal_records/ |
| **Dependencies:** | FR1, FR7, FR10 v2.0, FR13 v2.0 |


*v2.0 introduces a constructive domain restriction for the functional: governance events are admissible only if they satisfy the Path-Aware Gap Accessibility Condition (FR10, Corollary 4.5) and the Structural Coupling Test, which includes a State-Change Decision Node (SCDN) and the logical decoupling condition ∂Outcome/∂R_S = 0. The admissible domain is formalised as a directed graph 𝒢 with causal dependency edges. The functional is redefined as a double infimum over primitives and admissible events, subject to the friction constraint f(g) ≤ f_max(g). If the admissible domain is empty, the functional is undefined, triggering stewardship intervention (FR13). These additions were driven by FR13's coupling theorem, which specified the precision standard the evaluation layer had to meet for the coupled corpus to close.*


**Abstract.** FR10 (Primitive Stability Theorem) defines the effective primitive value as the infimum of a governance primitive across all states in which the subject exercises legitimate contestation. This record names that operator the Gildenston Functional and demonstrates that it is the closure condition required to make four independent theoretical streams — Bell's non-locality, Sapolsky's biological determinism, Hoffman's Interface Theory, and the Three Primitives governance architecture — operationally stable for a human subject. Without the functional, each stream describes a necessary structural requirement that cannot be enforced. With it, the corpus from FR1 through FR13 closes into a deterministic architecture in which simulated governance cannot pass as real.


## 0. Dependencies and Prerequisites

This record depends on the following prior works. Readers should be familiar with these before proceeding.

**Three Primitives — Canonical Logic Sequence (FR1)**

Proves that action-mapping is non-unique: the same input state permits multiple incompatible authority assignments. This establishes that declared authority is not derivable from system outputs and must be supplied externally. The non-uniqueness result is the upstream condition that makes a closure operator necessary. First author: Pyrate Ruby Passell.

**Bell Non-Closure and the Law of Declared Authority (FR7)**

Proves formally that a governance decision outcome cannot be explained by variables local to the system producing it, and that declared authority must therefore originate externally. The Bell translation used throughout Section 2 of this record depends on that result.

**Primitive Stability Theorem (FR10 v2.0)**

Defines the effective primitive value as the infimum of a governance primitive across all states in which the subject exercises legitimate contestation. Proves that a primitive is satisfied only if both its static and effective values meet the ADCI-grounded threshold. Contains the operator this record names. v2.0 adds the friction coefficient f(g), per-event and cumulative friction constraints, and the Path-Aware Gap Accessibility Condition (GAC).

**ILMM Coupling Theorem (FR13 v2.0)**

Defines the Four Powers of Stewardship, the Transparency Kill Switch, and the Structural Gap Audit requirement. FR13 specified the precision standard the detection and evaluation layers had to meet for the coupled corpus to close. The admissible domain D and the undefined functional state are the formal triggers for stewardship intervention.

*Throughout this record, 'correspondence' denotes a structural correspondence: the same formal constraint operating independently across domains, not a surface analogy between them. The distinction is developed in Section 2.*

---

## 1. The Gildenston Functional

### 1.1 Effective Primitive Value (from FR10)

FR10, Definition 2.3 defines the effective primitive value as:

```
P_i^eff = inf { P_i(t') : t' >= t, R_S(t') ≠ 0 }
```

We name this operator the Gildenston Functional.

The naming is not nominal. It identifies a specific mathematical object with a specific structural role: the closure operator that maps a governance primitive to its floor value under legitimate subject contestation. It is the only operator in the corpus that distinguishes a real governance primitive from a simulated one, because it is the only operator conditioned on resistance rather than rest.

Three properties make it the correct operator for this role.

**Property 1 — Dynamic**
The functional does not measure the primitive at a single moment. It tracks the primitive across all future states in which the subject acts.

**Property 2 — Adversarially Conditioned**
The infimum is taken precisely when the subject pushes back. This is not a stress test applied externally. It is the value the system reveals when the person the decision was made about exercises their legitimate right to contest it.

**Property 3 — Floor-Seeking**
Maximum and average operators permit masking. A snapshot permits gaming. The infimum does not. It finds the lowest value the primitive reaches under contestation — the only value that cannot be manufactured by a compliant subject.

