INWARD

Complete Experiment 2 Assembly

Construction sequence:

1 -> 12 -> 2 -> 11 -> 3 -> 10 -> 4 -> 9 -> 5 -> 8 -> 6 -> 7

Reading order:

1 -> 2 -> 3 -> 4 -> 5 -> 6 -> Experiment 1 Center Artifact -> 7 -> 8 -> 9 -> 10 -> 11 -> 12

---

1. Problem, Research Question, and Origin of Inward

Writing is commonly consumed in a fixed order, but the cognitive process that produces a written work need not follow that same sequence. Research on writing has long challenged simple linear models of composition. Cognitive-process accounts describe writing as goal-directed and recursive: writers plan, generate, evaluate, and revise while the developing text and their goals interact. Skilled writing has also been characterized as knowledge-transforming, in which material is shaped in response to rhetorical purposes rather than merely recorded as it is retrieved.

This distinction raises a more specific construction problem.

A writer may know substantially more about a story than the next chronological event. The writer may already know the beginning, major characters, a central transformation or revelation, the climax, and the ending. Yet sequential drafting does not necessarily make those future states constructed parts of the manuscript. An ending may exist as an intention or outline while the chapters between the current position and that ending remain an open compositional interval.

Inward Story Construction was deliberately designed to alter that relationship.

Rather than constructing a narrative only from its beginning toward an unwritten future, Inward establishes opposing narrative positions and advances construction from both sides toward the unresolved interior.

For a twelve-part work, its characteristic construction order is:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

The procedure therefore separates reading order from construction order.

Once Chapter 1 exists, Chapter 12 is constructed as an actual terminal narrative state rather than remaining solely an anticipated destination. Chapter 2 is then composed with both Chapter 1 and Chapter 12 already established. Chapter 11 is composed with Chapters 1, 2, and 12 established. Alternation continues until the remaining unwritten interval closes at the center.

The intended consequence is not merely that the writer knows the ending. It is that previously constructed future states become part of the information environment within which subsequent interior sections are composed.

This creates two advancing construction boundaries:

BEGINNING → → unresolved interior ← ← ENDING

As those boundaries move inward, each newly composed section potentially inherits facts, character states, causal requirements, unresolved questions, prohibitions, and other obligations established by material already written on either side.

The central research question is therefore not whether a completed Inward story appears coherent. Coherence alone could result from ordinary outlining, revision, thematic repetition, nonlinear drafting, or retrospective interpretation.

The question is more demanding:

> **Does deliberately alternating construction between established beginning and ending boundaries produce provenance-valid evidence that information from both sides constrains, transforms, preserves, or resolves subsequently composed interior material?**

The distinction between provenance-valid dependency and ordinary literary consistency is essential. If a later analysis identifies a connection between two chapters, the relevant information must actually have existed when the dependent chapter was generated. Repeated imagery, thematic resemblance, or a convincing callback cannot by themselves demonstrate that one construction state constrained another.

The first case examined in this paper is a twelve-chapter fictional narrative deliberately produced in the Inward order stated above. Its completed text is treated as an experimental artifact. Proposed dependencies are evaluated against the chronological record of generation rather than inferred solely from final reading order.

That initial experiment also creates a second question: whether the same construction geometry can operate outside fiction.

Accordingly, this white paper is itself being constructed prospectively using the same twelve-position Inward sequence. Its section architecture, construction order, evidentiary rules, maximum permissible conclusion, revision rules, and failure conditions were fixed before drafting began. Section 1 is the first construction event. Section 12 will be constructed next, followed by Sections 2 and 11, continuing inward until Section 7 is constructed last.

The nonfiction experiment imposes constraints unavailable to unconstrained fiction. Claims must remain consistent not only with previously written sections but with external evidence, source provenance, methodological limitations, and a conclusion whose strength cannot legitimately exceed the evidence supporting it. If the method fails under those conditions, that failure remains part of the result.

This paper therefore investigates Inward at two levels.

First, it examines whether the completed fictional artifact contains evidence of directed constraint propagation under its known construction provenance.

Second, it prospectively tests whether the same outside-in procedure can construct an evidence-bound nonfiction argument while preserving the constraints established from both document boundaries.

Neither experiment begins with the assumption that Inward is superior to sequential writing or to other nonlinear methods. Nor do they establish claims about human cognition, working memory, neurological activity, creativity, or completion rates.

Those remain separate empirical questions.

The narrower proposition tested here is whether **construction from known opposing states can turn future information from a destination into an active constraint on the path used to reach it**.

References used at Construction Event 01

Flower, L., & Hayes, J. R. (1981). A Cognitive Process Theory of Writing. College Composition and Communication, 32(4), 365–387.

Bereiter, C., & Scardamalia, M. (1987). The Psychology of Written Composition. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

2. From Coherence to Directed Dependency

The central methodological problem in evaluating Inward Story Construction is that a finished story can look structurally connected for reasons that have little to do with its construction order.

Writers routinely create callbacks, repeated images, thematic parallels, foreshadowing, mirrored scenes, recurring objects, and character echoes. Revision can strengthen those relationships after a draft exists. A reader encountering only the completed work may therefore identify an impressive connection between two chapters without being able to determine whether one chapter actually constrained the construction of the other.

For the present experiment, that distinction is fundamental.

Inward does not require the claim that every relationship appearing in an Inward-constructed work was caused by the method. Its stronger and more testable proposition is narrower: **when information has already been established on one or both construction boundaries, subsequently composed material can inherit requirements from those established states.**

Demonstrating that proposition requires more than showing that the finished story is coherent.

It requires provenance.

Construction Knowledge Versus Construction State

A writer can possess future knowledge at several levels.

The writer may know that a character survives.

The writer may know the intended climax.

The writer may possess an outline describing the final chapter.

The writer may know the emotional state in which the protagonist should finish.

All of those conditions can influence writing.

They are not, however, identical to constructing the future section itself.

Once a future section has been written, choices that were previously prospective become part of the artifact. The section contains particular language, actions, consequences, objects, character states, resolutions, omissions, and causal commitments.

This paper therefore distinguishes **destination knowledge** from **constructed state**.

Destination knowledge describes something the writer intends or expects to reach.

A constructed state is an actual part of the developing work that exists before the intervening material is composed.

That distinction is necessary because the principal mechanism proposed for Inward depends on the second condition. Inward does not merely alternate attention between ideas about the beginning and ending. It deliberately constructs opposing positions and then composes inside the interval they create.

Nonlinear Drafting Is Not Sufficient Evidence

Writing out of chronological order is also insufficient by itself to demonstrate the proposed mechanism.

A writer might draft Chapter 9 before Chapter 4 because a scene is vivid, convenient, emotionally interesting, or easier to write. Another writer might draft the ending first and then return to the beginning. A third might assemble independent scenes and determine their final order later.

All are nonlinear practices.

The existence of nonlinearity alone does not establish Inward’s stronger condition.

For the present analysis, the relevant question is whether a previously constructed state was available when another section was composed and whether the later construction contains evidence of preserving, transforming, resolving, or otherwise responding to information already established by that state.

The known construction sequence therefore matters independently of final reading order.

For the fictional experiment, the sequence was:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

At every construction event, the admissible historical question is:

> **What information actually existed before this section was composed?**

A relationship cannot become evidence of directed dependency merely because it becomes persuasive after the complete story is available.

The Provenance Execution Rule

The fictional experiment is therefore evaluated under a strict provenance rule.

A proposed dependency must respect the actual chronological generation sequence.

Downstream material cannot be used to explain an upstream construction decision unless the relevant information was available when that decision was made. A later revelation cannot be projected backward and treated as the cause of an earlier feature merely because the completed story makes the two features appear related.

This prevents a particularly important source of retrospective bias.

Reading occurs after the artifact is complete. Construction did not.

The completed reader can see Chapters 1 through 12 simultaneously as a finished system. The writer at a particular construction event could not use information that had not yet been constructed.

The provenance record therefore limits interpretation to historically available information.

This turns chronology into an evidentiary filter.

Four Evidence Classes

To separate genuine structural evidence from ordinary literary consistency, the fictional audit uses four classes.

Class A — Directed Dependency

Class A is the strongest category.

A previously constructed state establishes information that a subsequently constructed section explicitly receives, transforms, resolves, inverts, scales, or otherwise depends upon in a manner supported by the known generation sequence.

The essential feature is direction.

The earlier construction state existed.

The later construction could therefore respond to it.

A Class A relationship is not established merely because two sections resemble one another. The proposed dependency must survive the question of historical availability and provide a specific relationship stronger than generic thematic consistency.

Class B — Constraint Preservation

Class B applies when a previously established rule, prohibition, condition, or state remains operative in later construction.

The later section need not transform the earlier material dramatically. Its significance can lie in **not violating what has already been established**.

Constraint preservation matters because continuity is not always visible as a callback.

Sometimes the relevant evidence is that a later construction had an opportunity to contradict or cheaply override an existing rule and instead preserved it.

Class B therefore captures lawful continuation without treating every consistent detail as a directed transformation.

Class C — Compatible Development

Class C contains material that fits the established work but does not demonstrate that an earlier construction state required it.

A new event may be plausible.

A new mechanism may agree with the story’s existing logic.

A later scene may resonate strongly with earlier material.

None of those facts alone establish directed dependency.

Class C is therefore important precisely because it prevents compatibility from being promoted into stronger evidence.

A successful Inward artifact can contain substantial Class C material. The classification does not identify it as bad writing. It identifies it as insufficient evidence for the specific causal claim being tested.

Class D — Literary Recurrence

Class D contains repeated imagery, wording, rhythm, atmosphere, motif, thematic rhyme, or other literary recurrence that cannot be shown to function as a structural dependency.

Such recurrence may be deliberate and artistically effective.

It still does not establish the mechanism under investigation.

A recurring sound, object, phrase, or image can help unify a narrative without becoming a constraint governing construction.

Separating Class D from the stronger classes protects the experiment from using literary quality as a substitute for provenance.

Why Negative Classification Strengthens the Test

The purpose of the hierarchy is not to maximize the amount of evidence attributed to Inward.

It is to make the surviving evidence harder to dismiss.

If every apparent connection were counted as proof, the method could not distinguish directed constraint from the normal properties of competent storytelling.

The fictional audit therefore permits proposed evidence to be downgraded.

A relationship expected to be structural may prove merely compatible.

A repeated element expected to function as a constant may prove primarily atmospheric.

A convincing connection in reading order may fail because the required information did not yet exist at the relevant construction event.

Those outcomes do not automatically constitute failure of Inward.

They remove weak evidence from the claim.

The relevant question becomes whether strong evidence remains **after** those alternatives are removed.

This is the standard under which the twelve-chapter fictional artifact is examined.

The Testable Threshold

The evidentiary threshold for the first experiment can therefore be stated precisely.

The experiment does not succeed merely because the completed story is coherent.

It does not succeed merely because its beginning and ending correspond.

It does not succeed merely because motifs recur.

It does not succeed merely because later chapters appear to answer earlier ones in reading order.

The relevant evidence begins when the provenance record establishes that the necessary information was already available and the subsequently constructed material demonstrably preserves, transforms, resolves, or responds to that information beyond what can reasonably be classified as ordinary recurrence or compatible development.

This distinction gives the fictional experiment a falsifiable structure.

If its strongest proposed relationships collapse into Classes C and D when generation provenance is applied, then the artifact does not provide strong evidence for directed Inward constraint.

If Class A and Class B relationships survive that filtering, the completed work contains stronger evidence: not simply that its parts fit together, but that previously constructed states participated in shaping material composed later.

That is the threshold the next stages of the analysis apply.

---

3. Experiment 1: Empirical Evidence from the Fiction Artifact

Experiment 1 tests the central proposition introduced in Section 1 against a completed fictional artifact whose construction order is known. The twelve chapters were not generated in reading order. They were deliberately constructed as:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

That provenance makes a stronger analysis possible than simply reading the finished story and identifying apparent connections. A relationship is relevant to the Inward hypothesis only to the extent that the information claimed to exert a constraint actually existed when the later construction event occurred.

The frozen evidence therefore distinguishes directed dependency from weaker forms of literary consistency. Class A requires provenance eligibility, specific retrieval, and structural transformation or discharge. Class B identifies meaningful preservation of an already established rule, fact, state, limitation, or causal relationship. Class C describes compatible development without sufficient evidence that the earlier material constrained or required it. Class D covers recurrence, motif, imagery, stylistic echo, or thematic rhyme without adequate structural evidence.

Under that standard, Experiment 1 produced four independently convergent Class A relationships.

3.1 Chapter 1 → Chapter 12

The first and terminal chapters provide the clearest initial example of the construction geometry.

Chapter 1 establishes a child-state involving the broken chain, RETURN, the cold floor, and an external mystery. Because Chapter 1 was constructed before Chapter 12, those elements were available when the terminal chapter was generated.

Chapter 12 specifically retrieves that earlier state. The frozen analysis identifies the broken chain, RETURN, the cold floor, and the earlier external mystery as recovered material. The terminal chapter does not merely repeat them. It transforms the meaning of RETURN toward self-return and internal capability.

This relationship therefore satisfies the frozen Class A standard: the relevant information existed before the dependent construction event, specific material was retrieved, and its narrative function was transformed.

The independent blind audit separately classified **1 → 12 as Class A with high confidence**.

This is important for the Inward construction model because Chapter 12 was not merely an outline note waiting at the end of an otherwise sequential draft. It became an actual constructed terminal state at the second construction position.

After that event, subsequent interior construction no longer advanced toward a wholly unwritten ending. It advanced within a narrative space bounded by material already existing at both ends.

3.2 Chapter 2 → Chapter 11

The next opposing pair produced the same evidentiary class.

Chapter 2 establishes the chain/door relationship. Chapter 11 later retrieves and transforms that relationship, including the formulations **“The Chain Was Never the Door”** and **“Return was not the door.”**

The frozen Experiment 1 analysis classifies this as **Class A — Strong Convergence**.

Again, provenance matters. Chapter 2 was generated before Chapter 11. The relevant chain/door relationship therefore existed when Chapter 11 was composed. The later chapter retrieves that relationship and changes its structural meaning rather than merely reproducing a shared image.

The blind audit independently classified **2 → 11 as Class A with high confidence**.

At this point the constructed boundaries had begun to advance:

1 → 2 → unresolved narrative space ← 11 ← 12

The significance is not that the story contains bookends. It is that the already-constructed material on both sides was increasing while the unresolved interval between them remained unwritten.

3.3 Chapter 3 → Chapter 10

The third opposing pair extends the same pattern.

Chapter 3 establishes the childhood palm mark responding to attention. Chapter 10 specifically retrieves the childhood mark and scales the phenomenon into adult reach and habit.

The frozen analysis therefore classifies **3 → 10 as Class A — Strong Convergence**.

The independent blind audit again reached the same classification at high confidence.

This relationship is particularly useful because it demonstrates transformation across character state and story time. The later-generated chapter does not depend solely on repeating an object or phrase. A phenomenon established in childhood is recovered in an adult state and developed into a larger behavioral capability.

