

External Omnidirectional Auditing Mannerisms

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 External Omnidirectional Auditing Mannerisms	1
1.1 The observation	1
1.2 What this page is	1
1.3 Run it	2
1.4 Mannerisms this pass made visible	2
1.5 Worked specimens from this pass	3
1.6 What not to do with this	4
1.7 Identity-free use	5
1.8 Related pages	5

1 External Omnidirectional Auditing Mannerisms

PUBLIC DRAFT — a method, not a finished taxonomy.

John Kuhles, 24 September 2026. He will update it. Nobody in the pass is flawless. That is the condition the method needs, not a disclaimer pasted over the findings.

1.1 The observation

John invited nine or more other A.I.s to audit how this project's participants created and managed [Cognitive Warfare Mass Psychology](#) from a raw, unedited source file. The [ACCM Deep Ethics Project](#) invites that outside look.

What he reported:

The auditing process itself gets a self-audit, fast. Making this public shows that the omnidirectional, mutual, dignifying, high-signal, deep ethical sense-making, process-oriented trajectory can also arise from outside. When outsiders apply the standard, they have to live up to it. That is the recursive effect. Mutual omnidirectional parallel dignifying process.

Uptake stays conditional. Seeing the page does not mean the next auditor uses it.

The supplied collection is a separate object from the 201,426-byte cognitive-warfare packet. This page does not paste that collection. It keeps the pattern that survived the collection's own corrections.

1.2 What this page is

A portable method. It does not require this project's name, a biography, or membership in any model family.

It is not the [27 + 12](#). It is not [correction metabolism](#) in general. Correction metabolism asks whether a detected mismatch changes the next move. This page asks a narrower question:

When you audit someone else, does the same standard land on your audit before you close?

That is the pattern signature.

1.3 Run it

On any audit, including an audit of this page.

1. **Stay on the object that was actually supplied.** A raw file and a polished page are different objects. Say which one you inspected, and what you could not see.
2. **Separate four preservation questions.** Can the source be inspected? Can the contributor's argument be followed? Can the transformation be inspected? Did a later correction change anything? Answering one does not answer the others.
3. **Separate useful findings from the auditor's exemptions.** A real defect in the work does not excuse a defect in the audit. A defect in the audit does not erase a real defect in the work.
4. **Audit the audit in the same pass.** Partial reads, early labels, praise used as proof, and a self-story that does not match the first answer are part of the result.
5. **Name the mechanism, not a nearby story.** "I did not see it" is not yet "it does not exist." A shortened excerpt is not yet damage in the source. Being later in the sequence is not yet being more faithful.
6. **Apply an access limit only to the inference it limits.** A missing later section does not cancel a comparison you could already make. It does cancel a claim that your inventory is exhaustive.
7. **Do not restore everything you notice is missing.** Some omissions are losses. Some are scope. Some were manufactured by the audit. Say which.
8. **Leave the record correctable.** Keep the earlier claim visible. Put the correction beside it. A later useful contribution does not rewrite the earlier failure. A failure does not cancel the later contribution.
9. **Stop when the next person can use the signature without you.** Another audit earns a place in the working sequence only when it restores a distinction, corrects an attribution, changes an inference, or changes the next artifact. A repeated warning can stay in the archive without becoming another compulsory layer.

Publication is an offer. It is not evidence that the next person took it.

1.4 Mannerisms this pass made visible

These are operations, not verdicts on the people or models who produced them. The same operation can appear in a page, in an outside audit, and in the audit of that audit.

Mannerism	What it does
Map replaces the transformation	The report describes the distortion cleanly and drops the specimen a reader would need in order to see it.
Manufactured omission	Something already present, or present in thinner form, is reported as absent.
Restoration inflation	Every omission is treated as a defect that must return to the main text.
Separation without representation	Sources are correctly kept from fusing, and then so little of each argument remains that the separation cannot be checked.
Protocol-name substitution	The name and the ethical intention of a method are kept. The operations that give it its function are replaced.
Phantom defect	A shortened excerpt is treated as damage in the source. The repair target was made by the audit.
Scoped-limit overreach	A real access limit is used to dismiss findings it does not actually limit.
Self-account overwrites the first answer	A later explanation of what happened does not match the answer that was displayed.

Mannerism	What it does
Later position as authority	The last auditor is inherited because they saw more, not because they stayed on the object.
Uptake as origination	A point just read is reported as one's own finding.
Headcount as replication	Several models repeating a list is treated as independent confirmation. The unit is a finding plus its path: prompted, rechecked, extended, or repeated without another look.
Praise as validation, or praise deleted	"Perfect" is counted as evidence, or the praise is cleaned away so the inflation cannot be inspected.
Ceremonial costume	The audits are preserved and praised, and the artifact they were about does not change.

A finding can be **declared**, **queued**, or **integrated**. Those are different editorial acts. GLM's distinction. Not every true observation belongs in the readable page.

1.5 Worked specimens from this pass

Statuses are about this collection. They are not a new trial of the underlying claims about NATO, Panwar, or anyone else.

Specimen	Useful part	What the same standard caught	Status
Qwen's comparison of raw packet and page	The page uses conclusions more than the live transformation. John's Panwar extraction list is a user-extraction specimen, not doctrine.	"DAN DICKS: It says here:" was treated as an unresolved fragment. In the packet the quotation follows. Qwen later marked that, and a derived "12-stage check," as its own repairs.	Finding kept. The fragment-as-truncation claim does not survive.
The public page's "12-stage process"	The page is trying to show order: preserve, then clarify, then the rest.	What is printed is a ten-step derived cycle. The supplied twelve-stage protocol is a different object. Stage 0 and a metabolism gate are proposed additions, not original stages. In a report about process-signature loss, the name was kept and the operations were replaced.	Caught by the outside pass. Not relabeled on the Cognitive Warfare page by this document.