These three properties together produce what static measurement cannot: adversarial truth — adversarial in the game-theoretic sense, not in the sense of hostility. The Gildenston Functional does not ask whether the primitive appears satisfied. It asks whether the primitive survives the one test that cannot be simulated — the subject's own resistance.

The Gildenston Functional is not evaluated over hypothetical future states. It is measured over realized resistance trajectories — the actual contestation events that occur when a subject exercises an element of $R_S$. This makes it loggable, auditable, and operationally testable. The infimum is not a prediction. It is a record.

The evaluation horizon is not infinite. It extends across all states causally downstream of the contested decision. A system cannot pass the functional during a contestation window and then degrade

outcomes in states caused by that decision. Those downstream states fall within the trajectory. The functional closes that evasion path. The evaluation horizon is decision-bounded: it covers states causally downstream of and attributable to the contested decision within the system boundary. It does not extend to global or indefinite causal chains.

## 1.2 Admissible Domain D (Structural Coupling Test)

A governance event g belongs to the admissible domain D only if it satisfies the Structural Coupling Test:

**1. State-Change Decision Node (SCDN)** – There exists a formal terminus in the decision process where the subject's resistance vector $R_S$ is a required input variable for the authority resolution function $f(A, R_S)$.

**2. Logical Decoupling (Primary Definition)** – The coupling fails if $R_S$ is excluded from the decision-making logic. Formally:

$$\partial \text{Outcome}/\partial R\_S = 0$$

is prohibited for any admissible event. The partial derivative notation is formal shorthand for functional dependence: the outcome must be a function of $R_S$. It does not require differentiability of the outcome function over the discrete action space of $R_S$.

**3. Path-Aware Gap Accessibility (FR10, Corollary 4.5)** – The subject must be able to exercise $R_S$ within the Intervention Gap $\delta t$, evaluated against actual system state (including load effects, procedural drift, observer degradation). The contestation path must reach the original governance decision within a bounded number of steps relative to the applicable ILMM life stage and decision urgency. No event in the sequence may be structurally foreclosed by contesting another.

If any of the above fails, the event is not in D. It is reclassified as coercion or Ghost Authority by Silence-Dependency, and the Gildenston Functional is not evaluated over it.

## 1.3 Lemma 1.1 — Constructive Structural Map

Admissibility must be proven via a directed graph $\mathcal{G} = (V, E)$, where:

Nodes $V = \{ V_{subject}, V_{admissibility}, V_{SCDN} \}$ (other intermediate nodes may be added as needed).

Edges E are defined as causal dependency relations. An edge (u, v) exists only if a state change at v is functionally dependent on an input from u.

**Requirement:** For any event g to be in D, there must exist a path in $\mathcal{G}$ from $V_{subject}$ to $V_{SCDN}$ that is both:

**Connected** – a logical causal link exists;

**Traversable** – satisfies the time/cost constraints of FR10 (i.e., $f(g) \leq f_{max}(g)$ and the cumulative friction bound, and the path-aware GAC holds for the sequence).

***Proof:*** *If the graph contains no such path, then either the subject's resistance cannot causally affect the decision outcome (disconnected) or the path exceeds the reversibility window (non-traversable). In either case, the event fails the Structural Coupling Test and is excluded from D.* ∎

The graph $\mathcal{G}$ must be provided by the system as part of its governance design documentation. Its edges are not inferred from runtime behaviour; they are specified as structural requirements. Admissibility fails unless $\mathcal{G}$ explicitly identifies a connected, traversable path from $V_{subject}$ to $V_{SCDN}$.

## 1.4 The Reformulated Functional (Double Infimum)

Let D be the set of all governance events that satisfy the Structural Coupling Test (Section 1.2) and Lemma 1.1. For each $g \in D$, the friction constraint $f(g) \leq f_{max}(g)$ must hold, where f(g) is defined in FR10 Definition 4.3 and $f_{max}(g)$ in FR10 Corollary 4.4a.