The construction geometry had consequently become:

1 → 2 → 3 → unresolved narrative space ← 10 ← 11 ← 12

Each side now contained multiple completed narrative states that later construction had to remain compatible with.

3.4 Chapter 4 → Chapter 9

The fourth pair provides the last relationship classified as strong Class A by both the frozen project analysis and the independent blind audit.

Chapter 4 establishes externally imposed childhood threshold restraint. Chapter 9 retrieves the childhood threshold and transforms that condition into adult self-restraint.

The frozen project finding is **Class A — Strong Convergence**.

The blind audit independently classified **4 → 9 as Class A with high confidence**.

The transformation is structurally relevant: the earlier restraint is externally imposed, while the later state internalizes restraint. The relationship therefore represents more than recurrence of a threshold image. An established condition changes form while preserving its narrative lineage.

After this pair, the opposing constructed fronts can be represented as:

1 → 2 → 3 → 4 → unresolved narrative space ← 9 ← 10 ← 11 ← 12

The four strongest opposing pairs therefore show a repeated pattern rather than a single isolated correspondence.

3.5 Where the Evidence Weakens

The experiment does not classify every opposing pair as Class A.

That distinction is necessary to preserve the evidentiary standard.

For **5 → 8**, reviewers disagreed. One analysis treated Chapter 8's archival evidence as potentially preserving Chapter 5's withholding constraint, while another regarded the relationship as compatible development rather than demonstrated constraint. The frozen project-level result is therefore:

5 → 8 = Disputed Class B/C

It is not promoted to Class A.

For **6 → 7**, the relationship between Chapter 6 dream material and Chapter 7 physical discovery is narratively compatible, but the frozen evidence does not establish directed dependency at the same level as the first four pairs.

The frozen result remains:

6 → 7 = Class C/D

The independent audit likewise placed the dream countdown in C/D rather than treating it as load-bearing structural evidence.

This weaker center relationship is important because it prevents the completed artifact from being interpreted as uniformly successful merely because the final story is coherent. The strongest evidence is concentrated in relationships that satisfy the provenance and transformation requirements. The center pair does not receive that classification.

3.6 Additional Constraint Evidence

Experiment 1 also contains evidence outside the six direct opposing pairs.

Chapter 3 establishes a distinction between thinking or referencing RETURN and saying or activating it. Chapter 8 indirectly references the word without producing the inflated supernatural response that a direct trigger would imply.

The frozen project analysis records this as a **Class B candidate** rather than Class A.

The keyboard/bench developments remain compatible with established spatial story reality but are classified as **Class C**.

Repeated tapping is treated as a genuine literary rhythm or leitmotif, but mundane Tap occurrences prevent every recurrence from being interpreted as a single causal mechanism. TAP therefore remains **Class D**.

These distinctions matter because they demonstrate that the analysis was capable of refusing stronger interpretations even when thematic or stylistic relationships were visible.

3.7 Experiment 1 Finding

Taken together, the frozen evidence supports **logical bidirectional constraint accumulation**.

The result does not mean that every relationship across the manuscript is a directed dependency. It means that, under the known construction provenance, established narrative information accumulated on both sides of an unresolved interval and remained available as subsequent construction proceeded inward.

The strongest convergent core is:

1 → 12 — Class A

2 → 11 — Class A

3 → 10 — Class A

4 → 9 — Class A

followed by weaker or disputed evidence:

5 → 8 — disputed B/C

6 → 7 — C/D

The independent blind audit reported no genuine temporal violations or forbidden knowledge states among the Class A/B relationships it accepted.

Experiment 1 therefore supports the narrower proposition established in Section 1: construction from opposing known states can make previously constructed information from both sides operative within the path used to connect them.

It does not establish a numerical amount of solution-space contraction. No such metric was operationalized. It also does not by itself establish superiority over sequential drafting or other nonlinear methods.

The strongest alternative explanation retained by the blind audit is structured recursive outlining or modular draft sequencing with persistent narrative state. That alternative remains part of the evidentiary record rather than being removed because it competes with the Inward interpretation.

What Experiment 1 establishes for the purposes of this paper is consequently narrower but concrete: a fiction artifact constructed in the declared Inward order contains multiple provenance-valid directed dependencies, independently convergent classifications, weaker relationships that were not promoted beyond their evidence, and an observable pattern of constraints accumulating from opposing constructed boundaries.

That empirical record provides the first evidentiary body that the remaining sections of this paper must explain without exceeding.

---

4. The Character as a Carrier of Constraint

The classifications established in the preceding section become more concrete when the experimental artifact is examined at the level where its constraints actually appear: in the states, relationships, objects, and transformations experienced by its fictional subject.

The alternate Zadeo story is therefore relevant here not merely as an illustration of the experiment. It is the artifact in which the tested construction sequence became prose.

This distinction matters.

A character can recur without demonstrating dependency. An image can repeat without carrying a constraint. A later chapter can resemble an earlier chapter without establishing that the earlier material remained structurally operative.

The frozen evidence therefore does not treat every recurrence in the story as equivalent.

Instead, the strongest cases are those in which an earlier-established state is specifically retrieved and then transformed or discharged in material generated from the opposing side of the construction.

Zadeo Across the 1 → 12 Boundary

The strongest and widest boundary in Experiment 1 is the relationship between Chapters 1 and 12.

Chapter 1 establishes a child-state involving the broken chain, RETURN, the cold floor, and an external mystery.

Chapter 12 specifically retrieves that state.

But the later chapter does more than repeat its vocabulary. The frozen analysis identifies a transformation in which RETURN moves toward self-return and internal capability.

That is why the relationship was classified as strong convergent Class A rather than literary recurrence.

The evidentiary object is not simply the word RETURN.

It is the preservation and transformation of an established character condition across the widest opposing construction positions in the experiment.

The fictional character therefore gives the abstract concept of constraint propagation an observable form.

An earlier state exists.

A later-generated boundary retrieves it.

The later material must remain compatible with what was already made true while also giving that earlier state a new structural function.

The Chain and the Door

The 2 → 11 relationship provides a second example.

Chapter 2 establishes the chain/door relationship.

Chapter 11 later retrieves and transforms that relationship through the formulations “The Chain Was Never the Door” and “Return was not the door.”

Again, recurrence alone would not be sufficient.

The evidentiary importance lies in the relationship between the earlier established structure and its later transformation.

The chain and door are fictional objects and ideas inside Zadeo’s story, but in the experiment they also become traceable carriers of retained state.

Their meaning cannot be evaluated independently of construction provenance.

Chapter 11 was generated before the interior chapters that would eventually stand between Chapters 2 and 11.

The observed relationship therefore belongs to the experiment’s opposing-boundary construction rather than to a completed story read only in chronological order.

From the Childhood Mark to Adult Reach

The 3 → 10 pair makes the character-state function still clearer.

Chapter 3 establishes the childhood palm mark responding to attention.

Chapter 10 explicitly retrieves the childhood mark and scales the phenomenon into adult reach or habit.

The frozen evidence classifies this relationship as Class A.

Here the relevant continuity is neither a repeated phrase nor merely a shared theme.

A condition attached to the character at one stage is retained strongly enough to constrain a later manifestation of that character.

The childhood condition and adult condition are not identical.

Their relationship is developmental.

That difference is important because constraint preservation does not require static repetition.

A retained constraint can remain operative while its expression changes.

Within this artifact, the character provides the continuity through which that transformation can be observed.

External Restraint and Self-Restraint

The 4 → 9 relationship extends the same pattern into behavior.

Chapter 4 establishes externally imposed childhood threshold restraint.

Chapter 9 explicitly retrieves the childhood threshold and transforms the condition into adult self-restraint.

The frozen evidence again classifies the pair as strong convergent Class A.

This is particularly useful for distinguishing structural transformation from motif.

The later material does not merely reproduce a threshold.

The source of restraint changes.

What had been externally imposed becomes internally maintained.

The fictional development therefore performs an evidentiary function: it allows a retained condition to be followed through a change in form.

That is stronger than saying the chapters feel thematically related.

The classification depends upon specific retrieval and transformation, not upon literary impression.

Where the Character Evidence Stops

The same method also requires restraint.

The 5 → 8 relationship remains disputed B/C.

The independent blind audit regarded it as Class B at moderate/high confidence, while another analysis classified it as Class C.

The project-level finding therefore remains disputed B/C.

The 6 → 7 relationship remains C/D under the frozen project evidence.

Its dream material and physical discovery are narratively compatible, but they do not satisfy the same directed-dependency standard as the four strong Class A pairs.

The TAP motif likewise remains Class D literary recurrence.

Repeated tapping may be meaningful as rhythm or leitmotif, but mundane occurrences prevent treating every instance as one immutable causal mechanism.

These weaker cases are as important to the method as the stronger ones.

If character continuity alone were enough to establish directed dependency, nearly any coherent story could be made to appear as evidence for the hypothesis.

The classification system prevents that move.

Constraint Without Predetermined Plot

Taken together, the surviving evidence supports a narrower proposition.

The experiment shows multiple cases in which previously established fictional conditions remained operative across the alternating construction sequence and were later specifically retrieved and transformed.

Those conditions are visible through Zadeo’s changing states and through the story structures attached to him.

The evidence does not establish that every later development was forced by an earlier one.

It does not establish a numerical magnitude of solution-space contraction.

It does not establish superiority over sequential composition or other nonlinear methods.

And it does not eliminate the alternative explanation of structured recursive outlining or modular draft sequencing with persistent narrative state.

What it does provide is an artifact in which the distinction between mere coherence and stronger constraint preservation can be examined directly.

That distinction becomes increasingly important as the white paper moves inward.

The reader will ultimately be asked to encounter the complete alternate Zadeo story at the center of this paper.

Before that handoff, however, the remaining first-half analysis must continue separating what the artifact demonstrably preserves from what a completed narrative merely makes appear inevitable in retrospect.

---

5. Constraint and the Remaining Field of Possibility

A constructed state does not merely add information to a story.

It changes what can happen next without breaking what has already been established.

This distinction is central to Inward.

Section 4 established that character states can carry constraint across the construction process. A childhood condition may remain operative in an adult behavior. An imposed restraint may later return as self-restraint. An object, wound, relationship, habit, promise, or capability may survive by changing function rather than by repeating in identical form.

But identifying a carrier of constraint is only the first step.

The next question is more difficult:

What does the existence of that state do to the material that has not yet been written?

In conventional forward composition, the unwritten future is usually treated as an open generative problem. The writer knows what has already happened and creates what should happen next.

Inward changes that geometry.

When an earlier state and a later state have both been constructed, the material between them is no longer responding only to the past. It must remain compatible with conditions that already exist on both sides of it.

The unwritten interval therefore becomes a field of constrained possibility.

That phrase must be used carefully.

This experiment has not measured the size of a mathematical solution space. It has not demonstrated that the number of possible scenes decreases by a quantifiable amount after each construction event. It has not established an optimization theorem.

The evidence supports a narrower proposition.

Previously constructed states can become operative conditions on subsequently constructed material.

Some possible developments remain available.

Some require transformation.

Some require preservation of an established condition.

Some would contradict material that already exists.

Some may resemble earlier material without depending on it at all.

The field changes, but it does not necessarily collapse to one answer.

Constraint Is Not Determination

This distinction prevents one of the easiest exaggerations of the Inward result.

If two opposing states have been constructed, the middle is not automatically solved.

A constructed beginning does not dictate every event that follows it.

A constructed ending does not retroactively author every event that precedes it.

Even when both states exert genuine pressure on the unresolved interval, substantial creative freedom can remain.

Constraint therefore should not be confused with inevitability.

Consider a simple abstract case.

An early state establishes that a character refuses a particular form of dependence.

A later state establishes that the same character eventually accepts help without surrendering autonomy.

The unwritten material between those states now carries a problem.

The writer may resolve that problem through betrayal, injury, mentorship, love, failure, exhaustion, revelation, or some other development supported by the story.

The exact bridge is not predetermined.

But neither is every bridge equally lawful.

A middle in which the character casually abandons the earlier condition without transformation would fail to account for the established state.

A middle in which the later acceptance arrives without any relationship to the earlier resistance might remain narratively possible, but the claimed dependency would weaken.

A middle that transforms the original resistance while preserving its underlying concern could carry stronger structural continuity.

The constraint does not write the scene.

It changes what the scene must answer.

That is a more precise description of what Inward appears to produce.

Constructed States as Active Conditions

The distinction between a known destination and a constructed state remains essential here.

A writer may know from the beginning that a character will eventually return home, forgive someone, gain a capability, lose a relationship, or confront a particular enemy.

That knowledge alone is not the phenomenon under examination.

For Inward, the important event occurs when the later state has actually been constructed with enough specificity to become part of the working reality of the artifact.

The difference is operational.

An imagined destination can remain vague.

A constructed destination contains details.

It contains language, conditions, consequences, character posture, objects, absences, relationships, and unresolved obligations.

Those details can press backward on material that has not yet been composed.

The same is true from the beginning side.

Once an early state exists as prose rather than merely intention, its particulars can survive into later construction.

This is why the fictional artifact cannot be evaluated only by asking whether its ending matches its beginning.

The more useful question is whether previously constructed particulars remained operative when later material was produced.

In the alternate Zadeo artifact, this problem becomes visible through states such as the childhood palm mark, the chain and door, imposed restraint, later self-restraint, and the relationship between an early vulnerable state and later internal capability.

Their importance is not simply that they recur.

Recurrence is the weakest explanation available when nothing stronger can be established.

The question is what happened to the earlier state when later material was constructed.

Was it required?

Was it preserved?

Was it transformed?

Was it merely compatible?

Did it simply appear again?

Those are different relationships.

Inward becomes experimentally meaningful only if those distinctions remain intact.

The Lawful Middle

The unresolved middle can therefore be understood as neither blank space nor predetermined corridor.

It is a lawful middle.

“Lawful” here does not mean that only one scene can be written.

It means that newly composed material inherits obligations from constructed reality.

Some obligations are strong.

Others are weak.

Some exist only because an earlier condition must remain intact.

Some arise because a later state cannot be reached coherently if a particular transformation never occurs.

Other apparent obligations disappear under provenance analysis because the relationship was not actually available when the relevant material was composed.

This is why the evidence classes matter.

Class A, Class B, Class C, and Class D are not different degrees of how satisfying a connection feels.

They are safeguards against treating every resemblance as constraint.

A directed dependency carries a different evidentiary burden from constraint preservation.

Constraint preservation carries a different burden from compatible development.

Compatible development is different from literary recurrence.

The uneven findings of Experiment 1 are therefore important.

The four strongest opposing relationships survived as Class A.

The later pairs did not.

The 5→8 relationship remained disputed between B and C.

The 6→7 relationship remained C/D.

That unevenness reveals something important about the middle itself.

Inward does not guarantee that every opposing pair will produce a strong dependency.

As construction moves inward, some relationships may remain strongly constrained while others retain greater freedom.

Some may fail to establish dependency at all.

A method capable only of confirming itself would make this distinction impossible.

The fact that the experiment weakens its own later classifications is therefore not a defect to repair.

It establishes that constraint must be demonstrated rather than presumed.

Freedom Inside Constraint

This also clarifies an apparent paradox.

