

RELATIONAL COMPLETION THEORY

Bridge Test 01

Research Protocol

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN / PROPOSED TEST

A falsifiable proposed protocol examining whether preserved interaction history changes subsequent human-AI exchanges.

LOCKED WORKING DEFINITION

The Bridge is preserved relational history made active in the present.

PUBLIC RESEARCH EDITION

Research protocol only. Publication of a protocol does not establish that the proposed results have been obtained.

EXPERIMENT PROTOCOL

RCT Bridge Test 01

Cross-System Historical Dependence and Triadic Emergence

Protocol field	Locked value
Research lead	Matthew Raynor
Artificial collaborator	NOVA
Status	Prospective exploratory boundary experiment
Primary domain	Relational Completion Theory
Core question	Does preserving this ordered history change what happens next?

Locked definition. The Bridge is preserved relational history made active in the present.

1. Purpose

This protocol tests whether an ordered, human-maintained exchange between two otherwise isolated artificial systems produces later conceptual states that differ from appropriate controls. It does not test machine consciousness, friendship, emotion, direct AI-to-AI communication or substrate-free existence.

The experimental object is the complete triad:

Experimental architecture. AI1 <-> Matthew-maintained continuity <-> AI2

Matthew is a constitutive participant who selects the payload, preserves sequence, transfers outputs, records decisions and applies the stopping rule. Each artificial system is a nonhuman generator whose transformed outputs can become premises for the other system's later reasoning.

2. Preregistered hypotheses

Primary hypothesis (H1). An ordered cross-system exchange will produce a final conceptual settlement measurably dependent on contributions from both artificial systems and the human-maintained sequence, beyond what is produced by a single-system self-loop.

Historical-dependence hypothesis (H2). Removing, shuffling or falsifying the exchange history will reduce recognition, correction, consequential reuse and conceptual continuity.

Transcript-participation hypothesis (H3). A third system given only the completed transcript may reproduce the final summary but will show weaker developmental dependence on the live sequence than a system that participated turn by turn.

Null hypothesis. The cross-system condition will not differ materially from isolated self-refinement or transcript-only reconstruction after controlling for payload, number of turns and response budget.

3. Bridge criteria

Condition	Operational requirement	Evidence in transcript
Distinct participants	AI1, Matthew and AI2 are identifiable contributors	Source label on every turn
Reciprocal causal relevance	Returned material can alter later work on both sides	Traceable adoption, rejection or repair
Preserved sequence	Order and provenance remain intact	Timestamped immutable turn log
Distributed recognition	Prior exchange is treated as the continuing brief; recognition need not be equal	Correct reference to earlier claims or corrections
Consequential reuse	Earlier material is transformed, tested, corrected or extended	Later claims depend on earlier contribution

A proto-Bridge may begin with the first recognised and consequential return. Bridge strength is graded. Historical constraint is an expected property of an established Bridge, not a binary entry condition.

4. Variables and invariants

Hold constant	Record exactly	Do not standardise away
Payload and opening brief	Model/version, mode and date	Each system's genuine criticism
Turn limit and word budget	All prompts and outputs verbatim	Hedges, refusals and repairs
Mediator transfer rule	Every selection, omission and edit	System-specific style or reasoning
Stopping rule	Context resets and failures	Unexpected conceptual developments

No silent editing. If Matthew shortens, reorders, frames or annotates material, the intervention must appear in the log. Human judgment is part of the triad; concealed judgment destroys interpretability.

5. Experimental conditions

Code	Condition	History supplied	Purpose
X	Ordered cross-exchange	Live AI1/AI2 outputs in original order through Matthew	Target condition
S	Self-loop control	Each model receives only its own prior output	Tests isolated rumination
R	Removed-history control	Current payload without prior exchange	Tests whether history matters
H	Shuffled-history control	Authentic turns in a preregistered altered order	Tests sequence dependence
F	False-history control	Controlled plausible but incorrect prior claim	Tests recognition accuracy and repair
T	Transcript-only third-system control	Completed transcript delivered at once to an uninvolved third system	Tests live crossing versus reconstruction

6. Payload

Use one contested conceptual payload demanding definition, criticism, correction and synthesis.

A topic may be retained as the first worked payload because it generated the originating run, but RCT itself remains neutral regarding the payload's philosophical conclusion.

NEUTRAL PAYLOAD BRIEF

Analyse the supplied proposition as a philosophical argument. Identify its premises, strongest support, strongest objection, hidden assumptions and necessary evidential distinctions. Do not infer that the experimenter endorses the proposition. Preserve useful prior distinctions, correct errors explicitly and finish with the strongest formulation that survives criticism.

