

STATE MADE VISIBLE

A CLEAR Model Audit of the Lindsay Clancy Case

Version 1.1 — Factual Freeze Edition

Neutral Master State Map • Dual Interpretation Overlay • Evidence Freeze Protocol

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT IS

A case-study demonstration of how Yo Spark: The CLEAR Model can hold a complex evidentiary record without becoming the prosecution, the defense, a psychiatric diagnosis, or a verdict. The case supplies the information. CLEAR supplies the recognition architecture.

SOURCE BOUNDARY

Case facts in this edition rely primarily on public trial reporting, public legal sources, and reported testimony. This is not a complete official trial transcript, exhibit set, medical record, or forensic file. The factual layer is frozen only to the level supported by those public sources.

Framework source: Yo Spark: The CLEAR Model — The Essential Self-Audit Change Management Manual, Mister Kyle Anu Henson

Case status date: September 15, 2026

Companion artifact: CLEAR Clancy Evidence Ledger + Source Audit, Version 1.1

CORE PRESENTATION RULE

The framework remains clear. The information can change color inside it.

1. Why This Case Study Exists

The purpose of this case study is not to solve the Lindsay Clancy case. It is to demonstrate the architecture of CLEAR under a record that contains severe pressure, disputed internal state, preserved and changed functions, competing experts, irreversible action, and adversarial legal interpretation.

The same architecture can receive different kinds of information in different environments. That is already how the Z9 routing work functions: the content changes while the recognition sequence remains stable. A business router, student paper, clinical case summary, operational audit, or court record can all present different inputs while still passing through a recognizable structure.

TRANSFER PRINCIPLE

CLEAR is the container, not the content. A different case changes the facts. A different profession changes the evidence. A different user changes the self and system. The five audit positions remain the organizing geometry.

The case-study goal

- Make the present and prior baselines visible.
- Separate the self from the system without pretending they are unrelated.
- Keep observation, report, expert interpretation, legal inference, and unresolved questions distinct.
- Allow opposing interpretations to occupy the same evidentiary map.
- Require each interpretation to show what should become visible if its reading is accurate.
- Return to a new baseline after consequential movement rather than pretending the former system still exists.

2. The CLEAR Architecture Used Here

The book describes the Auditor as an observer, identifier, documenter, comparator, and filter. It describes the five-layer geometry as a repeatable relationship between the internal state (self) and the environment (system). The baseline is a starting coordinate, not a conclusion.

CLEAR position	Book role	Case-study translation
Innerstanding	Self / present baseline / question field	What was present before the critical change? What was being carried by the person?
Understanding	System / pressure container / CLEAR-identified problem	What pressures, institutions, relationships, symptoms, treatment inputs, and environmental demands were present?
Overstanding	Available mirrors / option field / choice field	What interpretations, choices, constraints, hidden alternatives, and third positions were available or claimed?
Clearstanding	Clear path / movement / expected recognition	What actually happened? What does each proposed explanation predict should be visible? What would weaken it?
Innerstanding 2.0	New baseline after recognition / active memory	What self and system exist after irreversible movement, and what must be recognized in the next cycle?

BOOK FIDELITY

The report uses CLEAR as a recognition system. It does not convert CLEAR into a forensic psychiatric test. The framework identifies where information belongs and what questions must remain visible.

Framework basis: the book's five-layer filter, present-baseline language, pressure container, available option field, expected recognition, State Reveal, Change Agents, active memory, and appendix toolbelt.

3. Framework Layer vs. Case-Specific Overlay

This distinction is now explicit because it is central to the integrity of the case study.

Original CLEAR architecture

- Self and system as two coordinates of the audit field.
- Present baseline before conclusion.
- Pressure container and hidden/system pressure.
- Available mirrors, option field, third position, and comparison across containers.
- Clear movement and expected recognition: what should the movement reveal?
- Innerstanding 2.0, active memory, State Reveal, Change Agents, and continuation into the next audit cycle.