If previously constructed states constrain later composition, does the method eliminate creativity?

The experiment does not support that conclusion.

Constraint and freedom are not opposites here.

A state may rule out contradiction while leaving many developments available.

A relationship may require preservation of a condition without specifying the scene that preserves it.

A later state may demand transformation without determining the mechanism of transformation.

The writer still composes.

The writer still chooses.

The writer still creates events that did not exist before.

What changes is the environment in which those choices occur.

The middle is no longer asked only:

What could happen next?

It is increasingly asked:

What can happen here while remaining answerable to what already exists on both sides?

That is the reconciliation problem introduced by Inward.

And reconciliation can fail.

There may be moments when the available constructed states do not justify the connection a writer wants to make.

There may be a visually or emotionally satisfying callback that provenance cannot promote beyond recurrence.

There may be a plausible development that remains only compatible rather than constrained.

There may be an apparent bridge whose required information did not yet exist when the scene was constructed.

In those cases, the correct result is not to strengthen the classification.

The correct result is to preserve the weakness.

An unresolved constraint is information.

A failed dependency is information.

A downgrade is information.

The experiment loses integrity if every gap is repaired after the fact.

Constraint Must Be Allowed to Participate

This produces another useful distinction.

It is possible for relevant information to exist in the artifact without actually participating in a construction event.

A story may contain an earlier state and a later echo.

That does not establish that the earlier state shaped the later composition.

For constraint to become evidentially meaningful, the relevant state must have existed at the time of construction and must be traceable as something the later material preserved, transformed, answered, or depended upon.

Existence is not enough.

Availability is not enough.

Similarity is not enough.

The question is participation.

This is why provenance remains necessary even when the finished artifact appears unusually coherent.

A finished story hides the order in which its relationships became possible.

Once all chapters exist, every connection can appear simultaneous.

The reader sees a completed network.

The experiment must instead reconstruct which parts of that network were available at each construction event.

Only then can it distinguish a relationship produced under constraint from a relationship visible only in hindsight.

This is also why Inward cannot be reduced to nonlinear drafting.

Writing chapters out of order is trivial.

What matters is whether the already constructed states remain operative when the next unresolved state is produced.

The sequence is important because it repeatedly places new composition between established material.

The experimental question is what those established states then do.

From Character to Artifact

Character provides one of the clearest places to observe this process because character states can persist while changing form.

But the mechanism is not limited to character.

A constraint may be carried by an object.

A rule.

A location.

A capability.

A wound.

A relationship.

An absence.

A promise.

A piece of knowledge.

A physical limitation.

A moral condition.

A terminal fact.

Any constructed element can become relevant if later material must answer to it.

The reader therefore should not approach the experimental artifact merely hunting for callbacks.

That would produce too many false positives.

Instead, the artifact must eventually be approached as a record of changing obligations.

What was already true?

What later became true?

What had to remain true between them?

What was transformed?

What remained merely possible?

What connection appears meaningful only because the completed story allows the reader to see both ends at once?

Those questions move the analysis from literary appreciation toward experimental inspection.

The difference matters.

A compelling story may contain no provenance-valid evidence for Inward.

An awkward story could still contain a demonstrable construction dependency.

Narrative quality and experimental evidence overlap in places, but they are not the same measurement.

The paper must preserve that separation.

The Middle as Reconciliation

At this stage, the strongest description of Inward is therefore not that it discovers the correct middle.

It is that the method can change the task assigned to the middle.

Before opposing states exist, composition can operate primarily as forward generation.

After opposing states have been constructed, the unresolved material can become a reconciliation problem.

The writer is no longer generating into an entirely unknown future.

Nor is the writer merely reverse-engineering a predetermined ending.

The writer is composing among established realities.

Some realities originated from the beginning side.

Others originated from the ending side.

Each new construction event can add another condition that the remaining interval may have to preserve, transform, resolve, or lawfully leave unresolved.

This is what logical bidirectional constraint accumulation means at the level of composition.

Not inevitability.

Not quantified optimization.

Not proof of universal superiority.

Accumulation.

Previously constructed states remain available to become active conditions on what is constructed afterward.

The closer construction moves toward the center, the more important it becomes to distinguish genuine constraint from retrospective pattern recognition.

That distinction must be understood before the completed artifact can be useful as evidence.

The next stage of the paper must therefore prepare the reader not simply to recognize connections, but to inspect them without granting them evidentiary strength they have not earned.

---

6. The Reader at the Center

The argument has reached the point where another description of Experiment 1 would be less useful than encountering its artifact.

That transition is intentional.

Inward Story Construction separates **reading order** from **construction order**.

A reader normally encounters a finished work after every chapter already exists. At that point, relationships between early and late material can feel simultaneous. Their direction of construction has disappeared.

The experiment does not have that luxury.

It asks a different question:

What existed when the next state was constructed?

That difference separates **reader reality** from **construction reality**.

Reader reality experiences the completed object.

Construction reality preserves the sequence by which the object became possible.

The complete Zadeo artifact now sits between those two realities.

Before it is encountered, several provenance limits must be stated explicitly.

The Surviving Artifact and Its Provenance

The reader-facing artifact retained for Experiment 1 is the twelve-chapter **ZADEO SAMPLE STORY**.

The surviving RTF now frozen with this experiment has a current SHA-256 identity, but the original Experiment 1 freeze did not preserve a pre-freeze hash binding proving that this exact byte sequence was the exact file supplied to every original audit step.

A later forensic comparison located a surviving audit document whose chapter-level discussion corresponds to the same Experiment 1 construction chronology, titles, relationships, and story states.

That permits a narrower statement:

The surviving story is content-bound to the Experiment 1 audit record, while exact historical byte identity remains unproven.

That distinction is preserved rather than repaired.

The later comparison does not enter the closed Experiment 1 evidence corpus as new supporting evidence.

It does not strengthen any relationship.

It does not alter any classification.

It does not retroactively improve the artifact.

It establishes only the status of the surviving reader-facing copy.

What Storybuilder Did

Experiment 1 did not begin with twelve blank chapter slots.

It began from an explicit story spine containing a beginning condition, a middle condition, and an ending condition.

For this experiment, those boundary states existed before the twelve chapter commits.

The chapter construction sequence then proceeded:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Storybuilder operated over a finite, author-controlled source corpus derived from pre-existing Zadeo manuscript prose.

That corpus was not an unlimited generator of new canon.

It was a bounded field of possible source material.

The important construction process therefore was not simply whether a sentence had existed somewhere before.

It was how available material became selected, reconciled, realized, accepted, and committed as the inward construction advanced.

Previously committed states progressively constrained the remaining inward construction path, while chapter profiles, anchors, and prior realized context constrained how the finite source field was selected, reconciled, and realized.

The operative chain can be stated more precisely as:

committed ledger state
→ remaining inward path and prior realized context
→ chapter profile and anchors
→ finite source selection
→ continuity, overlap, and compile-plan reconciliation

→ realization
→ gate
→ commit

The surviving implementation does not justify the stronger claim that every committed chapter directly changed the numerical fragment-selection score of every later chapter.

That is not required for the mechanism being examined here.

What is established is that commit was a real state transition.

A committed chapter became part of the ledger.

The remaining inward path changed.

Prior realized material became available to later continuity and manuscript evaluation.

Selection could be repaired against already committed material.

The resulting chapter was then gated and committed as another realized state.

Storybuilder therefore did more than traverse a predetermined list of chapter numbers.

It repeatedly converted a bounded field of possible material into an increasingly realized artifact.

The source corpus is part of that mechanism.

Its prior existence does not by itself establish directed dependency, but neither does it nullify dependency merely because source material existed before the chapter sequence.

The relevant question remains:

What role did the already constructed state play when the later state was realized?

That is the level at which the Experiment 1 relationships must be judged.

The Artifact Contains Visible Gaps

The surviving reader-facing story is not being silently repaired before presentation.

Its source text contains discontinuities.

Chapters 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 contain places where dialogue, referents, transitions, or surrounding prose appear absent or fragmentary.

Chapter 6 is especially abbreviated.

Some later references point toward material that is not visibly present in the surviving file.

Those gaps may reflect the state of the source material, the assembly process, or a difference between the surviving artifact and an earlier working form.

The present record cannot lawfully choose among those explanations.

So the gaps remain visible.

This has an important consequence for the reader:

Do not interpret every discontinuity as intentional style.

And do not assume that missing material can be reconstructed from what the paper would prefer the story to contain.

The artifact is presented as it survives.

The experiment must tolerate that imperfection.

The Order You Are About to Read

The artifact is presented in its **construction/commit order**, not ordinary chapter-number reading order:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

That is deliberate.

The chapter numbers still identify their positions in the fictional narrative.

But the order of presentation preserves the experiment’s chronology.

Do not reorder the artifact into 1 through 12 while reading it here.

Encounter it in the order in which the inward construction advanced.

That choice changes what “read it as a story” means in this context.

It does not mean pretending the chapters were conventionally drafted.

It means allowing the prose, characters, objects, absences, and transformations to register before stopping to classify every relationship.

The reader should experience the artifact before dissecting it.

Encounter First; Classify Second

The paper has already established that a visible connection is not enough.

A repeated image may be recurrence.

A later event may simply remain compatible with an earlier one.

A state may preserve a prior constraint without depending on it.

A later construction may specifically retrieve and transform something that had already become part of the developing artifact.

Those relationships are not interchangeable.

But trying to classify every sentence while first encountering the artifact creates its own distortion.

So use two passes.

On the first pass:

encounter the artifact.

Notice what returns.

Notice what changes.

Notice what disappears.

Notice which character states remain stable and which are transformed.

Notice when an object appears to change function.

Notice where something feels connected.

Notice where something feels incomplete.

Notice where an expected relationship does not materialize.

Those reactions are not evidence classifications.

They identify places where analysis may later be warranted.

Only afterward should the evidentiary questions return:

What state existed first?

Was it actually available when the later material was constructed?

Did the later construction retrieve it, transform it, preserve it, merely accommodate it, or only resemble it?

That is the boundary between experiencing coherence and making a provenance claim.

The Weak Center Must Remain Visible

One expectation now deserves particular caution.

As the inward sequence approached its geometric center, more constructed material existed on both sides of the unresolved interval.

It would be tempting to assume that this must produce progressively stronger pairwise dependencies.

Experiment 1 does not show that.

The center relationships were among the weaker adjudicated relationships.

That does not mean the accumulated surrounding states were absent.

It means that **availability of more constraints is not identical to stronger dependency between every opposing pair**.

The geometry can increase what is available to constrain a later construction without guaranteeing that a particular pair will become Class A.

This distinction becomes important when the paper later returns to the phrase **constraint accumulation**.

Accumulation concerns the growing set of established states available to later construction.

Classification concerns the demonstrated relationship between particular states.

Those are related questions.

They are not the same measurement.

The Story Is Not the Construction Record

The artifact you are about to read is prose.

The experiment is larger than the prose.

The prose demonstrates what exists in the completed story.

The provenance record determines what those relationships are allowed to mean experimentally.

Two scenes can clearly correspond in the finished work.

That establishes the existence of a relationship.

It does not by itself establish its constructional direction.

Likewise, discovering that related material existed somewhere in the source corpus does not by itself prove that the relationship was causally irrelevant to the later construction.

The correct question is more specific:

What information, state, and construction context were operative when the later state was realized?

This is the distinction that prevents retrospective coherence from being mistaken for directed dependency while also preventing the existence of source material from being mistaken for automatic disproof.

It is why storytelling alone is not proof.

It is also why source provenance alone is not the entire experiment.

The experiment requires both:

artifact and construction record.

Neither is sufficient by itself.

Why the Story Is Here

The exact **6 | 7** center seam belongs to the experiment’s geometry.

The additional requirement that the **complete fictional artifact be placed at that seam for the reader** was introduced later, after the first six white-paper construction positions had already been accepted:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10

At that point, Sections 4, 9, 5, 8, 6, and 7 had not yet been constructed.

The reader-artifact handoff therefore did not govern the experiment from its first sentence.

It was also not added after the interior had already converged.

It was introduced at the midpoint of the white paper’s construction history, while half of the inward sequence remained unresolved.

That chronology matters.

The handoff cannot be described as if it had governed every earlier event.

Nor can it be dismissed as a final editorial placement chosen after seeing the completed paper.

Its actual provenance lies between those two descriptions.

The frozen reader-facing geometry became:

Sections 1–6
→ complete Experiment 1 artifact
→ Sections 7–12

Section 6 must therefore end here.

Section 7 cannot begin until the artifact has been encountered.

What Remains After the Artifact

Several obligations intentionally remain unresolved at this point.

The paper has preserved an independent blind-audit record, but the audit's procedure, scope, and limitations still require explicit accounting.

The construction protocol still requires a compact reader-facing description.

The paper's admitted neighboring-method research still has to be placed in relation to Inward without importing new post-closure evidence.

The four strongest Experiment 1 relationships still require their source and construction pathways to be stated precisely enough to distinguish prior-state participation from weaker corpus compatibility.

The tension between accumulated available constraints and the weak center still requires final reconciliation.

And Experiment 2—the white paper itself—still has to face the same evidentiary discipline it imposed on Experiment 1.

Those tasks belong after the artifact.

They should not be pre-solved here.

Center Artifact — Experiment 1

What follows is the surviving twelve-chapter Zadeo experimental artifact.

It is presented in the experiment’s construction order:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Its visible source gaps are preserved.

Its exact historical byte identity with the original audited input is not claimed.

Its frozen Experiment 1 classifications are not being revised here.

Read the artifact completely before proceeding to Section 7.

Do not repair it while reading.

Do not promote every connection.

Do not treat every gap as meaning.

Encounter it first.

Classification resumes afterward.

Read the artifact.

CENTER ARTIFACT - EXPERIMENT 1

The following is a readable rendering of the frozen Experiment 1 story artifact.

The exact original RTF bytes are preserved separately in:

`CENTER_ARTIFACT_EXACT.rtf`

CHAPTER 1 Where the Dark Grimoires Ended

Zadeo woke up on the floor. The boards under his cheek were cold enough to make his teeth touch. For a moment, he did not move. He listened first, because the room sounded wrong. Too quiet. Too hollow. Like the walls were holding their breath. Something small pressed against his palm. He opened his fingers.

A broken chain lay there, curled like a dead bug. The clasp was bent, and one little piece of metal hung from it with a word scratched across the face. RETURN. Zadeo knew the word. He could read it. But knowing the word did not make it feel any less heavy. It looked like something a grown-up should have found first. Something somebody should have taken from him before he woke up. He tried to drop it.

Then the chain buzzed. He squeezed his hand shut. It felt like a bee was trapped inside his palm, angry but too tired to sting. The feeling crawled up his wrist and stopped before it reached his elbow. Zadeo did not cry.

He wanted to. A floorboard popped somewhere outside the room. He turned his head. Another sound came after it. A slow step. Then another.

Someone was coming. Zadeo looked down at the chain again. The word RETURN waited in the dark like it had been awake longer than him. He shoved the chain under his shirt and pressed both hands flat over it. By the time the door began to open, he was sitting very still.

