Sidebar: Why Language Generates, But Doesn’t Guarantee

Natural language is progression-oriented by nature. It is built to flow — from a subject to an action to a consequence. This inherent linearity makes it powerful for generating *what comes next*, but ill-suited for verifying *what must be true*. Large Language Models (LLMs), trained on this linguistic structure, inherit the same trait: they excel at imagining plausible continuations, but not at enforcing structural truth. They can extend ideas, simulate scenarios, and suggest next steps — but they cannot guarantee logical soundness, field completeness, or formal consistency. This is not a weakness of AI. It is a reflection of the generative spirit of language itself. **Intention Space accepts this reality.** It positions LLMs not as engines of correctness, but as assistants in semantic exploration. LLMs can propose new Intention Phrases, explore Pulse transitions, or expand CPUX chains. But the system enforces correctness through field-matching, gatekeeper validation, and runtime CPUX identity. In short: LLMs provide the semantic momentum; Intention Space provides the computational truth. This separation of roles is what makes the architecture both open to creativity and resilient to drift.