The Gildenston Functional G is then:

```
G = inf_{g ∈ D, f(g) ≤ f_max(g)}  inf_{i ∈ {A, L, R, ADCI}}
P_i^eff(g)
```

The outer infimum runs over all admissible events satisfying the friction constraint.

The inner infimum runs over all governance primitives (Authority, Legitimacy, Resistance, and the four ADCI primitives).

G represents the lowest effective primitive value across the weakest valid governance event.

*The double infimum is equivalent to the infimum over the product set D × {A, L, R, ADCI}. Because primitive values are bounded below by zero and D is non-empty, the infimum exists and the order of the two infima does not affect the result.*

**Domain emptiness:** If D = ∅, then G is undefined. This signals total governance failure and triggers stewardship intervention (see FR13, Section 6).

**Non-empty domain proof (from ILMM):** The ILMM life stages (Child, Teen, Early Career, Mid-Career, Senior Career) provide configurations where exogenous support (Child/Teen) or self-managed access (Mid-Career) maintain path-aware GAC and satisfy the friction constraints. Therefore, under nominal system operation, D ≠ ∅. A system that cannot produce a non-empty D is not a governance system.

---

## 2. The Four Streams

The GBSH Correspondence names four theoretical streams that converge on the Gildenston Functional as their necessary closure condition. Each stream describes a real structural requirement. None of them is operational without the functional. This section states what each stream contributes and what it cannot do alone.

The Primitive Stability Theorem (FR10) establishes independently that resistance-tested measurement is necessary: static measurement cannot distinguish compliance from simulated compliance, and a primitive that collapses under legitimate contestation was not satisfied at the time of measurement. The GBSH Correspondence does not re-prove that result. It demonstrates something different: that Bell, Sapolsky, and Hoffman each independently require this same operator to be present in any governance system grounded in their results. The streams do not derive the functional. FR10 derives it. The streams show why no system that takes their results seriously can operate without it. That is a correspondence, not a proof chain. It is also not an analogy.

The four streams are not analogies. An analogy borrows surface resemblance between domains. A structural correspondence identifies the same formal constraint operating independently across domains. Bell's result is not like the non-derivability of authority — it is the same logical structure operating in a different domain: an output that cannot be explained by variables local to the producing system. Sapolsky's result is not like a floor constraint on the Intervention Gap — it is the floor constraint: behaviour is the causal output of prior biological states, and those states have non-negotiable latency. Hoffman's result is not like the irreducibility of Interpretive Authority — it is the mechanism: the interface is constructed, its construction is controlled, and the subject navigates a surface they did not build. In each case the governance translation is not metaphor. It is the same impossibility result appearing in a different domain. The Gildenston Functional is the operator that makes that shared constraint enforceable.

The governance translation of Bell's theorem is not asserted in this record. It is proven in Bell Non-Closure and the Law of Declared Authority (FR7), which establishes formally that a governance decision outcome cannot be explained by variables local to the system producing it, and that declared

authority must therefore originate externally. This record depends on that result. Readers who dispute the Bell translation should engage FR7 directly.

**v2.0 note:** The sovereign gate described in Section 2.4 is now made constructive by the admissible domain D and Lemma 1.1. The gate is not open because the system says it is open; it is open because the structural map $\mathcal{G}$ contains a connected, traversable path from subject resistance to the SCDN, and the friction constraints are satisfied.

## 2.1 Bell — Non-Locality and the Open Door

Bell's theorem proves that measurement outcomes in entangled systems cannot be explained by local hidden variables. The cause of a correlated outcome cannot be found inside the local system. It must come from outside. This is the same logical structure operating in a different domain: an output that cannot be explained by variables local to the producing system.

The governance translation is precise. A system cannot derive the authority for a decision from its own outputs. The legitimacy of a governance interaction cannot be located inside the variables the system controls. This is the structural warrant for the Law of Declared Authority: authority must be declared from outside the system's own operation, or it does not exist.

Bell leaves the door open. It proves the external cause is required. It does not enforce the boundary. It does not verify that the declared authority survives contact with the subject. A system can satisfy the declaration requirement and still produce simulated compliance. Bell's contribution is necessary. It is not sufficient.