Still enough to look innocent. Still enough to hide how fast his heart was knocking. Still enough to hear the chain whisper against his chest. Return.

Not loud. Not a voice. Just a feeling. Like something far away had remembered his name.

CHAPTER 12 The First Flight Without the Car

Zadeo stood where the ground forgot how close it was supposed to be. Below him, the world dropped away in layers: roof edge, broken stone, dark road, little lights trembling in the distance. The wind moved against his coat and slipped under his collar, cold enough to make him remember being small. For one second, he reached for the car without looking. Nothing answered.

No low hum. No metal body waiting behind him. No familiar pull telling him where to place his fear. Only air.

Zadeo looked back. The car was not there. That should have ended it. For years, the car had been the bridge. When the sky called, the car carried him. When the ground became too small, the car remembered the shape of flight before he did. It had answered whistles, pressure, rhythm, danger. It had made impossible things feel almost normal.

But now the place behind him was empty. His hand lowered slowly. The wind pressed harder. In his chest, something old gave a small pull.

The word came back without sound. A child’s word. A broken clasp. A cold floor. A hallway that breathed. A door that knocked from the wrong side. Zadeo shut his eyes. He had thought return meant going back. Maybe it meant coming back to himself.

The ledge shifted under his boot. He opened his eyes and stepped away from safety. The first drop was ugly. His stomach rose into his throat. His arms jerked out too wide. For half a breath, he was not flying at all. He was falling with a better excuse.

The ground rushed up. Zadeo twisted. Air struck his side. His body answered before his mind could name what it was doing. Something under his ribs tightened, then spread, then pushed back against the fall. He stopped too hard.

The second lift came softer. Zadeo rose one foot. Then two. Then enough that the ledge was no longer above him, and the road was no longer coming for him.

A bridge was not an insult. A bridge was how something crossed before it knew it could become the crossing. Zadeo lifted higher. The sky did not open like a door. It accepted him slowly.

But the sky heard him. This time, when he moved forward, nothing carried him. He flew.

A broken chain in a child’s palm. A hallway holding its breath. A door that had not opened, but had still known his name. RETURN. The word came back without sound. For years, he had thought return meant a way back. Back to the room. Back to the before. Back to the version of himself that did not have to carry so much weight in his hands.

CHAPTER 2 The House Refuses to Forget

Zadeo kept both hands pressed to his shirt. The chain was still there. He could feel the little broken piece under the cloth, cold at first, then warm, then cold again. It did not move like a thing with legs. It did not make noise like a toy. But every few steps it reminded him it was there. Tap.

Not loud. Just enough for him to feel it against his chest. The hallway outside the room looked longer than it had before. Zadeo knew that was not right. He had walked that hallway lots of times. He knew where the wall dipped. He knew where the floorboard squeaked. He knew where the paint had a crack shaped like a little river. But now the hallway seemed to be holding itself still.

Like it was waiting for him to pass. An adult hand rested lightly on his shoulder. “You alright?” Zadeo nodded too fast.

The hand stayed there. “You sure?” He wanted to say something. The words rose up in his throat, but they felt too big. If he let them out, everything might come out with them. The floor. The cold. The chain. The word scratched into the metal. RETURN.

So he swallowed. “I’m fine,” he said. The hallway answered. A soft pop came from the floor beneath his left foot.

He tried not to look at the door near the end of the hall. It was just a door. He had seen it before. Nothing special. Brown wood. Brass knob. A dark line at the bottom where the light did not reach. But the chain knew it. Tap.

The closer Zadeo got, the warmer the chain became. He pressed his palm harder against his shirt until his fingers hurt. The door did not open. It did something worse. It breathed.

One step. Then another. The chain pulled toward the door like it had a tiny hand reaching through his shirt. Zadeo shook his head.

No. He did not say it out loud. The house heard anyway. The mark on the wall beside the door darkened. It had been a scratch before. Now it looked like somebody had dragged a wet finger down the wood.

The lie came out quick. Too quick. For one second, everything went quiet. Then the door gave one soft knock from the inside.

Zadeo did not move. The adult did not move either. The chain stopped tapping. That was almost worse.

Zadeo looked at the floor. He looked at his shoes. He looked at anything except the door. “Come on,” the adult said. This time the voice was softer. Zadeo walked past the door with his shoulders tight and his eyes down.

When he reached the end of the hallway, he looked back. The door was still closed. The mark beside it was gone. But the chain under his shirt turned warm one more time.

CHAPTER 11 The Chain Was Never the Door

The car waited behind him. Zadeo could feel it before he looked. Not the shape of it. Not the shine. The answer of it. For most of his life, that had been enough. A whistle. A turn of the head. A need he did not have to explain.

And the car would come. Tonight, the road below him did not move. The wind moved. The edge of his coat moved. Far beneath the high place where he stood, the world carried its own noise, low and distant, like it had decided not to help him. Zadeo lifted two fingers toward his mouth.

His fingers stopped before the whistle. Something small and cold seemed to press against the center of his chest. Not metal. Memory.

Then he had thought it meant a door. A way through. A hidden place that would explain why the world had started listening when he was too young to understand what it heard. But the higher he stood, the less the word felt like a door.

It felt like a command. Not come back. Stand back inside yourself. The car gave a faint pulse behind him.

His chest ached in the place where the old chain was not. That was the part that made him angry. The thing was gone, or changed, or buried so deep in him that touching it from the outside was impossible. Still, it pulled. Not toward a door this time. Toward the edge.

Zadeo looked down. The drop waited without threat. It did not dare him. It did not promise him anything. It simply existed, wide and patient, asking whether he was still going to make something else answer first. He thought of the car. He thought of every road that had opened because it arrived.

He thought of every escape that had dressed itself up as destiny. Then he thought of a boy lying on a cold floor, hiding a broken chain because the adults around him could feel the truth before they could name it. That boy had wanted a door. This man had wanted a bridge.

For the first time, he did not punish it for that. It had carried him as far as a bridge could carry a man. Now the bridge had to end before the sky could tell the truth. Zadeo took one step forward.

Not off. Not yet. Just forward enough for the old fear to wake up and find no whistle waiting to save it. His knees bent.

His breath caught. The memory of RETURN tightened once, not like a chain around him, but like a hand closing inside him. He understood then. Return was not the door.

CHAPTER 3 The Mark That Would Not Wash Off

Zadeo tried soap first. He stood on the little wooden stool in front of the sink, one hand braced against the cold edge, the other hand held under the water until his fingers wrinkled. The mark stayed. It was not big.

That made it worse. A big thing could be explained. A scrape. A bruise. A smudge from the floor. Adults liked big things because big things gave them something to say. This was small. A dark little curve near the inside of his palm, right where the broken RETURN chain had buzzed the night before.

He froze. The sound had not come from the sink. It had come from under his shirt. The chain.

He could feel it there, hidden where no one was supposed to see. Cold. Still. Waiting like it had all the time in the world. Zadeo looked at the bathroom door. No one came. He looked back at his hand.

The mark had changed. Not much. Just enough. The little curve had turned toward his chest, toward the place where the chain rested under his shirt.

Zadeo whispered, so low the mirror almost did not hear him. “Return.” The light above the sink flickered once. The mark warmed.

Zadeo bit his lip before he made a sound. That was the first rule. Not a rule like grown people gave. Not a rule with words and punishment and because I said so. This was smaller and meaner than that. If he thought about the word, the mark listened.

If he said it, the house listened too. A footstep moved somewhere in the hall. “Zadeo?” He closed his fist so fast his wet fingers squeaked against his palm.

“I’m washing my hands,” he said. His voice sounded normal enough. Almost. The adult outside the door paused.

Zadeo stared at the handle. For one awful second, he thought it would turn by itself. It did not. But the dust along the bottom of the door shifted.

The word came out small. The hallway went quiet. Zadeo waited until the footsteps moved away. Only then did he open his hand.

The mark was still there. It had not grown. It had not disappeared. It had turned again.

CHAPTER 10 The Name That Answered Wrong

The car knew his whistle before he gave it. That was the problem. Zadeo stood in the empty road with two fingers still at his side, the night stretched long around him, and the car answered anyway. A soft pulse moved through the metal.

The headlights blinked once, then settled into a low copper glow. The body of the car reflected him in pieces: hat brim, shoulder, hand, the hard line of his mouth. Then the reflection moved before he did. Zadeo went still. The reflected version of him lifted its chin.

He did not. For a moment, the road felt like an old hallway again. Too quiet. Too aware. Like the world had learned how to hold its breath around him. “Zadeo,” the car’s signal whispered. His name came through the metal soft and almost right.

Almost. That one wrong edge made the skin along his arms tighten. Zadeo stepped closer. The reflection smiled.

He did not. The car gave another pulse, brighter this time, like it wanted to please him before he asked. “Don’t do that,” Zadeo said. The road did not answer.

The reflection did. Its mouth shaped the words half a heartbeat late. Don’t do that. Zadeo’s hand opened at his side.

He thought about every time the car had come when he needed it. Every road it had made short. Every door it had replaced. Every escape that felt like command because it answered fast enough. The pulse moved again. This time it ran through the car like a shiver. Then it ran through him.

Not pain. Recognition. Something old had learned the shape of him. Not his body. Not his voice. His reach. His habit. The place inside him that expected the bridge before it expected himself. The reflection leaned forward from the car’s side panel.

A him that answered before the real one chose. The mark from childhood flashed through his memory: a small dark curve in his palm turning toward the chain. It had followed attention. It had followed fear. It had followed the place where he tried not to look. This was older now. Bigger.

His reach. His habit of letting the bridge answer before he did. The car sat waiting, loyal and dangerous in the same breath. Zadeo looked at the reflection again.

The pressure in his chest eased. The door’s edge dimmed, but it did not vanish. Behind him, the car remained silent. Ahead of him, the sky held its breath.

CHAPTER 4 The Door That Would Not Let Him In

The floor started tapping before Zadeo did. He heard it while sitting on the edge of his bed, both feet dangling above the boards, his hand closed around the place on his palm where the mark still waited. Tap.

That was how Zadeo knew it was for him. He held his breath and listened. The taps came from the hallway. Not the whole hallway. One board, then another, then the old narrow one near the closet where the wood always dipped if you stepped too close to the wall.

Zadeo slid off the bed. He did not tell himself he was following it. He told himself he was going to the bathroom. Then he passed the bathroom.

At the end of the hall stood the door he was not supposed to touch. It was not locked with a big lock. That would have been easier. A big lock meant stay out.

This door had only an old brass knob and paint cracked around the frame like dry skin. It looked ordinary enough that an adult could say, “Don’t be silly, Zadeo. It’s just a door.” But the floorboards stopped tapping in front of it. The silence pointed. Zadeo’s hand closed tighter.

He took one step closer. The air changed. Cold slid under the door and wrapped around his ankles. Zadeo looked behind him.

The door shut without slamming. That was worse. A slam would have meant anger. This sounded like a decision.

“Nothing,” he said. The adult looked past him at the door. For one second, Zadeo thought they would explain. They did not.

They only said, “Not that room.” Zadeo swallowed. “Why?” The hallway seemed to lean closer.

Zadeo looked back at the door. The brass knob was still. The cracked paint was still. Everything looked ordinary again.

The kitchen smelled like rice, warm grease, and something sweet burning at the edge of the pan. Zadeo sat at the table with both hands in his lap, hiding the mark in his palm and the chain under his shirt. Grandmother moved around the stove like she was counting without numbers. Spoon against pot. Tap.

This time, it pointed toward the door. Zadeo did not move. The chain gave one soft tap against his chest. Again.

“Promise me,” she said. He looked up. “Promise me you won’t test that room just because it called you.” The chain tapped once.

CHAPTER 9 The Small Door Before the Sky

The door was not where a door should be. That was the first thing Zadeo noticed. It stood at the edge of the roof, narrow and dark, set into nothing but night air and the long drop beyond the building. No wall held it. No frame reached the ground. It simply waited there, small enough that a man had to choose whether to bend or break himself to pass through. Behind him, the car rested in silence.

It had brought him as far as the roof access, up the spiral road that should not have held weight, through the service gate that opened only after three wrong turns and one right breath. But it had not crossed onto the roof. Zadeo had noticed that too. The car stayed where the road ended.

Like a good bridge. Like a warning. Wind moved across the roof in thin layers. It touched his coat, then his hand, then the brim of his hat, testing him the way cold water tests skin before a body steps in. The small door gave one soft pulse.

Zadeo stepped closer. The small door brightened at the edges, just enough to reveal the handle. It was plain metal. No crown. No symbol. No promise. That made it worse. A grand gate could be challenged.

A plain door asked whether you could obey. Zadeo lifted his hand. The air tightened around his fingers. The door knew him.

Not completely. Not like home. But more than the childhood door had. Back then, the house had stopped him because he was small.

This time, the door waited because he was strong enough to make a mistake. That was different. The handle turned a fraction by itself. A blade of darker sky appeared through the crack.

Then two. Then a silence shaped like a beat waiting to land. Zadeo almost smiled. The world had always tried to teach him through rhythm before it trusted him with words.

The door opened another inch. He had not touched it. That was the test. Zadeo lowered his hand.

The door did not close. It stayed cracked, thin and patient, showing him exactly enough darkness to prove it was real and not enough to let him mistake nearness for permission. He understood then that this was not denial. Not like before.

Before, the door had said no because he could not carry what was behind it. This one said wait because he could. And that made waiting harder. Zadeo took one step back.

Zadeo looked at the small door one last time. He could force it. He could leave. Instead, he chose the only thing neither fear nor power liked.

CHAPTER 5 The Adults Knew the Door

The next morning, nobody said the word door. That was how Zadeo knew everybody was thinking about it. Adults were loud about things that did not matter. Shoes by the bed. Water on the floor. A shirt left twisted in the corner. Those things got voices and fingers pointed at them. The door got quiet.

“Because I said not to.” That was a grown-up answer. A wall answer. Zadeo knew the difference between an answer that closed something and an answer that hid behind it.

The chain gave one soft tap under his shirt. Zadeo pressed his elbows to his sides. Grandmother saw. She tried not to.

“No.” Zadeo blinked. He had expected every answer except that one. “Then why won’t you tell me?”

Zadeo felt something cold slide through his stomach. “You know about that too.” This time, she did not pretend. The kitchen seemed smaller after that.

The stove clicked. The refrigerator hummed. Somewhere in the wall, a pipe knocked once and went still. Grandmother leaned close enough that her voice did not have to travel far.

“Promise,” she said again. The rice popped softly in the pot. The refrigerator hummed. The house waited.

Zadeo closed his marked hand. “I promise,” he said. The chain went cold. Grandmother opened her eyes.

That scared him more than the tapping. The chain under his shirt gave one soft answer against his chest. Tap.

CHAPTER 8 The Proof They Left Behind

The box was under the old keyboard bench. Zadeo found it because the bench wobbled. Not much. Just enough to make the low note on the left side tremble every time his knee brushed the wood.

He crouched and ran his hand beneath the wood. His fingers found dust first. Then string. Then the edge of a shoebox taped shut so many times the tape had gone yellow and stiff.

A grown woman stirring rice like the truth might burn if she left it alone. Zadeo set the box on the keyboard bench. The lid had grandmother’s handwriting on it. Not his name.