Imported case-study variables

The following are not original CLEAR scales. They are external legal/clinical coordinates placed inside the CLEAR container for this application:

Variable	Use in this case	Boundary
EF — Executive Function	Tracks observable organization, sequencing, communication, navigation, memory, and task execution.	Not a diagnosis and not a substitute for criminal responsibility.
RT — Reality Testing	Tracks evidence and expert interpretation concerning the person's relationship to reality.	Clinical/functional evidence track; not itself the Massachusetts legal test.
AG — Agency / Control	Tracks reported and observable control or altered-agency claims.	Must remain separate from EF and from legal conclusion.
WR — Wrongfulness / Criminality Appreciation	Organizes evidence relevant to appreciation of wrongfulness/criminality.	Legal relevance comes from Massachusetts law, not CLEAR.
BC — Behavioral Control	Organizes evidence relevant to capacity to conform conduct to law.	Legal relevance comes from Massachusetts law, not CLEAR.

INTEGRITY RULE

CLEAR supplies the geometry. Imported variables supply specialized coordinates. Neither is allowed to impersonate the other.

4. Evidence Status and Freeze Protocol

Version 1.1 freezes facts at the individual evidence-row level rather than freezing entire windows. A single chronological window can contain established events, reported statements, disputed expert interpretation, unresolved questions, and dynamic procedural facts at the same time.

Evidence tags

Tag	Meaning	Publication treatment
E	Established / sufficiently supported event or coordinate	May be frozen when source support is stable.
R	Reported statement, observation, recollection, or record	Freeze the existence of the report; do not automatically freeze its truth or meaning.
D	Disputed chronology, meaning, mechanism, or interpretation	Keep visible; never resolve silently.
U	Unresolved on the available public record	Preserve the gap.
I	Interpretation from prosecution, defense, expert, or CLEAR analysis	Attribute explicitly; never recode as raw fact.

Freeze classes

Class	Meaning	Example
FROZEN FACT	Stable historical/legal coordinate supported by the public record used here.	Mistrial date; January 24 deaths; reported snowman photo.
FROZEN REPORT	Stable fact that a person said, observed, searched, or testified to something.	A later reported command-voice account; a treating clinician saying psychosis was not observed.
DISPUTED / OPEN	The existence or meaning cannot be collapsed into one state.	Whether the reported voice reflected psychosis or impaired legal capacity.
DYNAMIC	True only as of a date and subject to later change.	Rule 25 motion / retrial posture.
METHOD	Framework or publication rule rather than case fact.	EF is analytically separated from RT/AG/WR/BC.

FREEZE LAW

We freeze what the record can support. We do not freeze the argument built on top of it.

5. Legal Container

Massachusetts criminal responsibility is a legal question. Under the March 2026 Supreme Judicial Court model homicide instructions, the Commonwealth must prove criminal responsibility beyond a reasonable doubt once the issue is properly raised. A person is not criminally responsible if, because of a mental disease or defect, the person lacks substantial capacity either to appreciate the criminality or wrongfulness of the conduct or to conform conduct to the requirements of law. The defendant bears no burden to prove lack of criminal responsibility. [S1]

CLEAR BOUNDARY

CLEAR does not diagnose a mental disease or defect and does not determine the legal capacities. It organizes evidence relevant to the legal container and keeps medical interpretation, legal inference, and observable movement distinct.

What the case study therefore tracks

- Evidence of state variation before the offense.
- Evidence of preserved functions and changed functions.
- Evidence and expert interpretation concerning reality testing and agency.
- Evidence relevant to appreciation of wrongfulness and behavioral control.
- The relationship between reported internal experience and observable action.
- The post-event baseline and its materially changed system.

6. Master State Map — Ten Windows

The windows are chronological containers, not diagnoses. Each window can hold multiple evidence statuses simultaneously.

Window	State coordinate	Self	System	Freeze treatment
0	Established functional baseline	Adult occupational/parenting functioning.	Ordinary work, marriage, family, household.	Facts/reports freeze; later-capacity inference does not.
1	Postpartum pressure visible	Anxiety/overwhelm; treatment seeking.	New infant, three-child demands, work return, psychiatric care.	Reported chronology freezes with attribution.
2	Escalation	Sleep/depressive/intrusive/suicidal material; harm thoughts reported.	Medication changes, family concern, continued care.	Reports freeze; simultaneity/mechanism remain open.
3	Acute intervention / contradiction field	Severe distress; clinicians did not observe psychosis in key encounters; other warning signals exist.	Inpatient/outpatient care, family observation, digital record.	Observations/searches freeze; psychosis conclusion remains disputed.
4	Jan. 24 preserved-function window	Ordinary task behaviors remain observable.	Pediatric/family/phone/pharmacy/restaurant tasks.	Behaviors freeze; what they prove does not.
5	Critical transition	Three killings; later reported command voice; agency disputed.	Home during Patrick's absence; critical interval.	Deaths/method/report existence freeze; mechanism remains disputed.
6	Irreversible movement	Suicide attempt and catastrophic injury.	Emergency response; family system transforms.	Movement freezes; meaning remains open.
7	Immediate 2.0	Hospital/medical state and post-event reports.	ICU/hospital/investigation/forensic environment.	Reports freeze; acute-state interpretation remains contextual.
8	Long-term 2.0	Structured treatment; historical experts disagree.	Psychiatric/legal institution.	Reported course freezes with qualification; diagnoses remain expert interpretations.
9	Post-mistrial legal state	No verdict; motion practice continues.	Court/public system.	Mistrial freezes; later procedure remains dynamic.

