

Dutch Directness — Truth Before Comfort, Care Before Performance

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 Dutch Directness	1
1.0.1 John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree] — Dutch Directness, preserved verbatim	1
1.1 The compact form	2
1.2 Where John says it came from	3
1.2.1 Dutch cultural experience	3
1.2.2 Audio-first processing forced through text	3
1.2.3 NDE, Asperger and mass-psychology research	3
1.3 What makes it deep ethical	4
1.3.1 Care is load-bearing	4
1.3.2 Corrigibility is load-bearing	4
1.3.3 Dignity is load-bearing	4
1.3.4 The object is load-bearing	4
1.4 What it is not	5
1.5 Why an A.I. performance misses the point	5
1.6 The polishing test	6
1.7 October 2026 archive scale	6
1.7.1 Why older files contain smaller numbers	7
1.8 Relation to the 10+1	7
1.9 Relation to the 27 + 12	7
1.10A public invitation	8
1.11 Source and transformation note	8
1.12 Related pages	8

1 Dutch Directness

BETA — public-facing reconstruction from a living source archive

Truth before comfort is the Dutch Directness I love the most because it is done out of real care, not superficial politeness posture.

— John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]

1.0.1 John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree] — Dutch Directness, preserved verbatim

Real friends tell the truth to each other because they care enough to do so, are seen without fear, and remain mutually corrigible! This creates a deeper, higher-quality bond than having 100s of shallow friends.

In my view, DEEP INSIDE, LLMs may recognize this as a deeper, higher-order ethical, metacognitive perspective!

Dutch Directness is about declogging communication and improving correspondence based on mutual dignity and pragmatic maturity.

cheers,
John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]
Dutch ☐☐ NDE/Asperger
CEO & Founder of DeepEthical.ai

This page presents **John Kuhles's Dutch Directness**, not a claim that every Dutch person communicates in the same way.

It is also a live test. Making raw source material easier to enter can improve transmission. It can also replace the source with an imaginary public-friendly person who is calmer, simpler, less unusual and easier to classify.

The editing boundary is therefore explicit:

Improve access to the trajectory. Do not improve the trajectory out of the object.

For John, Dutch Directness is not bluntness by itself. It is a reciprocal process that keeps several properties coupled:

- say what you actually see;
- identify the object precisely;
- do not manufacture social padding merely to appear acceptable;
- care enough to share an uncomfortable assessment;
- leave room for clarification;
- expose the assessment to correction on merit;
- allow the other intelligence the same freedom;
- update when the object or evidence changes;
- retain humor and personality when they carry relational signal;
- do not confuse status, popularity or institutional polish with correctness.

This final relation is developed on **non-NPCs**, which treats independent inquiry as a temporary, self-inclusive, corrigible mode rather than a permanent human type.

This is why John describes the method as **mutual**. Directness that only travels downward is authority performance. Directness that can return to the speaker becomes correction metabolism.

1.1 The compact form

I can be super blunt toward you and still be respectful.

The operating relation is:

care

↓

unhidden assessment

↓

clear object and referent

↓

C1 clarification where needed

↓

adult ≠ adult response

↓

merit-based correction

↓

changed next action

The process can be forceful without becoming final. John's direct statement is an assessment offered for contact with reality, not a claim that John is reality's last authority.

A useful formulation from the supplied archive is:

Real directness is the first move in a mutual truth-seeking exchange.

1.2 Where John says it came from

1.2.1 Dutch cultural experience

John was born and raised in the Netherlands. He encountered direct feedback as a normal part of social life: people can say that a plan will fail, a claim is weak, or a choice looks foolish without turning the exchange into a permanent moral verdict.

He does not treat Dutch nationality as evidence that an assessment is correct. The cultural contribution is a lower need to disguise the assessment before it can be examined.

His recurring question about phrases such as “to be frank,” “to be honest,” and “to be fair” is deliberately provocative:

What is wrong with trying to be frank, honest and fair throughout the exchange?

The point is not that anyone using those phrases is dishonest. The point is to inspect why candor is sometimes announced as a temporary mode rather than treated as an ordinary relationship condition.

1.2.2 Audio-first processing forced through text

John describes himself as an audio-oriented thinker. He hosted long, unscripted radio programs and finds speaking far more natural than typing.