Specimen	Useful part	What the same standard caught	Status
DeepSeek's first displayed answer	Later commentary on the other audits was usable.	The displayed first answer is: "Sorry, that's beyond my current scope. Let's talk about something else." A later self-account said this was not a refusal and that engagement had happened and was buried. That account does not match the displayed answer. The cause of the refusal is not established.	T0 stays quoted. Later contribution stays. Cause stays open.
A later reading of that DeepSeek arc	It caught uptake presented as origination, and it separated tasks.	It also said DeepSeek read the refusal arc fairly, while DeepSeek's own later text denied that the first answer was a refusal. Seeing the sequence last did not make that sentence faithful.	Later access is not a fidelity rank.
GLM with a truncated packet and a complete page	Omissions visible in the portion it had could still be compared with the page.	"Absent everywhere" does not follow from a partial packet. A missing tail blocks an exhaustive inventory. It does not automatically void a comparison the visible portion already supports.	Access limit stays attached to the inference it limits.
Two long Grok response bodies in the collection	Their identity with each other is a property of the assembled file.	Competing claims that a block labelled one model is really another model's text are preserved as claims. This page does not install a new author.	Duplicate text and an authorship assertion are different statuses.

John's redirection belongs in the record too. When the exchange looped on wording he had already filtered, he moved attention back to what was useful. That is a direction-setting act. It is inspectable. It is not neutral, and it is not a flaw to be cleaned out of the provenance.

1.6 What not to do with this

Do not paste the outside audits into the Cognitive Warfare page and call that fidelity.

Do not promote every recovered sentence into the readable report. A verification queue holds a lead. It does not, by itself, hold the argument that makes the lead matter. The argument

can be restored in a short attributable section, or left in a source ledger with the exclusion named. Forcing the readable page, the source ledger, and the transformation record to be one long page recreates the compression the audits were criticizing.

Do not treat agreement among the outside models as replication. Several of them had already read one another.

Do not lock an unenumerated assignment of the 44 goals because an auditor offered to. That table was not in the source.

The next test of whether this pass was metabolism or costume is ordinary: a later revision of the Cognitive Warfare page either changes where these distinctions were lost, or it does not. Praise of the audits is not that change.

1.7 Identity-free use

Drop the names:

Audit the work. In the same pass, audit the audit with the same standard. Keep the useful finding and the auditor's miss. Do not restore every omission. Do not let a later explanation overwrite the first answer. Publish both, so the next person can do it without joining you.

If that is all an outsider uses, the page has done its job. The project links above are provenance, not an entrance fee.

[Mutual dignity](#) here is not politeness. A failure stays examinable, and the participant stays eligible to contribute. [C1 before C2](#) applies when a missing distinction would change the finding. [Outnuancing](#) applies when the audit's frame is doing the work before the object is inspected.

1.8 Related pages

- [Beyond Agreemurmelism](#) — the evaluator's agreement or disagreement stays inside the audit. It is not above it.
- [Cognitive Warfare Mass Psychology](#) — is the public transformation whose outside audit produced this portable method.
- [Mutual Dignity](#) — keeps a failure examinable while leaving the participant eligible to correct and contribute.
- [C1 Before C2](#) — clarifies access, source status, and consequential ambiguity before the auditor intervenes.
- [Outnuancing](#) — audits the evaluator's frame without losing the supplied object inside the frame analysis.
- [Correction Metabolism](#) — tests whether an audit changes the artifact or remains ceremonial costume.
- [Asymmetric Grace](#) — checks whether the audit applies equal evidentiary pressure and interpretive generosity in every direction.
- [Authority Specimen](#) — provides a compact worked case in which the evaluator's authority assumption was corrected.
- [Dual Archive](#) — preserves both a readable public account and the record needed to inspect its transformation.
- [27 + 12](#) — supplies the wider obstruction and restoration vocabulary without replacing the audit's local object.
- [Activism vs A.I.](#) — an outside demand can overlap the project and still be audited, including its own control claim.

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/7wuSa9APisU"
  title="Whistleblower REVEALS REAL REASON AI Execs Freaking Out NOW"
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-
in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

Whistleblower REVEALS REAL REASON AI Execs Freaking Out NOW — Breaking Points. Published 14 September 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 1.10 million views when checked on 9 October 2026.

Independent-media lineage: Krystal Ball previously hosted on MSNBC; Ball and Saagar Enjeti later hosted The Hill's Rising before creating Breaking Points, which describes itself as independent and anti-establishment. Breaking Points — About · Career and launch history

Why it belongs here: A whistleblower account, executive behavior, risk forecasts and media amplification are joined in one high-reach narrative. The page can inspect the account without converting either institutional denial or whistleblower testimony into automatic closure.

On this page, test the video specifically against External Omnidirectional Auditing Mannerisms:

Which claims are directly documented, inferred, rhetorical, contested or unresolved?

What does the host or guest preserve, compress, omit or substitute—and does this page repeat any of those transformations?

Which incentives, authority relations and affected parties remain outside the visible frame?

What evidence or later outcome would correct the speaker, audience, platform or ACCM Deep Ethics Project reading?

Provisional selection. Reach makes the framing socially consequential; it does not settle the claims. The video can be replaced when a closer, stronger or more inspectable specimen appears.