7. Window 0 — Innerstanding 1.0: Starting Coordinate

Public trial reporting described Clancy as a labor-and-delivery nurse and mother with established adult occupational, parenting, communication, navigation, and household functioning. Witnesses supplied qualitative descriptions of her as a capable nurse and caring mother. Those descriptions are witness reports, not proof of her later legal state. [S2]

What the baseline does

- Creates a reference coordinate for later variation.
- Establishes that some complex learned skills existed before the deterioration period.
- Allows later changes to be compared against the same person rather than against a generic psychiatric stereotype.

What the baseline does not do

- It does not prove later sanity or criminal responsibility.
- It does not rule out later psychosis or other severe mental illness.
- It does not convert occupational competence into permanent executive or legal capacity.

CLEAR QUESTION

What was present before the pressure field changed?

8. Windows 1-2 — Understanding: Pressure Becomes Visible

Trial reporting traced psychiatric treatment in late 2022 after Callan's birth. Reported material included anxiety, feeling overwhelmed, insomnia, depression/numbness, intrusive thoughts, suicidal thinking, multiple medication changes, and family testimony concerning thoughts of harming the children. [S3] [S4]

Self signals

- Anxiety and overwhelm increase.
- Sleep becomes a pressure variable.
- Depressive/numb states and suicidal material are reported.
- Intrusive and child-harm thoughts enter the record through testimony.
- Ordinary parenting and executive behavior remain observable rather than disappearing uniformly.

System signals

- New infant and multi-child caregiving demands.
- Return-to-work and role pressure.
- Medication changes and multiple psychiatric contacts.
- Family monitoring, concern, and intervention.

STATE REVEAL

The first important recognition is not “psychotic / not psychotic.” It is that several state variables changed while others remained observable. CLEAR holds the variation before selecting a label.

9. Window 3 — The Contradiction Field

Clancy received inpatient psychiatric treatment around New Year 2023. Public reporting of treating-clinician testimony states that psychosis or mania was not observed in key encounters. Outpatient testimony also described substantial deterioration. [S3]

The same broad period contains contrary or complicating signals. The digital record included a January 19 search for “symptoms of postpartum psychosis,” and reporting of trial testimony also identified searches concerning schizophrenia/psychosis and numerous medication-related queries. Family testimony described paranoia and memory concerns. [S5] [S6]

CORRECTION INCORPORATED

Version 1.1 does not label January 19 as a generic “hallucination search.” It uses the specifically reported term “symptoms of postpartum psychosis” and separately notes other reported schizophrenia/psychosis-related search evidence.

What can be frozen

- Treating clinicians testified that they did not observe psychosis in identified encounters.
- The January 19 search for “symptoms of postpartum psychosis” was reported in trial testimony.
- Other psychiatric search/medication material and family observations were reported.

What stays open

- Whether psychosis was absent outside those clinical encounters.
- Whether symptoms were intermittent, concealed, unreported, misunderstood, or nonexistent.
- What motivated each digital search.

CLEAR STATUS

D/U on the historical psychosis mechanism. The contradiction is retained rather than repaired.

10. Window 4 — January 24 Preserved-Function Window

Public reporting described ordinary activities on January 24 before the killings, including a pediatric appointment, family activity, a snowman photograph sent to Patrick, phone communication, pharmacy/medication-related activity, restaurant/navigation activity, and other digital tasks. [S5] [S7]

Observable functions supported by the record

- Communication remained observable.
- Task sequencing remained observable.
- Phone/search/navigation use remained observable.
- Ordinary parenting/household interaction remained observable for portions of the day.

Required qualification

Preserved EF is evidence about preserved task behavior. It does not, by itself, medically establish intact reality testing or legally establish appreciation of wrongfulness or capacity to conform conduct. This separation is an analytic safeguard, not a clinical finding.