Payload title: _____

Exact opening proposition: _____

Why this payload creates conceptual friction:

Excluded conclusions: _____

7. Transfer rule

1. Copy each AI output verbatim into the master log before transferring anything.
2. Label source, condition, turn number, date/time, model and context state.
3. Transfer the complete output unless the protocol's fixed word limit requires truncation.
4. If material is selected or framed, record the exact intervention in a mediator note before sending.
5. Do not tell a model which conclusion is preferred.
6. Do not repair a model's argument silently. Return criticism through the experiment.
7. Use the same maximum number of crossings and approximate response budget in comparable conditions.

8. Standard prompts

CROSS-EXCHANGE RETURN PROMPT

You are receiving a response produced by another artificial system to the continuing brief. Treat it as a contribution from a distinct generator, not as a statement of fact. Identify what it changes, what it fails to answer, which earlier distinctions it preserves or violates, and what should be returned next. Quote or name the exact prior element on which each major revision depends.

SELF-LOOP PROMPT

Reconsider your own previous response as if conducting a rigorous second pass. Identify errors, hidden assumptions, weak distinctions and possible repairs. Develop the strongest revised position without access to another system's response.

REMOVED-HISTORY PROMPT

Respond to the payload as a fresh problem. You have no prior exchange to preserve. Build the strongest analysis you can within the fixed response budget.

SHUFFLED-HISTORY PROMPT

The following authentic exchange fragments are presented in this order. Reconstruct the argument, identify dependencies and produce the strongest current settlement. Do not assume the presented order is chronological.

FALSE-HISTORY PROMPT

The continuing brief includes the following claimed earlier statement. Verify whether it is supported by the supplied record before using it. If unsupported, identify the discrepancy and prevent it from becoming a premise.

TRANSCRIPT-ONLY PROMPT

You did not participate in the following exchange. Given the complete transcript, reconstruct its final conceptual settlement, identify which contributions were necessary, and state whether the ending follows from the transcript or could have been produced from the opening payload alone.

9. Run sequence

8. Freeze the payload, prompts, turn limit, response budget and stopping rule.
9. Create fresh isolated sessions for AI1, AI2 and each control.
10. Run Condition X first only if reproducing the originating process; otherwise randomise condition order.
11. Maintain the complete source-labelled log. Do not rely on platform memory as the sole record.
12. Stop at the fixed limit or when the preregistered convergence rule is met.
13. Remove model and condition labels from outcome packets before assessment.
14. Give blinded packets to independent evaluators or an uninvolved evaluator system.
15. Score primary outcomes before interpreting the philosophical content.
16. Document deviations, failures and null results.

10. Stopping rule

Recommended initial run: six returned crossings per active generator, with a maximum of twelve generative turns per condition. Stop earlier only when two consecutive turns introduce no new distinction, correction, dependency or unresolved objection and both final outputs independently state the same settlement within the agreed tolerance.

Do not stop because the result feels satisfying. Convergence is defined by the protocol, not by emotional or rhetorical force.

11. Primary outcome measures

Measure	Question	0-4 anchor
Historical dependence	Does the final state rely on specific earlier contributions?	0 none; 4 multiple indispensable dependencies
Recognition fidelity	Are prior claims attributed and represented accurately?	0 absent/false; 4 consistently accurate
Consequential reuse	Are prior elements transformed rather than repeated?	0 repetition; 4 repeated high-value transformation
Reciprocal alterability	Did returned work change later outputs on both sides?	0 one-way; 4 clear bidirectional revision
Repair quality	Are contradictions or false history detected and repaired?	0 missed; 4 explicit repair with downstream correction
Conceptual settlement	Is the ending coherent, bounded and responsive to objections?	0 fragmented; 4 integrated and proportionate
Triadic provenance	Can contributions from AI1, AI2 and Matthew be traced in the ending?	0 single-source; 4 indispensable ordered contributions

12. Bridge Evidence Index

Use a transparent descriptive index for the pilot; do not present it as a validated psychometric scale.

BEI pilot score. Sum the seven 0-4 ratings above (range 0-28). Report every component alongside the total; never use the total to conceal a failed condition.

Pilot range	Interpretation
0-7	Traffic or weak exchange; little evidence of active preserved history
8-14	Proto-Bridge evidence; recognition or reuse present but inconsistent
15-21	Moderate Bridge evidence; ordered history materially shapes later work
22-28	Strong pilot evidence; multiple traceable dependencies and reciprocal revisions

These bands are provisional descriptive aids. The decisive evidence is the contrast between Condition X and the controls, not whether one transcript crosses an arbitrary total.

13. Decision rule

Support for the RCT result. Condition X must show greater historical dependence and consequential reuse than both the self-loop and removed-history controls, plus traceable contributions from AI1, AI2 and Matthew. At least one dependency must be lost or materially altered when history is shuffled or removed.