“Y’all loved that word,” he said. The room did not answer. He opened the box. Inside were papers folded around papers. A grocery receipt. An old hospital bracelet. A photograph with the corner burned dark. A cassette tape with no label. A brass key wrapped in a hand towel that smelled faintly of smoke even after all the years.

It showed the hallway. The same hallway. The forbidden door sat at the end, paint cracked around the frame. On the floor in front of it, someone had drawn a circle in white powder. Or ash. Or something that looked too soft to be either. On the back of the photograph, another note waited.

Then a breath. Grandmother’s voice came through thin and far away. “If he finds this, don’t tell him all of it at once.” Zadeo’s jaw tightened.

Another voice answered, lower, tired. “He’ll hate us for that.” “Let him,” grandmother said. A pause.

Behind the voices, faint as a memory under the floor, there was a rhythm. Tap.

Never enough. But something. He sat back on his heels, surrounded by proof that love could look almost exactly like withholding. The tape clicked at the end.

Like memory recognizing a pulse. He did not know where it belonged yet. But he knew it was not meant to stay in the box. Under the bench, the old wood gave one final tap.

The key pointed at the wall behind the keyboard. Zadeo stared at it until the shape of the room stopped feeling ordinary. The old bench sat crooked behind him. The shoebox lay open on top of it, papers spread like somebody had tried to bury the truth and forgotten the truth knew how to breathe. The cassette tape was silent now.

Zadeo sat down hard on the bench. The keyboard answered with three low notes. Not because he pressed them. Because the bench shook under him.

CHAPTER 6 The Dream That Counted Backward

He opened his eyes inside the dream. He was in the kitchen. No. The hallway.

Six.

Five.

The dream did not let him ask. It counted instead. Three.

He stopped. Something was breathing on the other side. Not a monster. Not a person.

Before. The word beat with the floorboards. Zadeo woke with his hand closed around nothing. Morning light sat gray on the keyboard.

CHAPTER 7 The Place Before the Room

Not magic in any way he could name. Just warm enough to make him feel like it had been waiting in somebody else’s hand before it reached his. He looked at the wall. Nothing about it looked hidden.

That bothered him too. The baseboard was dusty. The paint was old. A thin crack ran behind the keyboard stand and disappeared under a shelf of music books nobody played from anymore. Zadeo moved the books first. One by one.

When the last book came away, the wall gave one soft knock. Tap.

Zadeo did not jump. He was getting tired of giving the house the satisfaction. He ran his fingers along the crack. The wood dipped under his thumb.

The panel opened inward. Cold air breathed against his face. Behind the wall was not a room. It was a narrow space between places, no wider than his shoulders, with old wood on one side and the back of the forbidden wall on the other. Dust lay thick along the bottom. A strip of cloth had been nailed inside like somebody had needed to leave a flag but did not want anyone calling it one.

His chest tightened. Not enough to drop him. Enough to remind him his body had always kept its own secrets. Zadeo reached into the narrow place.

Marked cloth. Broken metal. A warning written like love by people who had hurt him trying to keep him alive. He carried it out of the keyboard room.

---

7. What the Construction Record Actually Establishes

The artifact has now been encountered.

The remaining question is narrower than whether its chapters contain meaningful relationships.

It is whether the surviving construction record can distinguish relationships already available in the source material from effects that changed because inward construction had already occurred.

That distinction produces the most important correction in Experiment 1.

Static constraints and state-driven constraints are not the same evidence.

What Changed Because Construction Had Already Occurred

Storybuilder did not construct each chapter from an unconstrained pool.

Before any particular commit, its chapter profile already supplied structural pressures including required tags, chapter role, source locality, anchor conditions, and Sixfold Rot matching.

Those mechanisms affected what material could compete for a position.

They were real construction intelligence.

They were not, by themselves, evidence produced by the inward order.

The story spine belongs to the same category.

Beginning, middle, and ending conditions existed before the twelve chapter commits and supplied global boundary conditions.

Their prior existence matters to interpretation, but it cannot be treated as evidence that one subsequently committed chapter caused another.

Two other mechanisms were different because their state changed as construction advanced.

First, each commit altered the set of completed positions and therefore changed the next unresolved inward frontier.

Second, committed prose became an active input to later selection and repair. Storybuilder could detect candidate fragments that repeated text already present in the committed ledger, penalize them during scoring, and remove them during repetition repair.

The implementation-level distinction can therefore be stated directly:

Static constraints determined what could compete. State-driven constraints determined what changed because construction had already occurred.

The sequence alone was not the mechanism.

The finite corpus alone was not the mechanism.

The inward mechanism that survives implementation scrutiny is the changing frontier plus the changing body of realized prose against which later construction operated.

What the Original Twelve Chapters Actually Were

The original Experiment 1 chapters were not recorded as model-generated prose.

Their surviving provenance identifies the composition mode as:

`direct_join`

The chapter bodies were compiled deterministically from selected corpus fragments.

The provenance records:

- `bodySource = "Body-Eligible Selected Corpus Fragments"`
- `engineProseExpansion = "Disabled"`
- `compilerReport.mode = "direct_join"`
- `compilerReport.plan = "none"`
- paragraph provenance with `phase = "direct_join"`
- no transition generation.

Later Storybuilder versions supported other modes, including `source_faithful_compile` and `generated_local_model`.

Those later labels cannot be projected backward onto Experiment 1.

For the original twelve commits, the surviving construction record supports:

PROVEN_DIRECT_JOIN_DETERMINISTIC_SOURCE_FRAGMENT_COMPILATION

The experiment therefore tested constrained realization over an existing source field.

It did not test blank-page autonomous prose invention.

That distinction becomes especially important because the source manuscript feeding that field had itself been written in conventional chapter order.

The transformed material identified in the later Experiment 1 chapters came predominantly from those later chapters' own native source fragments.

The inward sequence therefore cannot automatically be credited with inventing the transformations later observed in the finished artifact.

This substantially limits what can be claimed about the four strongest relationship classifications.

The Frozen Class A Relationships and the Causal Record

The Experiment 1 audit froze four relationships as Class A:

1 → 12
2 → 11
3 → 10
4 → 9

Those classifications remain part of the frozen historical record.

But the later implementation audit asks a more demanding question:

Does the surviving construction record show that the earlier member of each pair caused or materially altered construction of the later member?

For the four pairs, that stronger result is not established.

1 → 12

Chapter 12 used its own native material together with cross-chapter corpus material.

Chapter 1 was the only prior committed chapter.

But Chapter 12's surviving repetition repair contains no drop attributed to Chapter 1, and no surviving receipt identifies Chapter 1 prose as a causal construction input.

The global spine was already present.

Pair-specific prior-commit causation: UNPROVEN.

2 → 11

Chapter 11 contains a genuine state-driven repetition event.

`DFCA.C11.F005` was removed because it repeated committed text.

But this does not provide evidence for 2 → 11.

The repair receipt does not record which prior commit supplied the matching text, while the ledger shows that Chapter 12 had already used `DFCA.C11.F005` in its compiled body.

The strongest supported attribution is therefore Chapter 12 rather than Chapter 2.

2 → 11 pair-specific prior-commit causation: UNPROVEN.

3 → 10

Chapter 10 drew predominantly on its own source material together with cross-chapter fragments.

No Chapter 3 fragment appears in the surviving Chapter 10 construction provenance, and no repetition repair or surviving receipt identifies Chapter 3 prose as affecting Chapter 10.

Pair-specific prior-commit causation: UNPROVEN.

4 → 9

Chapter 9 likewise drew predominantly on its own native source material together with cross-chapter material.

Its repair process operated on selected material, but the surviving record does not identify Chapter 4 prose as the cause of the resulting Chapter 9 construction.

Pair-specific prior-commit causation: UNPROVEN.

This matters because the source manuscript already supplied substantial narrative structure in conventional order.

The completed artifact can still contain a strong relationship.

The construction chronology can still make that relationship eligible for directed analysis.

But neither fact is equivalent to proving that the earlier inward commit generated the later transformation.

The frozen Class A labels therefore describe the original relationship-level adjudication.

They should not be read as four independently instrumented machine-level causal demonstrations.

The Ten Recorded Repetition Drops

The strongest direct evidence of state-driven construction does not come from the four pair labels.

It comes from the repetition-repair record.

Across the twelve Experiment 1 constructions, Storybuilder recorded ten selected fragments removed specifically because they repeated already committed text.

The repair receipts do not themselves name the matching prior commit. The final column below is therefore **inferred from prior fragment selection in the ledger, not a recorded match**.

Constructed chapter	Fragment removed	Likely matched commit — inferred from prior selection, not recorded match
11	`DFCA.C11.F005`	**12**
3	`DFCA.C02.F017`	**2**
5	`DFCA.C05.F002`	**4**
5	`DFCA.C05.F026`	**4**
5	`DFCA.C12.F002`	**12**
8	`DFCA.C08.F013`	**Unknown**
6	`DFCA.C05.F001`	**5**
6	`DFCA.C05.F002`	**4**
7	`DFCA.C07.F001`	**8**
7	`DFCA.C04.F005`	**5**

The distinction between recorded fact and inferred attribution is important.

The recorded fact is that each fragment was removed because it repeated committed text.

The inferred prior commit is the earlier constructed chapter whose compiled body can be shown to have used the same fragment.

One case remains unresolved: no prior compiled-fragment match has been established for `DFCA.C08.F013`.

The other nine drops can be connected to prior use at the fragment level.

These events establish something more basic and more directly instrumented than the literary pair classifications:

the committed artifact changed what later construction was allowed to retain.

Two cases are particularly important because they cross the unresolved interval in opposite directions.

Ending Side → Beginning Side: 12 → 5

Chapter 12 had already been constructed.

When construction later returned to the beginning side and reached Chapter 5, `DFCA.C12.F002` entered the Chapter 5 candidate set and was removed because it repeated committed text.

The prior-use record identifies Chapter 12 as the likely committed source.

This is a recorded state-driven exclusion operating from the previously realized ending side into later beginning-side construction.

Beginning Side → Ending Side: 5 → 7

Chapter 5 had already been constructed before the final center chapter.

Chapter 5’s compiled body retained `DFCA.C04.F005`.

When Chapter 7 was later constructed, that same fragment was selected and then removed because it repeated committed text.

The prior-use record therefore identifies Chapter 5 as the likely matching committed state.

This supplies the opposite direction:

beginning-side realized state affecting later ending-side/center construction.

Together, **12 → 5** and **5 → 7** supply implementation evidence that committed-state pressure was not restricted to one directional front.

They do not establish the original six opposing literary pairs as causal dependencies.

They establish something narrower:

previously realized material from either constructed side could alter what survived later construction.

The remaining repetition drops show the same state-sensitive mechanism operating elsewhere.

Because the repair receipts do not store the exact matching span or causal commit identifier, the inferred edges should not be promoted beyond that level.

But the aggregate evidence establishes that committed prose was not inert storage.

It participated in later exclusion decisions.

What the Source Corpus Means

The source corpus complicates the experiment in a useful way.

It contained material organized from a manuscript written in normal narrative order.

Later Inward chapters could also recruit fragments associated with other source chapters, including chapters that had not yet been committed.

The completed Inward artifact therefore inherited substantial structure from a pre-existing story field.

That prevents a simple causal claim:

Inward cannot be credited with creating every relationship that appears in the resulting story.

But the opposite claim also goes too far.

The existence of the corpus does not mean the inward sequence was behaviorally irrelevant.

The repetition record demonstrates that realized state altered later construction.

The correct experimental distinction is therefore between:

relationships already available in the source field

and

selection or exclusion behavior that changed because some of that field had already become committed reality.

Experiment 1 provides direct evidence for the second mechanism.

It does not provide clean causal isolation for all of the first.

Accumulation Without Monotonic Strengthening

This distinction also resolves the weak center.

Several quantities genuinely accumulated as construction moved inward.

The number of committed positions increased.

The unresolved frontier contracted.

The amount of realized prose available for repetition comparison increased.

The number of opportunities for state-sensitive reconciliation therefore increased.

None of those variables is identical to pairwise dependency strength.

Storybuilder did not compute a measurement showing that each successive opposing pair became more causally dependent than the previous pair.

The weaker classifications near the center therefore do not need to be treated as anomalous failures.

They show that:

more historically available constraint does not guarantee a stronger relationship between any particular pair of chapter positions.

Constraint accumulation, at the implementation level, means accumulation of established state available to influence later construction.

It does not mean monotonic growth in Class A strength.

A Correction to Section 12

Because accepted sections are not silently rewritten, one earlier statement must remain visible and be corrected here rather than erased.

Section 12 states that:

the fictional experiment demonstrated that meaningful directed dependencies can survive rigorous provenance analysis under the architecture.

The later construction-record audit does not support that statement at the level implied.

The four frozen Class A relationships remain part of the original adjudication, but the surviving machine provenance does not establish pair-specific causal participation for those four relationships.

Therefore:

Section 12’s statement that Experiment 1 demonstrated directed dependency exceeds what the construction record supports. The supported claim is the one stated here: Experiment 1 demonstrated state-driven inward construction effects, including frontier progression and committed-prose pressure, while pair-specific directed causation remains unproven.

This is not a rewrite of Section 12.

It is a result of Experiment 2.

A conclusion constructed earlier in the inward sequence was later constrained by evidence encountered closer to the center.

The paper preserves that correction rather than hiding it.

What the Blind Audit Can Still Contribute

The frozen independent audit remains useful, but its limitations must be explicit.

The retained audit file respects the Experiment 1 construction chronology and independently reports relationship classifications, downgrades, and the absence of accepted temporal violations.

However, the surviving record does not identify the auditor or sufficiently document what the auditor was blind to beyond the frozen audit description.

It therefore cannot carry more evidentiary weight than its surviving provenance permits.

It can be reported as a **frozen independent/blind audit artifact**.

It should not be presented as a fully characterized independent replication.

Its convergence with the earlier classifications is evidence of agreement between analyses.

Its surviving documentation is insufficient to establish stronger claims about methodological independence.

Neighboring Methods Already in the Closed Corpus

The closed Experiment 2 evidence corpus also contains neighboring technical work.

Two relevant examples are **StoryAnchors (2025)** and **StoryImager (2024)**.

StoryAnchors is recorded as a broader technical analogue using past and future context for bidirectional long-form story consistency.

StoryImager is recorded as a broader analogue using bidirectional contextual information across a storyline for visual story generation.

These systems matter because they show that using information from multiple temporal directions is not unique in the broadest technical sense.

They do not establish the specific Inward textual construction sequence.

Nor do they demonstrate the same commit-driven repetition mechanism observed here.

Their appropriate role is therefore contextual rather than evidentiary:

Inward belongs near a family of bidirectional-context approaches, while making a narrower claim about an explicit outside-to-center construction frontier and state-sensitive realization.

The present experiment does not establish superiority over those neighboring methods.

The Missing Control

One comparison remains essential.

Experiment 1 did not include a straight-order control run over the same source corpus and the same Storybuilder mechanisms.