> ***Without the Gildenston Functional, Bell describes an open door with no sovereign gate.***

One attack on this architecture deserves explicit closure: a system cannot satisfy the functional by generating or controlling the resistance against which it is tested. Resistance is valid only if it originates outside the system's control surface. This is not an additional requirement — it follows directly from Bell's non-locality result and Hoffman's interface boundary. A system that controls the interface controls what the subject perceives as available to them. Resistance that the system designs, permits selectively, or routes through sandboxed channels is interface output, not subject contestation. The functional measures the subject's resistance. Not the system's representation of it.

Legitimate resistance requires one clarification. It is not defined morally or procedurally. Legitimate resistance is any subject-originating action that attempts to alter, reject, or reinterpret the decision outcome within the subject's accessible action space. This definition avoids both system control and unbounded subjectivity. It does not require the resistance to be coherent, well-formed, or successful. It requires only that it originate with the subject and target the decision outcome.

Resistance and primitive value are independent objects. Resistance is defined by its origin and target: a subject-originating action directed at a decision outcome. Primitive value is defined by the ADCI thresholds established in FR3. Neither definition references the other. The functional takes resistance as input and returns primitive value as output. There is no circularity.

## 2.2 Sapolsky — Determinism and the Unread Clock

Sapolsky's account of biological determinism establishes that human behaviour is the causal output of prior biological and environmental states. A decision made about a person lands in a biological system with non-negotiable latency. The person cannot process, recognise, and respond to a governance decision faster than their neurobiology permits.

This is the physical warrant for the Gap Accessibility Condition in FR10 Corollary 4.2. The Intervention Gap is not an administrative courtesy. It is a biological requirement. A contestation window that closes before the subject's causal chain has had time to produce a response is not a window. It is a scheduled opening that the subject's own biology prevents them from using.

Sapolsky gives the functional its floor constraint. The infimum cannot be taken over a resistance vector the subject's biology has not had time to activate. δt has a hard minimum that is not set by regulation. It is set by the meat.

Sapolsky describes the clock. He does not enforce that anyone is required to read it. A governance framework can acknowledge biological latency and still set contestation windows that violate it. The Gildenston Functional is what makes the floor enforceable — because a primitive whose effective value is taken before the subject could biologically activate $R_S$ was never validly measured.

> ***Without the Gildenston Functional, Sapolsky describes a biological clock with no one required to read it.***

## 2.3 Hoffman — Interface Theory and the Unowned Surface

Hoffman's Interface Theory of Perception establishes that organisms do not perceive reality directly. They perceive a fitness-tuned interface — a constructed surface that represents the world in terms useful for survival, not in terms that correspond to its actual structure. The self is a feature of that interface, not an observer outside it.

The governance translation is this: the subject does not encounter the governance system directly. They encounter an interface. What they perceive, what they are told, what options appear available to them — these are all interface features. The system controls the interface. The subject navigates it.

Interpretive Authority — the I in ADCI — is the requirement that the subject owns the meaning of what happens to them in a governance interaction. Hoffman proves why this cannot be assumed. The interface is constructed. Its construction is controlled. A system that controls the interface controls what the subject perceives as available to them, including whether resistance appears possible at all.

This is the mechanism behind Ghost Authority by Silence-Dependency. The subject does not activate $R_S$ not because they have no right to, but because the interface has been constructed in a way that makes contestation invisible, inaccessible, or apparently futile. The silence is manufactured at the interface layer.

The Gildenston Functional is what breaks that. It does not ask what the interface presented. It asks what value the primitive reaches when the subject actually pushes back — regardless of what the interface suggested was possible. It restores Interpretive Authority by making the subject's resistance the test, not the system's representation of the subject's options.

> ***Without the Gildenston Functional, Hoffman describes an interface with no one guaranteed the right to interpret it.***

One evasion path remains after blocking system-generated resistance: a system may permit genuine resistance while systematically degrading its effectiveness — increasing friction, narrowing feasible paths, nudging toward low-impact contestation. This fails the Control condition in ADCI. A system that degrades the effectiveness of subject resistance reduces the primitive value under the functional. Structural weakening of resistance is not distinct from suppression of resistance. The functional measures what resistance achieves, not merely that it occurred. The friction coefficient (FR10, Definition 4.3) and the per-event friction bound (FR10, Corollary 4.4a) formalise the line between cost and suppression: resistance that exceeds the friction bound has been structurally suppressed regardless of whether it remains nominally available.

