



PROJECT
OVERVIEW



THE COUNCIL METHOD

Ollie Alley Edition

Keeping the useful disagreement. Tightening what it means.

SOURCE PROMPT	OLLIE ALLEY EDITION
The Council Method Created by Molly Ruland at Heartcast Media	Seth Edwards Owner / Operator - Ollie Alley AI Studio

Where the Ollie Alley Edition Came From

The Council Method implementation created by Molly Ruland at Heartcast Media has a strong, simple idea: instead of asking one AI voice for one answer, seat several distinct perspectives, make them challenge the decision, and then synthesize the result for the human.

UPSTREAM CREDIT

This edition builds from the Council prompt created by Molly Ruland at Heartcast Media. Ollie Alley developed it as a focused refinement for its own R&D. It keeps that prompt as the source and does not imply endorsement by Molly Ruland or Heartcast Media, or that Ollie Alley owns Molly's source prompt.

That core was worth preserving. Our design review found that the Council is memorable, reusable, and creates useful friction before commitment.

What already worked

A persistent board is easier to call on than rebuilding a prompt every time. Distinct perspectives expose tradeoffs a single-answer format may miss. And the final synthesis turns the discussion into something a person can actually use.

What needed tightening

The same features can mislead if their rules stay vague. Several AI roles can look independent when they are not; a Contrarian can invent objections; rankings can reward confidence or agreement; and a Chairman's verdict can sound more authoritative than the evidence supports.

The answer was not a bigger Council. It was a clearer one: keep the recognizable experience, but make the mechanics underneath it more explicit.

How the Council Works

The experience is deliberately recognizable. Five standing perspectives stay seated, one or two additional advisors can be added for the goal, and every full Council run follows the same three-round shape.

CORE FIVE	GOAL-SPECIFIC SEATS	HUMAN
Contrarian, Realist, Ambitious One, Money Advisor, Customer. Each approaches the same decision from a different angle.	One or two extra advisors may be added, but only when they fill a real perspective gap the standing five do not cover.	The Council advises. You decide. Board changes and final decisions stay with the person using it.

The three rounds

Round 1	Each seat forms its first position before receiving the other seats' positions. If the AI platform cannot truly isolate them, the Council says so.
Round 2	The reasoning is reviewed for strengths, weaknesses, missing pieces, and usefulness. Rankings follow a fixed rubric rather than popularity or confidence.
Round 3	The Chairman synthesizes the best reasoning, the strongest case against it, the important unknowns, one question to answer, and a reconsideration tripwire.

INTERNAL AGREEMENT IS NOT OUTSIDE PROOF

Several roles can still share the same model, context, facts, and blind spots. Agreement inside the Council is useful convergence, not independent external validation.

Simple on the surface

The goal is useful friction before commitment, not a tribunal for every choice. The structure is there to help the decision, not to become the decision.

What Ollie Alley Tightened

The work focused on the mechanics inside Council itself: who sits on the board, how seats behave, how first positions are formed, how peer review is judged, and what the Chairman is allowed to do.

THE DESIGN RULE

Keep the recognizable Council. Tighten only the mechanics that belong inside Council itself. Do not turn the panel into Steward, SEW, or an execution authority.

Board changes are visible

The roster receives a visible version. Seats are not silently added, removed, renamed, or materially repurposed.

Extra seats have to earn their place

A goal-specific seat must fill a real decision-relevant gap. The Council names the gap and why that advisor belongs there.

Disagreement is not mandatory theater

A seat can report that it found no additional material concern. The Contrarian does not have to invent an objection just to sound contrarian.

Independence is described honestly

If the platform cannot guarantee isolation or blind review, the process is labelled role-separated or content-focused instead of pretending those technical guarantees exist.

The Changes

Most of the edition is made of small structural changes that stop the process from quietly claiming more than it earned.

CHANGE	WHAT IT MEANS
Board continuity	You can tell when the Council changed. No silent reseating.
Seat discipline	Advisors stay inside the perspective that earned the seat; extra seats must add something distinct.
No forced dissent	A useful Council can agree sometimes. Disagreement has to come from the reasoning, not the character description.
Honest separation	Multiple AI roles are not called independent unless the platform can actually support that claim.
Reasoning over popularity	Peer rankings use relevance, assumption clarity, logic, tradeoffs, and decision usefulness, not confidence or majority agreement.
Bounded Chairman	The Chairman synthesizes but does not vote, break ties, or create extra evidence. A materially new Chair idea must be surfaced and reconsidered before it changes the verdict.

What stayed the same

The five familiar perspectives. One or two goal-specific seats. Three rounds. Direct challenge. A usable final synthesis. And the central rule: the Council advises; the human decides.

Where the Ollie Alley Edition Stands

CURRENT STATE	DESIGN REVIEW	LIMITS
Current working edition. Not yet publicly released.	Eight targeted Council improvements passed the design review, and the recognizable Council core was preserved.	Not yet proven through formal testing. Not a standalone safety system. It does not automatically gain the powers or safeguards of Steward, Enforcer, Warden, or SEW.

What it still cannot do

- Turn several AI voices into independent human experts or independent evidence.
- Turn the simulated Customer seat into a real customer interview or stakeholder record.
- Verify external facts just because every seat repeats them.
- Create legal, financial, technical, or other professional authority the model does not have.
- Authorize real-world execution simply because the Council recommends an action.
- Guarantee technical isolation, blind review, memory, or other platform capabilities the AI service does not actually provide.

Where it fits

COUNCIL STAYS COUNCIL

Steward checks the decision itself. SEW carries those safeguards into whether requirements were followed and how failures are handled. C-SEW separately asks whether Council should connect to SEW at all. The Ollie Alley edition does not absorb those systems.

About the underlying prompt

This overview describes the edition. It does not itself release the underlying prompt. Redistribution, licensing, attribution, and branding permissions for the prompt remain subject to the separate public-release review.

Why This Could Matter

The useful part of Council is not the illusion of six or seven independent experts. It is structured friction: making a decision survive several different ways of looking at it before a person commits.

USEFUL FRICTION	LESS THEATER	HUMAN CONTROL
Make a decision survive several different ways of looking at it before the person commits.	Keep disagreement, agreement, and the Chairman's verdict closer to what they actually mean.	Keep board changes visible and final authority with the person using the Council.

What I am not claiming

- Proof from formal testing that the Ollie Alley Edition improves decisions.
- Its internal perspectives being treated as independent experts, or their agreement being treated as independent evidence.
- Replacement of real customer input, professional advice, source verification, or external research when those are needed.
- Ownership of the source Council prompt created by Molly Ruland at Heartcast Media, or endorsement by Molly Ruland or Heartcast Media.

What happens next

Release review first

First, finish the separate rights and release review for the Ollie Alley edition prompt. Separately, C-SEW research will later test whether selected Council information should connect to SEW at all, after SEW's own testing is finished.

The Council edition can remain useful on its own regardless of that later result. C-SEW is allowed to conclude that the better design is to keep Council and SEW separate.

THE SHORT VERSION

The Ollie Alley edition keeps the Council recognizable, but makes it harder for the process to pretend it knows more than it does.

Different perspectives still argue. The Chairman still synthesizes. The human still decides. The difference is that seats have clearer rules, disagreement does not have to be manufactured, and agreement does not become proof.