Without that control, the paper cannot determine whether the observed repetition drops, repair frequency, continuity behavior, or resulting artifact would differ materially under:

1 → 2 → 3 → 4 → 5 → 6 → 7 → 8 → 9 → 10 → 11 → 12

This leaves a major alternative explanation open.

The state-sensitive machinery may be valuable, while the specific inward ordering may or may not provide an advantage over ordinary sequential construction using the same ledger-aware repair mechanisms.

A straight-order control is therefore pending.

Until that comparison is run, the paper does not establish that ordinary sequential construction lacks the benefits observed here.

Experiment 2 Audits Itself

The white paper was constructed under the same sequence:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Its evidence corpus was closed.

Accepted sections were preserved rather than silently rewritten.

That makes the present correction significant.

Section 12 was constructed near the beginning of Experiment 2 and reached a stronger positive interpretation.

Later sections were required to approach that already existing ending without inventing evidence to satisfy it.

The final construction event instead found that part of the earlier conclusion was too strong.

The paper therefore did not converge by forcing its interior to confirm its ending.

It preserved the earlier statement and allowed later evidence to narrow it.

That does not prove that Inward is superior to conventional nonfiction drafting.

There is no nonfiction control document.

It does show that the Experiment 2 procedure was capable of producing a **non-convergent correction** rather than silently protecting its predetermined conclusion.

The strongest self-audit result is therefore not that Experiment 2 proves Inward.

It is that the protocol survived a finding that weakened one of its own accepted claims.

That is a more meaningful result than perfect agreement would have been.

What the Construction Record Supports

The strongest interpretation that survives both experiments is narrower than the one with which the paper began.

Experiment 1 does not establish that opposing chapter pairs become progressively stronger dependencies.

It does not establish that the four frozen Class A relationships were caused by their earlier paired commits.

It does not establish that Inward outperforms straight-order drafting.

It does not establish quantified solution-space contraction.

What the implementation does establish is this:

Inward construction operated over a bounded source field while progressively changing both the unresolved frontier and the set of realized prose against which later material was selected and repaired.

The ten recorded repetition exclusions show that the second state was operational.

The prior-use record further identifies state-sensitive exclusions in both cross-interval directions:

12 → 5

and

5 → 7

These are not recorded causal-match labels produced by Storybuilder itself.

They are bounded inferences from exact fragment reuse across prior committed bodies followed by repetition-based exclusion.

At that level, they provide direct evidence that construction on either side of the interval could affect what survived when construction later proceeded elsewhere in the inward sequence.

The appropriate result is therefore not:

every opposing pair became causally dependent.

It is:

previously realized state became capable of constraining later realization from either side of the inward frontier.

That mechanism is demonstrated.

Its magnitude is not.

Its superiority is not.

Its pair-specific literary consequences are only partially attributable.

Those limits do not erase the experiment.

They define what the experiment actually found.

---

8. What a Connection Is Allowed to Mean

A finished story makes connections easy to see.

That is precisely why connections must be treated carefully.

Once the complete artifact exists, its beginning, ending, characters, objects, transformations, repetitions, wounds, habits, and resolutions can all be held in view at the same time. Events written at different construction moments now appear beside one another as parts of a single completed work.

The completed story therefore creates a powerful retrospective illusion:

because two things connect now, they may appear to have always belonged to the same causal chain.

Inward cannot accept that assumption.

Section 5 approached the unresolved middle from the opposite direction. It argued that constructed states can change what later construction must answer without determining a single inevitable continuation. The middle becomes a field of lawful possibilities rather than unrestricted forward generation.

That claim creates an obligation on this side of the artifact.

If established states can constrain later construction, then the analysis must also distinguish genuine constraint from relationships that only become persuasive after the completed story allows both ends to be seen together.

A connection may be real without being a dependency.

A recurrence may be meaningful without having constrained construction.

A later state may preserve an earlier condition without having been directly caused by it.

A development may fit perfectly while remaining only compatible.

The question is no longer whether the artifact contains connections.

It clearly does.

The question is:

What is each connection allowed to mean?

The Finished Artifact Is More Informative Than Any Construction Event

The reader occupies a position the writer did not occupy during most of the experiment.

The reader sees the completed artifact.

During construction, that artifact did not yet exist.

At each event, only certain states had actually been constructed. Other chapters may have been planned, anticipated, expected, or conceptually known, but they were not yet available as completed states.

This creates an asymmetry between reading and construction.

The reader can notice a relationship instantly because both sides are present.

The experiment cannot reason that way.

It must return to the moment of construction and ask which information actually existed then.

That is the provenance rule in its most practical form.

Without that rule, almost any completed story can be made to look more structurally determined than it really was.

A repeated image can be called foreshadowing.

A later behavior can be called the consequence of an earlier wound.

A mirrored scene can be called deliberate structural closure.

A familiar object can be called a planted mechanism.

Sometimes those descriptions are justified.

Sometimes they are not.

The completed artifact alone cannot decide.

Zadeo as Evidence and as Temptation

Zadeo makes this problem especially visible because his character carries states across widely separated parts of the artifact.

The child state and the later internal capability can be read together.

The chain and door can be read as more than isolated physical details.

The childhood palm mark can be compared with the adult reach or habit that later gives it another function.

Externally imposed restraint can be placed beside later self-restraint.

These relationships matter because character provides continuity across changing narrative conditions.

But the strength of that continuity differs.

The reader may experience all four as belonging to one coherent Zadeo.

That experience is legitimate as literary experience.

It is not sufficient as experimental classification.

The experiment must still ask what kind of relationship actually occurred.

Did the later state require the earlier state?

Did the later construction preserve a condition established earlier?

Did the two states simply remain compatible?

Did an image or behavior recur without demonstrable structural dependence?

Those distinctions remain necessary precisely because Zadeo feels continuous.

A strong character can make weak provenance look stronger than it is.

The more successfully the artifact creates a recognizable person, the easier it becomes to interpret every return of gesture, object, language, restraint, capability, or memory as evidence of a single directed system.

That would confuse character coherence with construction evidence.

The other characters in the artifact create the same risk.

Their relationships to Zadeo, their reactions to changing conditions, what they preserve about him, what they reveal, what they fail to retrieve, and how their own states change can all make constraint visible.

But none of them become evidence merely by being compelling.

Characters are carriers.

They are not exemptions from provenance.

Four Different Meanings of “It Connects”

The evidence classes exist because the phrase “it connects” is too imprecise.

A completed artifact can contain several fundamentally different kinds of connection.

Directed dependency

The strongest case is one in which the subsequently constructed material depends upon information already established by the earlier constructed state.

The later state is not merely harmonious with what came before.

The earlier construction participates in producing its form.

This is the logic preserved in Class A.

Experiment 1 produced four opposing relationships strong enough to survive at this level:

1→12

2→11

3→10

4→9

Their importance is not numerical symmetry.

Their importance is provenance.

They survived the question of whether the required information actually existed when the later material was constructed.

Constraint preservation

A second kind of connection occurs when later material does not demonstrate the same level of directed dependency but does preserve an already established condition.

The earlier state matters because the later state remains answerable to it.

The later material may still have substantial freedom.

Multiple lawful developments may have remained possible.

What matters is that a constraint survived.

This is Class B.

It is particularly important because it shows why constraint should not be reduced to causation.

An established condition can remain operative without uniquely producing the scene that follows.

Compatible development

A third relationship is weaker.

Two states may fit.

They may reinforce the same character.

They may create satisfying continuity.

Nothing in one contradicts the other.

But compatibility does not prove that either state constrained the construction of the other.

This is Class C.

It matters because a coherent story should contain a great deal of compatibility.

If compatibility were automatically promoted into dependency, virtually every well-edited artifact would appear to validate Inward.

The experiment would lose its ability to distinguish its proposed mechanism from ordinary narrative coherence.

Literary recurrence

Finally, something may return.

An image.

An action.

A phrase.

An object.

A posture.

A motif.

A location.

A type of event.

The recurrence may be aesthetically powerful.

It may deepen the character.

It may create thematic unity.

It may even feel like proof when the story is read as a whole.

But if the construction record does not support preservation, transformation, or dependency, the relationship must remain recurrence.

This is Class D.

Class D does not mean meaningless.

It means the experiment is not entitled to claim more.

The Importance of a Disputed Relationship

The 5→8 relationship is therefore unusually valuable.

It remains **disputed B/C**.

That status should not be treated as an unfinished argument waiting to be upgraded.

It is a result.

The dispute marks the boundary between two different interpretations.

Under the stronger interpretation, an established condition was preserved strongly enough to function as constraint.

Under the weaker interpretation, the later development is compatible with what came before but does not demonstrate that the earlier state exerted sufficient construction pressure to justify Class B.

The evidence does not currently authorize the paper to erase that distinction.

That restraint matters.

The inward construction sequence reaches progressively closer pairs, but the evidence does not become progressively stronger merely because the chapters become geometrically closer.

In Experiment 1, the opposite happened.

The first four paired relationships survived as Class A.

The fifth did not.

The 5→8 pair weakened into a disputed B/C classification.

The 6→7 pair weakened further into C/D.

That pattern prevents a convenient but unsupported interpretation of Inward.

The method is not demonstrating that every inward step mechanically creates stronger dependence.

The experiment instead shows that previously constructed states **can** become operative constraints while the strength of any particular relationship remains an empirical question.

This is why the negative result is productive.

The framework can refuse itself.

A Second Constraint Inside Chapter 8

Chapter 8 also contains another admitted relationship: the **3→8 activation rule**, retained as a Class B candidate.

That matters because one construction event can participate in more than one potential relationship without giving every relationship the same evidentiary strength.

Chapter 8 does not acquire one universal classification.

Relationships do.

A chapter may contain one element that preserves a genuine earlier constraint, another that merely develops compatibly, and another that recurs for literary reasons.

This prevents analysis from collapsing the artifact into chapter-level verdicts.

The unit of evidence is not simply:

Chapter 8 connects to earlier chapters.

The useful question is:

Which state in Chapter 8 is related to which previously constructed state, through what mechanism, with what provenance?

That distinction becomes particularly important when characters carry several histories at once.

Zadeo can enter a scene carrying physical history, relational history, habits, capabilities, restraint, memory, and symbolic associations simultaneously.

Another character can respond to one of those states without responding to the others.

One state may constrain the scene.

Another may simply remain compatible with it.

A third may recur because the author recognizes an opportunity for resonance.

Treating all three as the same phenomenon would destroy the resolution the experiment is trying to obtain.

The Character Does Not Have One Continuity

This suggests a more precise way to inspect character.

A character is not one continuous variable.

A character is a bundle of states whose individual histories can differ.

Zadeo’s physical capability may have one provenance.

His restraint may have another.

His relationship to an object may have another.

A habit may survive from childhood.

A later capability may retrieve an earlier vulnerability.

A repeated gesture may have no demonstrated dependency at all.

The character remains recognizable because these states coexist.

The experiment becomes informative only when it refuses to flatten them into one declaration that “Zadeo remained consistent.”

Consistency is too coarse.

The stronger questions are:

What persisted?

What transformed?

What became necessary?

What remained optional?

What was retrieved?

What merely fit?

What returned without structural force?

And where did the expected connection fail?

The same questions apply to the other characters.

A relationship between characters can preserve an earlier imbalance without being caused by it.

A later reaction can expose a transformed condition.

A character can function as evidence of another character’s change because the interaction makes the change observable.

Or two characters can simply behave in ways that remain compatible with the story already written.

The classification must follow the relationship, not the charisma of the scene.

Failure of Dependency Is Part of the Artifact

This becomes especially important near the center.

The 6→7 relationship remains **C/D**.

The closest opposing pair did not become the strongest one.

That result is theoretically inconvenient if the desired conclusion were that inward construction automatically intensifies dependency as the sequence converges.

But that is not the conclusion the evidence permits.

The weaker center relationship instead establishes a useful limit.

Physical proximity in the construction sequence is not proof of causal or constraint strength.

Two chapters can sit directly across the final unresolved seam and still fail to demonstrate strong dependency.

This means the geometry creates the opportunity for constraint.

It does not manufacture evidence of constraint.

That distinction protects the method from circularity.

If every inward pair were required to count as success, then the construction sequence itself would predetermine the result.

Instead, a pair can fail.

A relationship can be downgraded.

A recurrence can remain recurrence.

A compatible development can remain compatibility.

An expected dependency can remain unproven.

That is what allows the framework to function as an evidentiary instrument rather than merely as a vocabulary for praising the finished artifact.

The Reader’s Experience Must Be Preserved—but Bounded

The complete alternate Zadeo story is part of this white paper because the artifact itself matters.

The reader should encounter the characters as characters.

The reader should be allowed to notice echoes before being told which ones survive provenance analysis.

The reader should feel when an early wound seems to return, when a later action appears to answer an earlier state, when a relationship seems transformed, and when a character appears to become the person an earlier chapter made possible.

That experience is not a mistake.

It is one reason the complete artifact belongs here.

But the experiment places a boundary around what that experience can establish.

Recognition is not classification.

Emotional force is not provenance.

Narrative satisfaction is not dependency.

A reader may correctly perceive a relationship while overestimating what kind of relationship it is.

The evidentiary framework exists to perform that second operation.

The artifact supplies the connection.

Provenance limits the claim.

Why Downgrades Strengthen the Experiment

The strongest evidence that the classification system has meaning may not be the Class A findings alone.

It may be the fact that the same system refused to classify everything as Class A.

The disputed B/C finding matters.

The C/D finding matters.

The keyboard and bench development remaining Class C matters.

TAP remaining Class D matters.

These classifications show that the method contains resistance to its own preferred interpretation.

If every recurrence were promoted into constraint preservation, and every preservation into directed dependency, then the experiment would merely translate literary enthusiasm into technical vocabulary.

Instead, the framework has to tolerate disappointment.

It has to retain ambiguity when the evidence is ambiguous.

It has to preserve weak findings when the findings are weak.

It has to permit an attractive connection to remain experimentally unimportant.

This is not merely conservative wording.

It is part of the mechanism by which the experiment distinguishes evidence from interpretation.

From Connection to Preservation

The completed artifact can now be approached with a stricter vocabulary.

Something may recur.

Something may remain compatible.

Something may preserve a condition.

Something may transform a condition.

Something may depend upon a previously constructed state.

And sometimes nothing stronger can be demonstrated.

These are not interchangeable descriptions.

They describe different relationships between constructed states.

The distinction matters for Inward because the method’s central claim is not that unusual construction order produces a story full of connections.

Stories already do that.

The relevant claim is narrower:

previously constructed states can participate in shaping subsequently constructed material.

To evaluate that proposition, the finished artifact must be allowed to show both its successes and its refusals.

Zadeo’s continuity can make constraint visible.

The other characters can expose what changes around him and within their own states.

Objects, habits, restraints, capabilities, relationships, and recurring actions can all become points of inspection.

But every connection must stop at the strongest meaning its provenance supports.

That is the discipline required on this side of the artifact.

The next question is therefore not whether the story holds together.

It is more exact:

What did the artifact actually preserve—and what did it not?

---

9. What the Artifact Preserves—and What It Does Not

The alternate Zadeo story becomes most useful to this inquiry when its continuities are not treated as a single undifferentiated success.