## 2.4 Gildenston — Closure and the Sovereign Gate

The three streams above describe real requirements. Non-locality requires external authority. Biological determinism requires a usable gap. Interface theory requires that the subject own the meaning of their interaction. None of them enforces these requirements. None of them can detect when a system appears to satisfy them while failing under resistance.

The Gildenston Functional is the closure condition. It takes the requirements the other three streams identify and makes them testable at the only moment that counts — when the subject pushes back.

A governance primitive is satisfied if and only if it meets its threshold both at rest and under resistance. That is the sovereign gate. Not the declaration of authority. Not the architectural openness of the gap. Not the formal availability of an appeal mechanism. The floor value of the primitive when the subject actually contests.

The gate is not open because the system says it is open. The gate is open because it remains open when the subject tests it.

---

## 3. Why the Infimum Is the Right Operator

Maximum is optimistic. It finds the best the primitive can be. Governance validity is not established by best cases.

Average is maskable. High values under silence offset low values under resistance. A system optimised for static measurement will produce exactly this distribution. The average passes. The subject is not protected.

Snapshot is gameable. A measurement taken at the moment of decision captures the primitive under compliance, not under contestation. Systems optimised to avoid detection will produce high snapshot values reliably.

The infimum is none of these. It finds the lowest value the primitive reaches when the subject activates any element of their legitimate resistance vector. It cannot be gamed by producing high values at other moments. It cannot be masked by averaging. It does not ask what the system looked like before the subject acted. It asks what the system becomes when they do.

The infimum is the correct operator because it is the only one that simultaneously satisfies all three required properties: it is dynamic across future states, it is conditioned on resistance rather than rest, and it is floor-seeking rather than optimistic or average. Each property is necessary. Maximum satisfies none. Average satisfies the first but not the second or third. Snapshot satisfies none under adversarial conditions. A composite operator combining floor-seeking with resistance-conditioning would replicate the infimum over $R_S$ by construction. No weaker operator satisfies all three. The infimum is not asserted as unique by stipulation. It is the minimal operator that meets the requirements the other three streams independently establish.

The functional is not a statistical estimator. It does not characterise typical system behaviour or average performance across resistance events. It is a breach detector. A single valid resistance event that reveals a sub-threshold primitive value is sufficient to invalidate the primitive claim. One instance of collapse under legitimate contestation means the primitive was not satisfied at the time of measurement. The floor is not a trend. It is a threshold.

The functional is defined only over non-empty resistance trajectories. If no valid resistance occurs, the functional is not evaluated. Absence of resistance yields non-evaluation, not satisfaction. An uncontested primitive is unmeasured. It does not pass. This is a structural design choice, not an operational gap: a governance system is never “known good,” only “not yet shown bad.” The burden of demonstrating validity through resistance-tested measurement sits with the system, not with the subject’s willingness to contest.

The double infimum (over primitives and over admissible events) ensures that the weakest primitive across the weakest accessible event determines validity. A single sub-threshold value anywhere in D collapses G.

---

## 4. The Correspondence

The four streams are not parallel contributions. They are a dependency chain that terminates in a closure condition.

Bell establishes that the authority cause must come from outside. Sapolsky establishes that the subject needs biological time to act on it. Hoffman establishes that the subject must own the meaning of the interface through which they act. The Gildenston Functional establishes that none of the above is enforceable without a resistance-tested floor value for each governance primitive.

Remove any one stream and the architecture weakens. Remove the functional and the other three describe a ghost system — structurally coherent, formally stated, and operationally hollow.

The GBSH Correspondence is not a synthesis of four theoretical positions. It is the proof that the Gildenston Functional was the missing operator in each of them, and that naming it closes the architecture of the Three Primitives corpus from FR1 through FR13.

**The subject is the test. The functional is what makes the test count.**

---

## 5. Implications

Two implications follow directly and do not require further proof.

First: any governance framework that does not evaluate effective primitive values alongside static primitive values is measuring compliance and calling it governance. The distinction is now formal. It has a name. It has an operator. It can be audited.