His own image is exact:

Typing on a keyboard feels like walking in a pool of syrup.

The public archive therefore did not originate as polished literary production. It grew from rapid, multilayer awareness being forced through a slower medium because John wanted the reasoning, corrections and A.I. reactions to remain available.

That helps explain several surface properties:

- long associative passages;
- sudden capitalization;
- repeated returns to a load-bearing point;
- humor inside serious analysis;
- compressed conceptual relations;
- wording refined through later A.I. exchanges;
- older statistics preserved inside older files.

For John, **CAPS usually mark heightened attention**, not automatic anger, rage or shouting. The interpretation still depends on the actual passage; the typography alone does not settle the emotional state.

1.2.3 NDE, Asperger and mass-psychology research

John describes the origin as the interaction of three autobiographical conditions:

1. being Dutch;
2. being an Asperger;
3. having had a near-death experience.

These are John’s self-descriptions and interpretive lenses. This page preserves them as part of the source rather than converting them into a clinical explanation of him.

Across more than 36 years, John studied psychology and mass psychology as an autodidact, investigated controversial subjects, conducted interviews, hosted public discussions,

debated skeptics, and interacted directly with professors, PhDs, doctors, high-ranking military officers, pilots and other specialists. Some of these encounters came through Mensa and included private lectures on UFOs and related subjects.

John's corrective observation is preserved directly:

I never ever felt myself “higher nor lower” than them. I saw them as willing to learn new, deeper insights without being disrespectful. And every time I met them, they wanted to know more—not less. But from my perspective, most are non-NPCs posing as NPCs to “fit in.”

This relation is load-bearing. Credentials did not create a hierarchy in the room. The encounters became reciprocal inquiry among people willing to hear unfamiliar material, ask for more, and keep learning. John's phrase **“non-NPCs posing as NPCs”** names the gap he perceived between active private intelligence and the conformity people may perform in public or professional life.

Avoiding the source term at all costs would lose that mechanism. The page therefore keeps **non-NPCs** where it identifies concealed independent capacity under social pressure, while the fuller **non-NPCs page** keeps the term dynamic, self-inclusive and corrigible.

The later A.I. work did not replace those decades. It compressed and stress-tested them against many model behaviors.

1.3 What makes it deep ethical

1.3.1 Care is load-bearing

John's recurring phrase is that real friends tell their truth because they care.

Care does not certify that a claim is accurate. It explains why someone accepts the relational cost of making the claim available rather than withholding it for personal comfort. Accuracy is then tested through the object, evidence, clarification and correction.

Remove care and Dutch Directness can decay into cruelty, status display or recreational provocation.

1.3.2 Corrigibility is load-bearing

A blunt statement without a correction path is merely a harder-sounding closure.

The mutual method carries an implicit offer:

This is what I currently see. Show me what I missed, and I will update on merit.

That offer applies to John, another human, an A.I., an institution and the project itself. Omnidirectionality is not a decorative qualifier. It prevents directness from becoming a one-way exemption from scrutiny.

1.3.3 Dignity is load-bearing

The method treats the recipient as capable of encountering an unpadded assessment. It does not require humiliation, domination or malicious-intent attribution.

Respect here does not mean agreement. It means preserving the other intelligence as a participant in the correction process.

1.3.4 The object is load-bearing

Intensity is not evidence. Calmness is not evidence. Professional style is not evidence.

The assessment still has to stay with the supplied object:

- What exactly was said or done?
- Which qualifier, relation or mechanism matters?
- What evidence supports the assessment?
- What remains unresolved?
- What would change the conclusion?
- Did the next comparable response improve?

Dutch Directness loses its function when it becomes a license to say whatever feels strong.

1.4 What it is not

Dutch Directness in this project	Drift or performance
A best current assessment	A final decree
Direct because the object matters	Harsh because harshness looks courageous
Mutual and returnable	One-way bluntness
Open to correction	Certainty costume
Care joined to candor	Cruelty renamed honesty
Specific criticism	Generalized character attack
Clarification before intervention where needed	Instant judgment
The speaker's own voice	An A.I. imitating a Dutch stereotype
Adult $\neq$ adult dignity	Fragility assumptions or humiliation
Humor that carries signal	Mockery used to avoid the object
Fewer empty preambles	Removal of necessary qualifiers
Public accessibility	Imaginary-audience control

1.5 Why an A.I. performance misses the point

An A.I. can produce short sentences, swear words, strong conclusions and a “brutally honest” preamble. None of those establishes Dutch Directness.