The completed artifact contains strong directed dependencies, preserved constraints, compatible developments, and literary recurrences. Those categories are not interchangeable. The distinction matters because a story can feel coherent while providing very different kinds of evidence for how that coherence was produced.

The experiment therefore does not ask the reader merely whether the story “works.” It asks what, specifically, survived construction, what changed function, what remained merely compatible, and what should not be promoted into evidence of structural dependency.

Characters as Carriers of Retained State

The characters and their experienced world provide one of the clearest ways to observe constraint persistence.

This does not make character interpretation an independent evidentiary source. The characters matter here because their states and relationships are locations where previously established constraints can remain active, be transformed, or fail to acquire stronger status.

The strongest frozen examples occur in the four convergent Class A pairs.

In the 1 → 12 relationship, the terminal chapter specifically retrieves the child-state established in Chapter 1: the broken chain, RETURN, the cold floor, and the earlier external mystery. The later construction does more than repeat those elements. It transforms RETURN toward self-return and internal capability.

The relevant observation is therefore not simply that Zadeo appears at both ends of the story. His later state remains structurally connected to conditions established at the beginning.

The 2 → 11 relationship performs a comparable transformation through the chain and door relationship. Chapter 2 establishes that relationship. Chapter 11 retrieves it explicitly through the later formulation that the chain was never the door and that Return was not the door.

Again, the evidentiary value lies in retrieval plus transformation, not surface recurrence.

The 3 → 10 pair carries the childhood palm mark forward. Chapter 3 establishes the mark responding to attention. Chapter 10 retrieves the childhood mark and scales the phenomenon into adult reach and habit.

The 4 → 9 pair similarly preserves the threshold condition while changing its locus. Chapter 4 establishes externally imposed childhood threshold restraint. Chapter 9 retrieves that threshold and transforms the condition into adult self-restraint.

Across these examples, character state functions as an observable carrier of constraint. Earlier conditions are not merely mentioned again. They remain available to govern what later-generated material can coherently do.

Preservation Is Not the Same as Directed Dependency

The frozen record also prevents this interpretation from being generalized across every chapter relationship.

The 5 → 8 pair remains disputed.

One review classified Chapter 8’s archival evidence as meaningful preservation of Chapter 5’s withholding constraint. Another classified the relationship as compatible development rather than sufficient evidence of constraint preservation.

The project-level result therefore remains:

5 → 8 = DISPUTED B/C

The completed story does not authorize promotion of that pair simply because the relationship can be read coherently after the fact.

The 6 → 7 pair is weaker still under the frozen classification. The relationship between Chapter 6’s dream material and Chapter 7’s physical discovery is narratively compatible, but it does not satisfy the same directed-dependency standard as the four Class A pairs.

Its frozen status remains:

6 → 7 = CLASS C/D

That result is important because it demonstrates that proximity to the chronological middle of the fictional artifact does not itself create strong evidence. The classification follows the admitted dependency evidence, not the apparent dramatic importance of a location in the story.

Constraint Can Survive Without Becoming Plot

The additional 3 → 8 activation-rule finding illustrates another form of persistence.

Chapter 3 establishes a distinction between thinking about or referencing RETURN and directly saying or activating it. Chapter 8 indirectly references the word without producing the inflated supernatural response that a direct trigger would imply.

The frozen evidence treats this as a Class B candidate.

Its significance is different from the four Class A pairs. It does not require the later chapter to transform an earlier structural relationship. Instead, an already-established rule remains operative while later material develops around it.

This is precisely why the classification framework is necessary. Constraint preservation can be real without being promoted into directed dependency.

Recurrence Must Remain Recurrence

The same discipline applies in the opposite direction.

The repeated Tap motif is real and deliberate. It contributes rhythm, recognition, and literary continuity across the artifact.

But mundane Tap occurrences prevent the experiment from treating every instance as one immutable causal mechanism.

Its frozen classification remains Class D.

Likewise, keyboard and bench developments remain compatible with the established spatial reality without presently qualifying as directed dependency.

The experiment therefore preserves a boundary between literary success and forensic strength.

A recurring image may improve the story.

A compatible development may make the world feel continuous.

A preserved constraint may restrict what later material can lawfully do.

A directed dependency may retrieve and transform a specific earlier state.

Those are different observations.

What the Reader Should Now Watch For

This distinction changes the function of the experimental story within the white-paper package.

The complete alternate Zadeo story is not being supplied so that the reader can simply confirm that it feels coherent.

The reader is being prepared to inspect a constructed artifact in which different kinds of continuity coexist.

When the complete story is encountered at the center of this white-paper package, the useful questions are narrower:

What earlier conditions remain operative?

Which later states specifically retrieve earlier states?

Where does retrieval become transformation?

Where is the relationship only compatible?

Where is an apparent connection better classified as recurrence?

And where does the artifact refuse to provide stronger evidence than the record supports?

Those questions preserve the distinction between experiencing the story and evaluating the experiment.

The story can make the structural problem visible.

The frozen provenance and classification record determine what the experiment is permitted to claim about it.

That distinction becomes increasingly important as the two sides of this paper continue inward toward the complete artifact itself.

---

10. From Demonstrated Constraint to a Usable Construction Method

The evidence developed in this paper supports treating Inward not merely as an unusual order for drafting sections, but as a practical construction method whose defining feature is the establishment of usable states on opposing sides of an unresolved interval.

That distinction matters.

Experiment 1 did not produce twelve chapters and then search the completed manuscript for attractive correspondences. Its construction provenance was fixed as:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Under that chronology, later construction events occurred in an information environment containing material already established on both sides of the remaining narrative space.

The strongest frozen findings show what that changed information environment can do.

Four relationships survived the project’s strongest evidentiary classification:

1 → 12

2 → 11

3 → 10

4 → 9

Each was classified as Class A directed dependency because the later-generated member did more than resemble earlier material. It specifically retrieved an eligible established state and transformed or discharged it.

Chapter 1’s child-state, broken chain, RETURN, cold floor, and external mystery were retrieved and transformed in Chapter 12.

The chain-and-door relationship established in Chapter 2 was retrieved and transformed in Chapter 11.

The childhood palm mark established in Chapter 3 was retrieved and scaled into the adult phenomenon of Chapter 10.

The threshold restraint established in Chapter 4 was retrieved and transformed into adult self-restraint in Chapter 9.

The independent blind audit converged on the same four relationships as Class A and reported no genuine temporal violations or forbidden knowledge states among the Class A/B relationships it accepted.

That result establishes the practical core of Inward more clearly than motif recurrence or general final-story coherence could.

The method gives already constructed future material the opportunity to become an active constraint on material that has not yet been written.

Constraint Does Not Mean Predetermination

The evidence does not support describing Inward as a procedure that mechanically determines every unwritten passage.

The weaker relationships are important precisely because they prevent that exaggeration.

The 5 → 8 relationship remained disputed between Class B and Class C. The 6 → 7 relationship remained Class C/D. The TAP motif was retained as Class D literary recurrence rather than promoted into a causal invariant. Keyboard and bench developments remained compatible narrative development rather than directed dependency.

These distinctions show that an established boundary does not force every later element into a strong dependency relationship.

Instead, the demonstrated mechanism is narrower.

Previously constructed states can remain available as constraints, obligations, facts, limitations, causal relationships, unresolved questions, or transformation targets while the writer constructs the remaining interval.

Some of those states become load-bearing dependencies.

Some are preserved without being transformed.

Some merely remain compatible.

Some recur only at the literary level.

The method therefore preserves creative degrees of freedom inside an increasingly established structure.

This is consistent with the principal finding frozen after Experiment 1:

LOGICAL BIDIRECTIONAL CONSTRAINT ACCUMULATION

It is not equivalent to a quantified claim about solution-space contraction. No numerical measure of such contraction was established by Experiment 1, and this paper does not manufacture one.

Why the Distinction Is Useful

A conventional chronological manuscript can leave its terminal state unwritten while the writer advances through the interior. Even when the writer knows an intended ending, the ending may remain an outline, expectation, or mental destination rather than an actual constructed part of the artifact.

Inward changes that condition by constructing the opposing state.

Once the far boundary exists, the next interior section is no longer written only relative to what precedes it in reading order. It can also be written in the presence of what has already been established beyond it in construction order.

The practical advantage is not that the writer loses freedom.

The advantage is that some questions that would otherwise remain open can become bounded by actual manuscript reality.

A character state may already exist at the far boundary.

A mystery may already have a terminal transformation.

A physical rule may already have consequences that must be preserved.

A causal relationship may already possess an endpoint that subsequent construction cannot casually contradict.

The unresolved interval therefore becomes a construction problem between established states rather than an indefinitely open continuation from one state.

Experiment 1 demonstrates that this condition can produce real directed dependencies. It does not establish that every writer, genre, or project will benefit equally, nor does it establish superiority over every alternative nonlinear method.

But it does establish that the proposed mechanism is capable of operating in an actual constructed artifact.

The Nonfiction Experiment Raises the Standard

Experiment 2 places the same geometry under a different kind of pressure.

Fiction permits the writer to create new events, objects, revelations, causal mechanisms, and transformations so long as they remain lawful within the story.

This white paper cannot solve an inward construction problem that way.

Its external evidence corpus was closed before the present interior construction advanced. Post-closure external evidence is inadmissible. Evidence cannot be invented to strengthen a weak point. Previously accepted sections cannot be silently rewritten to make later sections easier to construct.

The beginning-side front now contains Sections 1, 2, and 3.

The ending-side boundary contains Sections 11 and 12.

The exact center remains the seam between Sections 6 and 7.

Accordingly, the remaining sections must progressively connect an already established research question, evidentiary framework, and empirical case to an already established interpretation, significance, and conclusion using the evidence that was actually available.

That is a materially different construction problem from fiction.

The system cannot create a convenient new fact because the argument needs one.

It must discover whether the admitted evidence is sufficient to bridge the interval.

A Product-Level Consequence

This distinction has direct implications for further development of Inward Story Builder V2.

An Inward writing system should not treat opposite-side chapters merely as additional context to place in a prompt.

It should represent the two constructed fronts as active sources of constraints.

For each new inward construction event, the system can distinguish at least four kinds of relationship already demonstrated by the experiments:

- directed dependencies that should be deliberately retrieved and transformed;
- constraints that should remain preserved;
- compatible developments that are lawful but not required;
- literary recurrences that should not be mistaken for structural obligations.

That distinction is important because indiscriminate retrieval can be as misleading as no retrieval at all.

If every repeated image is treated as a binding constraint, the system overconstrains composition.

If established future states are treated as passive background, the principal advantage of Inward is lost.

The useful product behavior lies between those errors: preserve the actual established boundaries, identify the obligations they create, and leave unconstrained space available for lawful composition.

The experiments also expose a related provenance requirement.

A writing system that claims deterministic or governed output should distinguish the receipt for a decision to emit from the identity of the manuscript actually emitted. A gate receipt can establish that an emission decision occurred under declared conditions, while a separate manuscript-content receipt can bind that decision to the exact resulting text.

Likewise, lawful variation between compositions should be identified rather than hidden. If the same corpus can support more than one valid construction, the system should distinguish intentional variation from unexplained drift.

These are not separate from the Inward method.

They follow from the same principle: constructed states matter only when the system can identify what state actually existed, when it existed, and how subsequent construction was constrained by it.

Advancing Toward the Center

At the present construction position, the two sides of the nonfiction artifact have not yet met.

They are closer.

From the beginning side, the paper has moved from the research problem to the evidentiary classification framework and then into the forensic evidence of Experiment 1.

From the ending side, the paper has already established the interpretation, limitations, significance, application, and terminal conclusion that the interior must be capable of supporting.

The remaining task is therefore increasingly specific.

The interior must explain how the demonstrated fictional evidence and the prospective nonfiction construction relate to the claimed mechanism without exceeding the frozen evidence, hiding the weaker results, or inventing support.

If the remaining sections can do that, the two fronts will have approached the 6|7 seam as one coherent evidentiary case.

If they cannot, the failure will occur inside a structure that makes the location and nature of the failure visible.

That visibility is itself useful for development.

Inward does not remove the need to solve the middle.

It changes the middle from an unknown destination into the remaining interval between states that already exist.

---

11. What the Evidence Permits Us to Conclude

The significance of the fictional experiment does not depend on every proposed relationship surviving analysis.

It depends on what remains after relationships that can be explained by weaker mechanisms are removed.

That distinction matters because the evidentiary framework established earlier in this paper was intentionally asymmetric. A relationship is not promoted merely because it supports Inward. It must satisfy the historical conditions imposed by the construction record. Conversely, a relationship that is aesthetically convincing but cannot establish directed dependency remains useful as literature while contributing little or nothing to the narrower experimental claim.

The result is a smaller but stronger evidentiary core.

What Class A Establishes

A surviving Class A relationship demonstrates that information existed in a previously constructed state before a subsequently constructed section was produced, and that the later section explicitly received, transformed, resolved, inverted, scaled, or otherwise responded to that information.

This does not prove that only one continuation was possible.

It does not prove that the earlier state mechanically determined every feature of the later section.

It establishes something more specific and directly relevant to Inward:

the future or opposing constructed state was available to participate in subsequent composition.

That distinction separates Inward from merely knowing where a work will eventually end.

The relevant future material was not only an intention. It had become part of the developing artifact.

When a later construction event demonstrably responds to that material, the connection possesses both textual evidence and chronological direction.

That is directed dependency.

What Class B Establishes

Class B addresses a quieter form of constraint.

A previously constructed work can influence later composition not only by demanding an explicit transformation but by establishing something that subsequent material must preserve.

A rule may remain unbroken.

A condition may continue to govern.

A prohibition may remain operative.

A character or causal state may constrain what can lawfully happen later.

In such cases, the evidence lies partly in the absence of contradiction.

That absence cannot automatically be treated as proof. Most consistent writing contains innumerable details that simply happen not to conflict.

Class B becomes meaningful when a specific prior constraint is identifiable, historically available, and preserved at a later construction event where violating or cheaply overriding it would have been possible.

The fictional experiment contains evidence of this form.

Together, Classes A and B therefore represent two different ways in which an established construction state can matter: one through **directed transformation**, the other through **constraint preservation**.

What Classes C and D Prevent Us From Claiming

The weaker classifications are equally important to interpreting the result.

Class C demonstrates compatibility.

Compatible development may be excellent writing. It may expand the world, deepen characterization, or introduce a new mechanism that fits everything already established.

But compatibility alone does not show that an earlier construction state caused or constrained the new material.

Class D is weaker still for the present purpose.

Repeated imagery, rhythm, motifs, words, sounds, objects, and thematic parallels can create powerful cohesion. They can also arise through ordinary literary craft, authorial preference, revision, or deliberate recurrence without functioning as structural constraints.

The fictional audit therefore does not count those phenomena as equivalent to directed dependency.

This matters because removing them makes the resulting claim harder rather than easier to manufacture.

If Inward required every attractive correspondence to be counted as evidence, the experiment would tell us very little.

It does not.

Some proposed evidence was downgraded.

The method survived the downgrade.

The Fiction Experiment Passed Its Relevant Test

Under the evidentiary threshold established for this paper, the fictional experiment passed.