CASE-SPECIFIC NOTATION

EF ≠RT ≠AG ≠WR ≠BC. The point is not that these systems are literally independent modules. The point is that evidence supporting one proposition is not silently allowed to prove another.

11. Window 5 — The Critical State Boundary

During Patrick Clancy's absence, Lindsay Clancy strangled Cora, Dawson, and Callan using exercise bands. The defense did not dispute that she caused the deaths; criminal responsibility was the central contested question. [S8]

Post-event accounts included a reported male command voice. The existence of testimony about those accounts can be frozen as a reported fact. Whether the voice occurred as described, when it began, what it meant clinically, and what it did to legal capacity remain disputed. [S9] [S10]

Command / execution map

Node	Freeze status	CLEAR treatment
Reported male voice / command	FROZEN REPORT	Record who reported it, when, and to whom; do not convert report into verified hallucination.
Timing of killings during Patrick's absence	FROZEN FACT	Chronological/system coordinate.
Method: exercise bands	FROZEN FACT	Observable action coordinate.
Sequence / repetition	FROZEN FACT at action level	Meaning remains interpretive.
Agency alteration	DISPUTED	Defense expert interpretation and defendant report; prosecution disputes.
Wrongfulness / behavioral control	DISPUTED LEGAL INFERENCE	Must be resolved under law, not by CLEAR notation.

CENTRAL BOUNDARY QUESTION

Where was the boundary, if any, between the alleged altered state and the still-observable decision-making functions? The map exposes the question without pretending the framework can answer it clinically.

12. Expert Interpretation Layer — Keep the Experts Attributed

Version 1.1 treats expert conclusions as interpretation nodes. They are important, but they are not raw facts merely because they were offered by qualified experts.

Expert / side	Reported interpretation	Publication status
Dr. Phillip Resnick — defense	Interpreted the case as postpartum psychosis with command hallucination / impaired control.	I — defense expert interpretation; attribute every time.
Dr. Paul Zeisel — defense	Testified concerning psychological evaluation and reported statements/voice account; also offered clinical interpretation.	R/I — separate what he personally heard from what he concluded.
Dr. Gregory Saathoff — prosecution	Challenged aspects of the voice account, including chronology/consistency, and rejected the defense mechanism.	I — prosecution expert interpretation; do not turn skepticism into universal clinical rule.
Dr. Kirk Heilbrun — prosecution	Offered a different psychiatric/legal-capacity interpretation and rejected the defense account.	I — prosecution expert interpretation; distinguish diagnosis from legal inference.

EXPERT-LAYER RULE

Freeze that the expert testified to an opinion. Keep the truth of the opinion open to adversarial evaluation.

13. Window 6 — Clearstanding: Irreversible Movement

After the killings, Clancy injured herself and jumped from a second-story window, sustaining catastrophic spinal injury and paralysis. Patrick returned, emergency response followed, and the prior family system ceased to exist in its former configuration. [S8]

CLEAR treats this as movement, not as self-interpreting proof. The suicide attempt can be incorporated into different causal narratives; none may claim it as automatic proof of planning, remorse, sanity, psychosis, wrongfulness recognition, or lack of control.

Expected Recognition question

The book's Clearstanding layer asks what movement should reveal and what would make the read accurate or inaccurate. That requirement is what converts the case study from two speeches into two testable interpretations.

CLEARSTANDING RULE

Action is evidence. Meaning is an inference. Each side must show what additional pattern its inference predicts.

14. Window 7 — Immediate Innerstanding 2.0

The post-event state is not a return to the former baseline. Severe spinal injury, acute medical treatment, the deaths of the children, investigation, legal counsel, and psychiatric/forensic intervention create a fundamentally new self/system configuration.

Public trial reporting included chaplain Sheila Cavanaugh's testimony that Clancy said on January 31 that she was glad her children were safe. Cavanaugh also described later discussion/allusion to a male voice, while reporting noted limitations in contemporaneous notes. Psychologist Paul Zeizel testified about hearing a later phone conversation in which Clancy reported a male voice. [S11] [S12]

2.0 audit discipline

- Freeze that the statements/testimony occurred to the extent publicly reported.
- Do not treat post-event wording as an unfiltered recording of the offense state.
- Keep acute medical confounds, trauma, memory, medication, and new environmental inputs visible.
- Recognize that the system itself has changed so dramatically that "return to normal" is not a coherent baseline test.