Second: the populations least likely to activate $R_S$ are the populations most likely to have their simulated compliance go undetected. These are not edge cases. They are the populations every major governance framework claims to protect — children, seniors, people without institutional resources, people navigating systems constructed in terms they did not design. The absence of resistance from these populations is not evidence of validity. It is evidence of an untested system. Silence does not pass the test. It means the test has not been run. The Gildenston Functional makes that distinction formal: an uncontested primitive is not a satisfied primitive. It is an unmeasured one. The burden sits with the system, not with the subject's capacity to push back.

The framework is falsifiable. A governance system passes the Gildenston Functional if and only if every primitive meets its ADCI-grounded threshold under all realized resistance trajectories, across all applicable ILMM life stages, for the full downstream causal horizon of each contested decision. Any system that produces a sub-threshold primitive value under a single valid resistance event has failed. That is the falsifying condition. It is observable, loggable, and not subject to interpretive discretion.

> **Core Finding**
> **Governance that cannot be resistance-tested is not governance. It is a record of silence.**

---

## 6. Integration with FR13 (Stewardship)

The admissible domain D and the undefined state G = ∅ are the formal triggers for the Four Powers of Stewardship defined in FR13 v2.0 (restated here for reader convenience; FR13 §6 is the canonical source):

**1. Latency Verification** – Stewardship may independently measure time($R_{process}$) under load.

**2. Drift Detection** – Stewardship audits sequences for procedural drift, observer degradation, branching foreclosure, and procedural absorption.

**3. Reversibility Enforcement** – Stewardship may halt actions that become irreversible before $R_S$ can be activated.

**4. Transparency Kill Switch** – Stewardship may declare D = ⌀ publicly, publishing the audit trail (the Structural Gap Audit) showing which edges or nodes in $\mathcal{G}$ failed the connectivity or traversability test.

The functional's undefined state is not an error; it is the visible signal that the governance circuit has broken and stewardship must intervene.

---

## 7. Changelog

**v2.0 (May 2026):** FR13's coupling theorem specified the precision standard the evaluation layer had to meet for the coupled corpus to close. The following additions bring the Gildenston Functional to matching formal resolution:

Added admissible domain D with Structural Coupling Test, SCDN, and logical decoupling condition $\partial\text{Outcome}/\partial R_S = 0$.

Added Lemma 1.1 (Constructive Structural Map) with directed graph $\mathcal{G}$, causal dependency edges, connectivity and traversability requirements. The graph is a required design artifact, not runtime inference.

Reformulated Gildenston Functional as a double infimum over D and primitives, subject to friction constraint. Added well-definedness note confirming commutativity over bounded, non-empty sets.

Defined undefined state G = ⌀ as total governance failure, triggering FR13 stewardship.

Added non-empty domain proof referencing ILMM life stages.

Cross-referenced FR10 v2.0 (path-aware GAC, friction coefficient, cumulative constraints) and FR13 v2.0 (Four Powers of Stewardship, Transparency Kill Switch).

Standardised resistance vector notation to $R_S$ (capital S) throughout.

Updated abstract and added Section 6 (Integration with FR13).

All other sections (2–5) unchanged from v1.8.

**v1.8 (May 2026):** Added definitional note on structural correspondence for readability. No proofs, definitions, or logical content changed.

**v1.7:** Added evaluation horizon decision-boundary clarification, explicit non-circularity note, legitimate resistance definition, evasion-path closure for resistance-degradation attacks.

**v1.6:** Added three-property analysis and uniqueness argument for the infimum operator.

**v1.5:** Initial formal record.

**v1.2–v1.4:** Working drafts.

**v1.1:** Initial draft.

---

## Attribution and Licence

build upon this work for any purpose, including commercially, provided you give appropriate credit to 3primitives.io and Stacy Gildenston as originator.

**Suggested citation:**

*Gildenston, S. (2026). The GBSH Correspondence: Gildenston, Bell, Sapolsky, Hoffman. On the Closure Condition for Sovereign Governance Under Contestation. Three Primitives Framework, Formal Record 11, v2.0. Melbourne, Australia. 3primitives.io. CC BY 4.0.*