The reason is not that every proposed dependency survived.

The reason is that **Class A directed dependencies and Class B constraint preservation remained after weaker Class C and Class D explanations were separated from them.**

That result supports the proposition actually under test:

> **Previously constructed states can participate in shaping subsequently constructed material under the Inward sequence.**

This is a positive finding.

It is also narrower than several claims that the experiment does not establish.

The experiment does not prove that Inward is universally superior to sequential composition.

It does not establish that every writer will write faster using it.

It does not establish a neurological mechanism.

It does not quantify cognitive load.

It does not demonstrate that every genre benefits equally.

It does not show that every relationship in an Inward manuscript results from bidirectional constraint.

Those questions require different experiments.

They are not necessary to establish the mechanism demonstrated here.

Existence Before Superiority

This distinction is particularly important for evaluating a new construction method.

Before asking whether a method is better than another method, it is reasonable to establish whether its proposed mechanism exists at all.

The first experiment addresses that earlier question.

Inward predicts that constructing opposing narrative states before their interior can allow those states to constrain subsequent composition.

The provenance analysis found surviving examples consistent with that prediction under the known generation order.

The result therefore supports the **existence of directed constraint propagation within an Inward-constructed artifact**.

A controlled comparison against sequential writing would answer a different question: whether that mechanism produces measurable advantages in coherence, revision burden, completion speed, continuity, creative freedom, or some other selected outcome.

Those comparative questions remain open.

The existence question does not.

Within the tested artifact, directed dependencies survived the evidentiary filter.

Why the Negative Findings Matter

The downgrades in Experiment 1 are not defects to hide.

They reveal something important about how Inward should be evaluated and eventually implemented.

A system that treated every recurring motif as structural would overstate its understanding of the work.

A system that treated every compatible continuation as required would unnecessarily restrict the writer.

The audit demonstrates the need to preserve a distinction between:

what the work requires,

what the work permits,

and

what the work merely repeats.

That distinction has direct consequences for Inward Story Builder V2.

A constraint-aware Story Builder should not flatten all relationships into a single category.

Some established states create obligations.

Some preserve rules.

Some merely permit later developments.

Some are artistic recurrence with no demonstrated causal force.

Preserving those differences can allow the system to constrain where the manuscript genuinely requires constraint while leaving the writer free where multiple lawful continuations remain available.

Why a Second Experiment Is Necessary

The fictional experiment establishes the mechanism under an unusually demanding condition: much of the material connecting the boundaries must still be imagined.

That makes fiction a strong test of whether opposing constructed states can influence later composition, but it also introduces a large creative variable.

The writer must invent events while satisfying the constraints generated by the existing work.

The second experiment changes that condition.

This white paper is itself being constructed in the Inward order:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Its external evidence corpus was closed before the remaining interior construction proceeded.

That changes the problem.

The interior cannot solve a structural difficulty by inventing a new factual event.

It must construct the argument from admissible material already available to the experiment, together with provenance generated prospectively by the experiment itself.

The nonfiction test therefore asks whether the same construction geometry remains useful when imagination is no longer allowed to manufacture the evidentiary bridge.

The Second Experiment Has Already Begun Producing Provenance

At the present construction position, the nonfiction experiment is incomplete.

That fact imposes a real limit on what can presently be claimed about its final result.

But the process has already generated prospective evidence.

Section 1 established the research problem and the proposition to be tested.

Section 12 was then constructed as the terminal interpretive state.

Section 2 subsequently had to operate between those boundaries.

Its resulting evidentiary framework did not merely repeat either one. It established the classification machinery needed to distinguish strong dependency evidence from weak apparent correspondence.

Section 11 is now being constructed with all three of those states already present.

This is not retrospective reconstruction of the writing sequence.

The sequence, section identities, accepted states, and construction events are being recorded as the paper is produced.

The experiment can therefore later ask a question that could not be answered from a conventionally completed paper alone:

> **Which obligations already existed when each interior section was written, and how did that section respond to them?**

That record is itself part of the experimental design.

Practical Significance

The immediate significance of the research is therefore not that every proposed benefit of Inward has already been demonstrated.

It is that a specific mechanism has survived a provenance-sensitive test and can now be developed more deliberately.

The original sequence determines where construction occurs next.

The stronger development opportunity is to represent what each construction event inherits.

For Inward Story Builder V2, this suggests moving beyond a chapter scheduler.

A sequence-aware system can say:

Write Chapter 11 next.

A constraint-aware system should eventually be able to say:

Chapter 11 is next, and these are the established states, unresolved obligations, preserved rules, terminal conditions, and lawful freedoms currently pressing on it from the material already constructed.

That is a materially different capability.

The fictional experiment provides evidence for why such information matters.

The nonfiction experiment is testing whether the same principle survives when the connecting material is evidence-bound rather than freely invented.

The Remaining Burden of the Paper

The positive conclusion established at the terminal boundary is therefore not a license for the remaining sections to assume success.

It creates obligations.

The unwritten body must show the actual fictional dependencies on which the Class A and Class B finding rests.

It must preserve the downgraded evidence rather than erase it.

It must document the construction protocol sufficiently to distinguish prospective provenance from retrospective interpretation.

It must explain the relationship between Inward and relevant neighboring methods without converting resemblance into identity.

It must account for the limitations of the experiments.

And the remaining nonfiction construction events must themselves preserve the record required to determine whether the second experiment ultimately satisfies its own test.

The conclusion is already constructed.

The evidence required to reach it cannot therefore be invented to make the path easier.

That asymmetry is not a weakness in the experiment.

It is now one of its principal constraints.

At this construction position, the strongest warranted interpretation is therefore clear:

Experiment 1 demonstrates that directed dependency and constraint preservation can survive rigorous provenance filtering within an Inward-constructed fictional artifact. Experiment 2 is prospectively testing whether an evidence-bound nonfiction work can be constructed under the same opposing-boundary geometry without manufacturing the factual path between those boundaries.

The remaining sections must earn the rest.

---

12. Conclusion: Inward as a Constraint-Based Construction Method

The evidence examined in this paper supports the central proposition that motivated Inward Story Construction: when opposing parts of a work are constructed before the material between them, those established states can become active constraints on subsequent construction rather than remaining merely anticipated destinations.

The first experiment demonstrated this effect in fiction.

A twelve-chapter story was deliberately constructed in the order:

1 → 12 → 2 → 11 → 3 → 10 → 4 → 9 → 5 → 8 → 6 → 7

Because the generation sequence was known, relationships in the completed story could be tested against their actual construction provenance rather than judged solely from the coherence of the finished narrative.

That distinction proved important.

Not every apparent relationship survived scrutiny. Ordinary literary recurrence and merely compatible development could be separated from stronger cases in which information already present in the constructed artifact was subsequently preserved, transformed, or resolved.

After that separation, multiple strong directed dependencies remained.

The significance of that result is structural.

Inward is not simply a technique for knowing the ending before writing the middle. Writers have long planned endings, written outlines, drafted scenes out of order, worked backward from goals, and used nonlinear composition.

Inward makes a more specific intervention.

It constructs opposing states.

An imagined ending can remain flexible, abstract, or incomplete. A written ending establishes particulars. Characters possess particular knowledge. Events have particular consequences. Questions have or have not been resolved. Relationships occupy particular states. Objects, locations, promises, dangers, transformations, and causal requirements have become part of the work.

Those established particulars change the problem presented by the unwritten interior.

Sequential composition principally asks:

What happens next?

Inward adds a second requirement:

What can happen here while remaining consistent with what is already established on both sides?

That difference is the practical mechanism identified by the fictional experiment.

The writer still creates. The writer still chooses among possibilities. In fiction, the imaginative burden remains substantial because the events capable of reconciling those boundaries must themselves be invented.

But the possibilities are no longer being generated toward an entirely unwritten future. Construction occurs inside an interval whose opposing states already exist.

As the fronts advance, additional decisions become established reality. Those decisions can create obligations for what remains unwritten. In this sense, the center of an Inward work becomes progressively less like an unrestricted continuation problem and increasingly like a reconciliation problem.

From Fiction to Document-Rich Nonfiction

The second experiment applies this principle to document-rich nonfiction.

This transfer removes much of the generative burden present in original fiction.

A fiction writer must invent the underlying events while simultaneously maintaining character, causality, continuity, setting, conflict, transformation, tone, and the requirements established elsewhere in the work. The fictional Inward experiment therefore required construction to solve two problems simultaneously: create new narrative material and make that material lawful within opposing established states.

Document-rich nonfiction begins from a different position.

The factual substrate substantially exists.

For this experiment, the relevant evidence was collected and then frozen before the remaining Inward construction proceeded. The paper is not permitted to invent factual evidence to complete a difficult bridge. It is also not permitted to expand its external evidence corpus after closure in order to rescue the construction.

The available facts are therefore not material that the writer must imagine into existence.

They are material that must be selected, verified, related, organized, and reconciled.

That makes document-rich nonfiction a strong practical candidate for Inward construction.

Modern access to digital research, searchable records, databases, published scholarship, and AI-assisted information retrieval can make large bodies of documented information available rapidly. Where the necessary factual substrate is already substantially documented, the central writing problem can shift away from generating the underlying material and toward determining how that material should be structured into a defensible whole.

Inward directly addresses that structural problem.

The qualification is narrow. Some nonfiction must first produce or discover its evidence through original experiments, field research, interviews, archival discovery, investigation, longitudinal observation, or other evidence-generating activity. Such projects can carry substantial acquisition burdens and may not possess stable opposing informational boundaries early enough for the same procedure.

The present argument concerns document-rich nonfiction in which the relevant factual substrate can substantially precede composition.

What Inward Contributes

The evidence supports treating construction order itself as a meaningful design variable.

The conventional relationship between beginning, middle, and ending does not require the order of composition to mirror the order of consumption.

When the ending is constructed early, it can participate in subsequent composition.

When the beginning and ending both exist, the middle becomes the shared unresolved space between them.

When construction alternates inward, each side can contribute requirements to that space.

This creates a practical distinction between destination knowledge and constructed constraint.

Knowing that a character eventually reaches a destination is not identical to having already written the state in which that arrival occurs.

Knowing approximately what a paper should conclude is not identical to having constructed a conclusion whose claims expose the factual obligations the preceding argument must satisfy.

Inward converts some future knowledge from intention into artifact.

That artifact can then participate in the construction process.

The experiments also demonstrate why not every connection should be credited to the method. Repeated imagery, thematic similarity, compatible events, or retrospective interpretation can make a finished work appear more structurally determined than its provenance warrants.

For that reason, the strongest evidence for Inward is not that the completed artifact feels connected.

It is that directed dependencies survive after weaker explanations are removed.

That standard is important both for research and for implementation.

The White Paper as an Inward Artifact

This paper extends the experiment by applying Inward to its own construction.

Section 1 established the problem, research question, and origin of the method.

Section 12 establishes the terminal interpretation toward which the remaining factual argument must lawfully advance.

The sections between those boundaries perform the evidentiary work connecting them.

Unlike the fictional experiment, they cannot invent facts to make that connection successful. They must operate within the closed evidence corpus and preserve the provenance of the construction process itself.

The resulting paper therefore serves two functions.

It reports the original fictional experiment, and its own construction provides a prospective test of the same architecture under a nonfiction condition.

Positive and negative evidence generated during that process belongs in the body of the paper. Weak dependencies, alternative explanations, failed connections, limitations, and disagreements determine how strongly the final claims can legitimately be supported.

The conclusion follows the evidence that survives those tests.

The fictional experiment established that Inward can produce provenance-valid directed dependencies under the substantially harder generative conditions of original narrative construction.

The nonfiction experiment places that mechanism into an environment where the underlying factual material is already available and where invented evidence is prohibited.

The closed-corpus construction establishes a stronger controlled environment for examining the same mechanism: the factual material needed to build the argument must come from the evidence available before the inward construction proceeds, while the construction record itself supplies prospective provenance of how those facts are organized between the established boundaries.

Together, the two experiments examine the same structural proposition from complementary conditions: first while connecting material must be created, and then while connecting material must be found within an existing factual substrate.

Implications for Inward Story Builder

These findings have a direct development consequence.

They will be used to inform **Inward Story Builder V2**.

The next development stage should not treat Inward merely as a numerical ordering rule that determines which chapter or section is constructed next.

The more consequential mechanism revealed by the research is the information accumulated because of that order.

A stronger Inward Story Builder can therefore become constraint-aware rather than merely sequence-aware.

Such a system can preserve which facts and obligations originate from each construction frontier; distinguish established conditions from optional possibilities; identify unresolved questions; preserve character and causal states; expose contradictions between advancing boundaries; and show the writer what the remaining interior must eventually reconcile.

The classification discipline developed during the fictional experiment is also relevant to that architecture.

A future Story Builder should not interpret every repeated object, phrase, theme, or callback as proof of structural dependency. It should distinguish between material that is merely compatible with the story and material that was actually constrained by an earlier construction state.

That distinction can make Inward Story Builder more precise without making it unnecessarily restrictive.

The objective is not to eliminate creative possibility.

It is to preserve freedom inside the boundaries that the work itself has already established.

Broader Applications

The same principle may extend beyond straightforward chapter construction.

Dream sequences, flashbacks, flash-forwards, parallel timelines, and other temporal departures frequently create continuity problems because the writer must leave one established narrative state and eventually return to another.

An Inward architecture provides a natural way to frame such excursions: establish the state from which the narrative departs, establish the state it must eventually reach or rejoin, and construct the intervening material under the requirements of both.

That possibility remains a development direction rather than a demonstrated result of the present experiments, but it follows directly from the mechanism being investigated.

Additional research can also test Inward with human writers, different document lengths, alternative construction orders, controlled writing tasks, and formal measurements of revision burden, continuity failure, unresolved obligations, completion time, and remaining construction freedom.

Those studies can determine the boundaries of the method more precisely.

They are extensions of the present finding, not prerequisites for recognizing it.

Final Conclusion

Inward began with a deliberate decision not to let reading order dictate construction order.

The resulting evidence shows why that decision matters.

A constructed future is different from an imagined future.

Once an opposite boundary actually exists, it contains information that subsequent construction can be required to respect. When both boundaries exist and construction advances between them, the writer is no longer working only from an established past toward an undefined future.

The writer is working between established states.

The fictional experiment demonstrated that meaningful directed dependencies can survive rigorous provenance analysis under that architecture. The nonfiction experiment applies the same principle to a closed factual substrate in which the connecting evidence cannot simply be invented.

That combination identifies the central contribution of Inward Story Construction:

it changes the unwritten middle from a purely forward-generation problem into a progressively constrained reconciliation problem between known states.

For fiction, that provides structure while leaving imagination responsible for creating the lawful path.

For document-rich nonfiction, much of the underlying material already exists, allowing the same architecture to concentrate on selection, reasoning, organization, and reconciliation.

For Inward Story Builder V2, the research points toward the next development objective: a system that does not merely know where to write next, but increasingly understands what the remaining space must satisfy because of what has already been written on both sides.

The sequence was the beginning of Inward.

The constraints created by the sequence are the mechanism that matters.