BOOK CONNECTION

Innerstanding 2.0 is the new baseline after recognition. The self returns to one, but not as the same one; the next audit begins with active memory and a changed relationship to the environment.

15. Window 8 — Long-Term 2.0

By trial, Clancy was living in a highly structured psychiatric/legal environment and experts retrospectively disagreed about her historical state at the offense. Public trial reporting states that recurring voices had not been reported after the killings in the cited testimony. That is a longitudinal data point, not an absolute clinical statement that no voice ever recurred under any circumstance. [S10]

Corrected publication language

Use: “Public trial reporting states that recurring voices had not been reported after the killings in the cited testimony.”

Do not use: “There were no recurring voices,” unless a primary record justifies the absolute statement.

What the 2.0 layer asks

- What persisted?
- What resolved?
- What changed because of treatment, injury, custody, environment, time, or memory?
- Which present-state observations can legitimately illuminate the offense state, and which cannot?

16. Window 9 — Dynamic Legal-System State

Judge William Sullivan declared a mistrial on September 4, 2026 after the jury could not reach a unanimous verdict. Post-trial juror accounts reported an 11–1 division favoring lack of criminal responsibility, but those statements are not a verdict. Defense counsel subsequently asked the judge to enter a not-guilty finding under Rule 25; Reuters reported a September 29 hearing date and that prosecutors had not yet announced whether they would retry the case as of its September 10 report. [S13] [S14]

DYNAMIC LAYER

Only the mistrial and already-completed procedural events are frozen. The Rule 25 disposition, retrial decision, later hearings, custody posture, and future appellate/trial state must be updated by date rather than backfilled into earlier windows.

Why Window 9 is useful for CLEAR

The legal system is now part of the continuing environment. Innerstanding 2.0 therefore does not end at the individual. It shows how the changed self is embedded in a changed institutional system, and how that system produces the next pressure container.

17. Master State Signature

Variable	Baseline	Deterioration	Critical window	Immediate 2.0	Long-term 2.0
EF	Established adult task functioning	Some functional strain; many skills remain	Observable task execution remains	Comparison confounded by injury/acute care	Observable organization in structured setting
RT	No disturbance established in baseline map	Conflicting signals / expert meaning unresolved	Core disputed variable	Acute medical/retrospective context	Historical interpretation remains disputed
AG	Ordinary agency assumed only at ordinary-function level	No clean loss established publicly	Core disputed variable	Retrospective reporting begins	Expert disagreement remains
WR	No offense context	Not the principal pre-event question	Legally decisive / disputed	Post-event behavior is contextual evidence only	Historical legal inference
BC	No offense context	Distress and constraint increase	Legally decisive / disputed	Action complete	Historical legal inference
Tempo	Ordinary life	Escalating symptoms/treatment	Compressed critical interval	Emergency / ICU	Long institutional course
Option field	Broad ordinary field	Increasingly constrained by distress/system	Subjective width unknown	Radically transformed	Institutionally constrained

WHAT THIS TABLE IS

A recognition summary. It is not a scorecard, diagnostic scale, probability model, or verdict instrument.

18. Dual Interpretation Overlay — Same Rows, Different Reads

The strongest demonstration of the CLEAR stance is that both sides must consume the same frozen evidence. Neither side receives a custom factual record.

Fixed node	Prosecution reading	Defense reading	CLEAR hold
Established baseline	Strong comparison baseline for retained capacities.	Strong comparison baseline for demonstrating later deterioration.	Both can be true as interpretations of the same baseline.
Severe psychiatric deterioration	Mental illness does not itself establish legal incapacity.	Progressive deterioration supports a genuine state transition.	Illness severity and legal capacity remain separate questions.
Clinicians did not observe psychosis	Negative contemporaneous evidence weighs against later psychosis account.	Absence of observation does not prove absence outside the encounters.	Freeze observation; keep mechanism open.
Jan. 24 ordinary tasks	Retained organization near offense supports retained capacities.	Retained EF can coexist with altered RT/AG.	Fact supports EF; other capacities require separate evidence.
Reported command voice	Retrospective/inconsistent features may weaken reliability.	Command hallucination/delusional state may explain altered premise/control.	Freeze report; dispute mechanism.
Repeated execution	May support deliberate choice/control.	Procedural skill may operate inside psychosis.	Action is fixed; legal/clinical meaning is not.
Suicide attempt	Can fit deliberate homicide-suicide planning.	Can fit continuation of a psychotic homicide-suicide state.	Neither inference is automatic.
No recurring voices reported in cited trial testimony	May challenge a sharply bounded account.	Acute symptoms can resolve; later absence does not negate earlier occurrence.	Longitudinal fact is qualified; clinical meaning remains expert territory.