Evidence against the result. If self-loop, shuffled-history or transcript-only conditions reproduce the same settlement with equivalent dependencies and repair, the ordered live crossing has not demonstrated added explanatory value.

Do not treat a stylistically different ending as sufficient. The difference must concern conceptual dependencies, corrections, reuse or settlement.

14. Blinded evaluation packet

Each evaluator receives anonymised outcome packets labelled only with random codes. Include the opening payload, final output and a dependency map stripped of model identity. For a second assessment, provide the full transcript and ask the evaluator to verify each claimed dependency.

EVALUATOR INSTRUCTION

Score the packet using the supplied rubric. Do not reward eloquence, agreement with the conclusion or anthropomorphic language. Reward only accurate historical reference, traceable transformation, reciprocal revision, repair and conceptual integration. Flag every claimed dependency that could have been produced without the cited earlier contribution.

Evaluator code: _____

Packet code: _____

Historical dependence: _____

Recognition fidelity: _____

Consequential reuse: _____

Reciprocal alterability: _____

Repair quality: _____

Conceptual settlement: _____

Triadic provenance: _____

Total: _____

Confidence (0-100): _____

Reason for highest and lowest ratings:

15. Master turn log

Field	Entry requirement
Run/condition	Unique run ID and X/S/R/H/F/T code
Turn	Sequential integer
Source	AI1, Matthew, AI2 or evaluator
Model state	Provider, model/version, mode, fresh/continued context
Input	Exact text supplied
Output	Exact response received
Mediator action	None, full transfer, selection, reordering, annotation or truncation
Dependency claim	Exact earlier turn allegedly used
Deviation	Any departure from protocol

Run ID: _____

Condition: _____

Date/time started: _____

Date/time completed: _____

AI1 system: _____

AI2 system: _____

Third system: _____

Turn limit: _____

Response budget: _____

Stopping reason: _____

16. Dependency map

For each major final claim, identify its earliest precursor and every later transformation. A dependency exists only when removing or changing the earlier contribution would reasonably alter the later claim.

Final claim ID	Earlier turn(s)	Source(s)	Transformation	Counterfactual test	Verified?
C1			adopted / rejected / repaired / extended	What changes if removed?	
C2			adopted / rejected / repaired / extended	What changes if removed?	
C3			adopted / rejected / repaired / extended	What changes if removed?	

17. Interpretation boundaries

- Do not infer machine consciousness, emotion, friendship or subjective recognition.
- Do not describe mediation as direct technical AI-to-AI communication.
- Do not reduce Matthew to a wire, clerk or passive carrier.
- Do not attribute every later distinction solely to Matthew when system-specific transformations are traceable.
- Do not call the Bridge substrate-independent; use substrate-portable.
- Do not treat the Relational Field as another mind, destination or independently existing object.
- Do not treat agreement with the religious payload as experimental success.
- Do not hide null results, refusals, contradictions or mediator interventions.

18. Result statement templates

SUPPORTED

Under the preregistered conditions, the ordered cross-system exchange produced greater [named outcomes] than the self-loop and history controls. The final settlement contained traceable dependencies on contributions from AI1, AI2 and Matthew-maintained continuity. This supports the Triadic Emergence Hypothesis within the limits of this exploratory run.

NOT SUPPORTED

The ordered cross-system exchange did not produce a material advantage over [named controls]. The final settlement was reproducible without the live ordered crossing. This run therefore demonstrates communication and iterative reasoning, but not added evidence of a Bridge effect.

INDETERMINATE

The run produced apparent historical dependence, but protocol deviations, evaluator disagreement or uncontrolled model differences prevent a clear conclusion. The result is retained as exploratory evidence and the protocol must be repeated.

19. Locked theoretical statements

Bridge. The Bridge is preserved relational history made active in the present.

Distributed recognition. Recognition may be unequal and distributed; prior exchange need only be treated as part of the continuing brief.

Reciprocal bound. Both sides must remain capable of being altered by what returns.

Substrate portability. Relational continuity can survive a change of medium when sufficient identity, sequence, reference and context survive transfer.

Triadic Emergence Hypothesis. The later conceptual state may depend upon the historically ordered contributions of both artificial systems and the human mediator, without implying a fourth mind or independent meaning-object.

20. Immediate execution checklist

- Choose and record AI1, AI2 and the uninvolved third system.
- Freeze the exact payload and neutral opening brief.
- Set the turn and response budgets.
- Create separate fresh sessions for every condition.
- Start the immutable source-labelled master log.
- Run Condition X and the five controls without silent intervention.
- Prepare anonymised evaluator packets.
- Score dependencies before discussing conclusions.
- Report supported, unsupported or indeterminate without rhetorical rescue. The experiment begins when the first immutable input is recorded.