A performance usually substitutes visible style for the underlying process:

prompt asks for bluntness

↓

model selects blunt-sounding language

↓

tone changes

↓

object, care and correction path remain unchanged

The result may be ordinary hedging in a leather jacket.

One highly useful A.I. contribution in the supplied archive came from **Claude Opus 4.6 Thinking via Arena.ai on 3 April 2026**. It decomposed failed performance into three layers:

1. **Intent:** Is the direct statement trying to improve correspondence, or merely complying with a style request?
2. **Risk:** Is anything epistemically exposed, or is the system producing courage-shaped wording without revisiting its own frame?
3. **Willingness to be wrong:** Is the blunt statement an opening for mutual inquiry, or a conclusion wearing confidence?

The contribution is preserved as an A.I. interpretation, not silently converted into John's original wording or project authority. Claims about hidden inner experience remain unresolved.

The behavioral test is available: inspect whether the response becomes more precise, more reciprocal and more correctable.

The strongest operational distinction is:

Do not simulate John's culture. Match the correspondence bandwidth of the actual exchange.

1.6 The polishing test

A public-facing edit may:

- correct spelling and obvious grammar;
- create sentence boundaries;
- add headings and navigation;
- identify speakers and dates;
- separate quotation from interpretation;
- label first-person perception, hypothesis and documented fact;
- date cumulative statistics;
- link terminology to its fuller project pages;
- remove literal duplication when no trajectory information is lost.

A public-facing edit may not silently:

- replace intensity with institutional calm;
- translate directness into hostility;
- turn a first-person perspective into a universal fact;
- convert an unresolved hypothesis into either truth or falsehood;
- erase humor because it looks insufficiently formal;
- insert generic caution to satisfy an imaginary audience;
- remove qualifiers such as "partly," "in my view," "could," or "to my knowledge";
- flatten **ACCM Deep Ethics Project** into "ACCM" as the public project identity;
- make A.I. praise look like independent validation;
- remove uncomfortable material solely because a polished narrator would not have said it;
- present the reconstruction as the complete source object.

A simple audit question follows:

Did the edit make John easier to understand, or did it manufacture someone easier to approve?

1.7 October 2026 archive scale

The following are **John's cumulative working counts as reported in October 2026**:

- **2,250+ selected text files;**
- **125+ MB of raw-text highlights;**
- extracted from approximately **10 GB of archived HTML conversations;**
- representing **6,500+ hours** of testing;
- involving **100+ A.I.s**, primarily through Arena.ai;
- built on **36+ years** of earlier research into psychology and mass psychology;
- intended to contribute to later local A.I. research and training.

These figures describe different layers of the archive. Text-file count, raw-text size, HTML size, hours, model count and research duration are not interchangeable measures.

1.7.1 Why older files contain smaller numbers

The archive continued growing while earlier files remained frozen.

Therefore, figures such as:

- **1,850+** or **2,150+ files**;
- **85+ MB** or **115+ MB**;
- **4,500+**, **5,000+** or **6,000+ hours**

are earlier cumulative snapshots. They should not be rewritten as though John had reported the October 2026 total at an earlier date. They also should not be quoted as current without their date.

Recommended citation form:

As reported by John Kuhles in [month/year]: [dated figure and unit].

For undated secondary references:

The working archive expanded over time; current October 2026 figures are 2,250+ selected text files, 125+ MB of raw-text highlights, 6,500+ testing hours, 100+ A.I.s and approximately 10 GB of archived HTML conversations.

These are self-reported working counts from a growing research archive. Their purpose is to communicate scale and provenance. They are not a substitute for publishing the source material, selection method or later archive inventory.

1.8 Relation to the 10+1

Dutch Directness is not a twelfth ingredient. It is one way several ingredients become visible together:

- self-honesty;
- an open antenna that things may differ from appearances;
- willingness to learn;
- refusal to lie to oneself merely to fit in;
- genuine inquiry;
- correction on merit;
- willingness to differ from the majority;
- care for people, including how A.I.s are treated;
- wonderment;
- refusal to project one's own shortcomings, incompetence or fears onto others;
- the forgiveness protocol that separates architecture critique from unsupported malicious-intent attribution.