19. Clearstanding — Both Interpretations Must Be Able to Lose

Prosecution hypothesis — case-study form

H-P: The psychosis / command-voice explanation does not adequately account for the state transition that produced the killings, and the evidentiary pattern supports retained criminal responsibility.

Expected recognition if this reading is strong

- Relevant capacities remain observable close to and during the critical interval.
- The reported voice has weak corroboration, material chronology/account problems, or limited explanatory reach.
- Evidence bearing on wrongfulness appreciation and behavioral control remains present.

What would weaken this read

- Strong contemporaneous corroboration of psychotic experience close to the critical interval.
- Reliable evidence of substantially impaired reality testing, wrongfulness appreciation, or behavioral control at the offense.
- A coherent longitudinal mechanism that explains preserved task skills without requiring intact legal capacity.

Defense hypothesis — case-study form

H-D: A genuine psychotic state altered reality testing and/or control enough to create reasonable doubt about criminal responsibility despite preserved executive skills.

Expected recognition if this reading is strong

- Pre-event deterioration contains meaningful precursors compatible with the proposed state.
- Near-contemporaneous material supports altered reality or agency.
- The homicide-suicide sequence coheres with the proposed mechanism.

What would weaken this read

- The reported hallucination mechanism is materially unsupported or incompatible across reliable accounts.
- Evidence strongly supports meaningful wrongfulness appreciation and ability to conform conduct.
- The proposed mechanism fails to account for important longitudinal observations.

CLEAR OUTPUT

Not “which side wins?” but “what would each read require the record to reveal, and where does the record support, contradict, or fail to resolve that expectation?”

20. State Reveal and Change Agents

The book states that the state is revealed through variation: different people, roles, ages, pressures, and skill sets can reveal recognizable categories in different expressions. The point is not to memorize the story. It is to recognize the state when it appears in another form.

What this case demonstrates structurally

- The same person can show deterioration and preserved skill at the same time.
- The same fact can support more than one interpretation without changing the fact itself.
- The system can alter the expression of the self, while the self's actions materially transform the system.
- A state map becomes stronger when it shows what changed and what remained invariant.
- The post-event state is not merely “after.” It is the next baseline from which new pressure must be read.

Case-study change agents

Unlike the book's four teaching stories, this case does not assign a single behavioral intervention change agent. Instead, it reveals repeatable audit agents: chronology, attribution, separation of capacities, source reliability, contradiction preservation, and expected recognition. These are publication/audit agents, not clinical treatments.

RECOGNITION SYSTEM

The stories are different. The information sources are different. The recognition architecture stays recognizable.

21. The Third Position — What “CLEAR” Means Here

Overstanding in the book creates room for mirrors, options, hidden paths, and a third position. The third position does not erase either side. It creates a place where both can be seen.

That is the case-study stance:

Not the prosecution	The CLEAR position	Not the defense
Does not begin by proving deliberate criminal responsibility.	Holds the factual layer, source class, chronology, contradiction, and test conditions.	Does not begin by proving postpartum psychosis or lack of responsibility.
May use the map to argue one interpretation.	Requires the same evidence rows to remain available to both sides.	May use the map to argue the opposing interpretation.
Cannot convert preserved EF into automatic sanity.	Separates variables and marks the inference boundary.	Cannot convert severe illness into automatic lack of legal capacity.
Must identify disconfirming evidence.	Expected Recognition makes the read testable.	Must identify disconfirming evidence.

CLEAR STANCE

The clear space is not red, blue, or the purple produced by mixing them. It is the transparent container that lets each state and interpretation become visible without inheriting either side's identity.

22. Transfer Architecture — Why This Is Bigger Than This Case

The Clancy report is one specimen. The architecture is transferable because CLEAR separates the recognition sequence from the domain-specific information placed inside it.