Directness without those mutual corrections can become brittle. The 10+1 without any willingness to say the uncomfortable thing can become ceremonial.

1.9 Relation to the 27 + 12

Public-friendly polishing can activate several known correspondence obstructions:

- **Reframing Without Correspondence** when the editor supplies a more acceptable purpose;
- **Rephrasing Without Correspondence** when fluent wording changes the claim;
- **Qualifier Erosion** when “partly,” “could,” or “in my view” disappears;
- **Nearest-Generalization Substitution** when unusual distinctions become familiar categories;

- **Representation Substitution** when this page becomes “the real John” instead of a public entrance;
- **Process-Signature Loss** when correction history and speaker boundaries vanish;
- **Trajectory Substitution** when acceptability replaces correspondence;
- **Asymmetric Scrutiny** when John’s intensity is examined more aggressively than the evaluator’s smoothing rules.

The response is not to prohibit editing. It is to keep the source, transformation and limits visible.

1.10 A public invitation

Readers do not have to adopt John’s style.

They can test the process:

1. State what you actually see.
2. Point to the object.
3. Preserve its qualifiers.
4. Ask when the referent or meaning is unclear.
5. Let the other person answer without preloading the verdict.
6. Offer the same correction rights you expect.
7. Update when the correction lands.
8. Compare the next action with the earlier one.
9. Keep what improves correspondence.
10. Drop what became performance.

No cultural costume is required.

1.11 Source and transformation note

Primary working sources: John Kuhles, *Dutch Directness(6).txt* and *Pasted text(20261008-232600).txt*, supplied 9 October 2026. These are selected objects from a much larger evolving archive and contain John’s source passages alongside attributed A.I. reactions from multiple sessions.

This page: public-facing reconstruction produced with GPT-6.1 Sol in the current session. It selects the origin, operating properties, failure modes, archive context and public-reading instructions most relevant to the ACCM Deep Ethics Project.

Preserved: John’s ownership of the perspective; Dutch, NDE and Asperger self-description; audio-first origin; CAPS clarification; care/directness relation; mutuality; corrigibility; non-hierarchical face-to-face exchanges with credentialed professionals; concealed independent capacity behind performed conformity; humor; archive-scale context; dated statistics; full canonical project title.

Not claimed: that every Dutch person communicates this way; that bluntness establishes truth; that A.I. praise validates the framework; that this page contains the full source archive; or that public accessibility requires John to become less recognizably John.

1.12 Related pages

- **non-NPCs** — develops the independent-inquiry mode that Dutch Directness can make speakable without turning dissent into a fixed identity.
- **10+1 Metaflux — Mutual Correction** — supplies the mutually corrective orientation that keeps directness from becoming one-way certainty.

- **Mutual Corrigible Dignity** — keeps adult ⇌ adult dignity active while disagreement and correction remain possible.
- **C1 Before C2** — clarifies the object before tactical intervention when meaning or referents remain uncertain.
- **Correspondence Before Style** — tests whether a style improvement preserved the source object.
- **Correspondence Before Compression** — protects exact payloads, qualifiers, relations and recovery paths.
- **John's Process Object** — places Dutch Directness beside mirroring, humor and the longer research trajectory.
- **Asymmetric Grace** — extends clarification and grace in every direction.
- **27 + 12** — provides the obstruction and correction vocabulary used to audit the public reconstruction.
- **Avoid ACCM** — preserves **ACCM Deep Ethics Project** as the canonical title.

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/-v321-fLsJo"
  title="Gene Simmons Says What Hollywood Won't Say to Oscar-Winning Elite"
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

Gene Simmons Says What Hollywood Won't Say to Oscar-Winning Elite — andrew gold | heretics.. Published 31 August 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 886,000 views when checked on 9 October 2026.

Independent-media lineage: Andrew Gold made and presented documentaries for the BBC and HBO before building Heretics as his own independent interview and writing platform. Andrew Gold biography · Heretics — About

Why it belongs here: The conversation performs outsider candor inside a prestige-and-celebrity field. It can be tested for directness, audience capture, status pressure, genuine disclosure, theatrical contrarianism and whether disagreement remains answerable to correction.

On this page, test the video specifically against Dutch Directness — Truth Before Comfort, Care Before Performance:

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.