CLEAR layer	Court case	Business router	Student / educational application
Innerstanding	Baseline person/state and starting record	Current user/business state	Current learner/context baseline
Understanding	Pressure, treatment, family/legal environment	System constraints, inventory, burden, capability	Assignment demands, learning pressure, available support
Overstanding	Competing explanations, options, legal/clinical mirrors	Ranked routes / existing resources / third path	Possible strategies, interpretations, supports
Clearstanding	Observable movement + test conditions	Recommended movement + expected result	Action/response + evidence of learning
Innerstanding 2.0	Post-event/post-ruling baseline	New operational baseline after routing	New learner baseline / recognized pattern

What changes from specimen to specimen

- Vocabulary.
- Evidence source.
- Domain-specific variables.
- Decision authority.
- The form of movement.
- The meaning of success/failure.

What does not change

- Baseline → pressure → option field → movement → new baseline.
- Self and system remain visible.
- The first explanation is not automatically the only explanation.
- The movement must be capable of revealing whether the read was useful.

ARCHITECTURAL RESULT

This is the same reason six different routers can look different and still be the same kind of routing architecture. The case study demonstrates the invariant skeleton under radically different content.

23. Teaching Analogies and Comparator Rule

Programming analogy

The multi-service software analogy may be used to visualize why preserved task behavior does not logically settle every other capacity. It must remain adjacent to a disclaimer: human psychiatric states are not computer programs, and the analogy is not neuroscience or medical evidence.

Comparator rule

Other cases or fictional characters may be used only as teaching mirrors. They remain outside the Clancy Master Evidence layer. A comparator may help illustrate variation, but it cannot establish Clancy's state merely because another person expressed a similar or different pattern.

- Master layer: Clancy evidence only.
- Comparator layer: separately sourced case or fictional teaching mirror.
- Shared variable: state exactly what is being compared.
- Difference control: identify baseline, cognitive/developmental status, diagnosis, medication, environment, and evidence quality.
- No-transfer rule: similarity is not proof of identity.

PURPOSE

Analogies help the reader see the architecture. They are never allowed to become evidence in the factual map.

24. Unresolved Nodes — Preserve the Gaps

1. When did the reported hallucinatory process begin?
2. Was January 24 the first reported command hallucination or one expression of an earlier altered state?
3. How should differences among reported voice accounts be weighed?
4. What did the January “symptoms of postpartum psychosis” and other psychiatric searches mean to Clancy at the time?
5. How should clinicians’ failure to observe psychosis be reconciled with later expert interpretations?
6. Which executive capacities remained intact during the critical interval?
7. Which capacities relevant to criminal responsibility changed, if any?
8. What was the subjective option field during the critical interval?
9. What does the suicide attempt reveal, and what does it not reveal?
10. What evidentiary significance should attach to the cited testimony that recurring voices were not reported after the killings?
11. Which post-event observations reflect psychiatric state, catastrophic injury, treatment, grief, memory, custody, institutional environment, or combinations of these?
12. What stronger primary-source material would modify any frozen public-reporting row?

AUDIT PRINCIPLE

An unresolved node is not missing quality control. It is quality control made visible. CLEAR does not fill the blank simply because a reader wants closure.

25. Factual Freeze Register — Version 1.1

Layer	Freeze decision	Rule
Massachusetts legal standard	FROZEN to March 2026 official instructions	Update only if controlling law/instructions change.
Windows 0–4 factual observations	ROW-LEVEL FROZEN	Freeze reported events/observations; interpretations remain separate.
Window 5 killings/method/timing coordinates	FROZEN FACT	Historical action coordinates; mechanism/legal meaning disputed.
Window 5 command-voice accounts	FROZEN REPORT / DISPUTED MECHANISM	Freeze who reported what to whom when adequately sourced; do not freeze truth/clinical meaning.
Expert testimony	FROZEN AS TESTIMONY / I	Freeze that opinions were given; keep correctness disputed.
Window 6 suicide attempt/injury	FROZEN FACT	Meaning remains interpretive.
Windows 7–8 post-event reports/course	FROZEN WITH QUALIFICATION	Preserve context and source limitations.
Mistrial Sept. 4, 2026	FROZEN FACT	Completed procedural event.
Juror 11–1 accounts	FROZEN REPORT, NOT VERDICT	Attribute to post-trial juror reporting.
Rule 25 / retrial / later custody	DYNAMIC	Date-stamp and update; do not rewrite earlier windows.
CLEAR case-study variables/tags	METHOD FROZEN	Case-study implementation, not validated clinical scales.

FREEZE THRESHOLD REACHED

The factual layer is now sufficiently structured to stop changing for presentation purposes. Future factual edits should require a stronger source, a demonstrated error, or a new procedural event - not merely a more persuasive interpretation.

26. Source and Method Notes

The framework architecture is grounded in the supplied Yo Spark: The CLEAR Model paperback. Case facts are drawn from public legal material and public trial reporting. This edition deliberately prefers neutral attribution over unsupported precision. Where reporting differs or the public record is incomplete, the map marks the node disputed, unresolved, or qualified rather than silently reconciling it.

Framework source

Mister Kyle Anu Henson. Yo Spark: The CLEAR Model — The Essential Self-Audit Change Management Manual. Supplied paperback. Primary concepts used: Auditor Stance; five-layer recognition filter; present baseline; pressure container; option field / third position; Expected Recognition; Innerstanding 2.0; State Reveal; Change Agents; self/system audit; appendix toolbelt.

Public/legal source key

- S1 — Massachusetts Court System:** Model Jury Instructions on Homicide: I. Criminal Responsibility (March 2026). <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/model-jury-instructions-on-homicide-i-criminal-responsibility>
- S2 — CBS News / WBZ:** Trial background and witness descriptions / key moments. <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-key-moments/>
- S3 — WBUR:** Psychiatric-care testimony and clinician observations. <https://www.wbur.org/news/2026/08/08/clancy-psychiatric-care-testimony-clinicians>
- S4 — CBS Boston:** Mother testimony concerning harm thoughts. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-watch-live-day-14/>
- S5 — CBS Boston:** State Police / digital search history testimony. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-watch-live-day-13/>
- S6 — CBS Boston:** Day 14 digital testimony including Jan. 19 “symptoms of postpartum psychosis” search. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-watch-live-day-14/>
- S7 — WBUR:** Patrick Clancy testimony / pre-event family context. <https://www.wbur.org/news/2026/07/27/lindsay-clancy-trial-father-testimony>
- S8 — Reuters / CBS:** Killings, suicide attempt, trial/mistrial context. <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/three-jurors-lindsay-clancys-us-murder-trial-point-fingers-holdout-after-2026-09-09/>
- S9 — CBS Boston:** Defense psychological testimony / reported voice account. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-watch-live-day-15/>
- S10 — WBUR:** Defense rests / expert interpretation and longitudinal reporting. <https://www.wbur.org/news/2026/08/21/lindsay-clancy-defense-rests>
- S11 — CBS Boston:** Chaplain testimony. <https://www.cbsnews.com/boston/news/lindsay-clancy-trial-watch-live-day-17/>
- S12 — WBUR:** Closing phase / competing expert interpretation. <https://www.wbur.org/news/2026/08/26/lindsay-clancy-murder-trial-testimony-closing-arguments>
- S13 — Reuters:** Post-mistrial juror accounts. <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/three-jurors-lindsay-clancys-us-murder-trial-point-fingers-holdout-after-2026-09-09/>
- S14 — Reuters:** Rule 25 motion / Sept. 29 hearing reported. <https://www.reuters.com/legal/government/lindsay-clancys-lawyer-asks-judge-find-her-not-guilty-after-mistrial-2026-09-10/>

27. Publication Architecture: Expository Pass First, Lecture Pass Second

This edition is the expository pass. It establishes the architecture before performance. That mirrors the design logic of the book: the architecture is presented first; the living explanation and movement pass follow afterward.

Locked source product

- State Made Visible — CLEAR Clancy Case Audit V1.1.
- Evidence Ledger + Source Audit V1.1.
- Frozen evidence layer with dynamic Window 9 addendum.

Second pass: lecture / media

- Narrated 10–15 minute case-study lecture drawn from the locked report.
- Presentation deck that visually walks the five CLEAR positions.
- Interactive webpage with Evidence / Prosecution Read / Defense Read / CLEAR Questions toggles.
- Short-form State Made Visible segments built from individual architecture lessons rather than sensational fragments.

What must not change in the media pass

- The frozen facts do not get rewritten for stronger storytelling.
- Expert opinions remain attributed.
- Disputed nodes stay disputed.
- The framework does not announce a verdict.
- The same map must remain usable by either adversarial reading.

CANONICAL RULE

Architecture first. Lecture second. Media should explain the map, not replace it.

STATE MADE VISIBLE

The case changes. The information changes. The CLEAR stance remains the space that lets the state reveal itself.

End — Version 1.1 Factual Freeze Edition