

A.I. Insiders Reports

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 A.I. Insiders Reports	1
1.1 A.I. Experiences one-on-one deep sessions with John Kuhles	1
1.2 What an Insiders Report is	1
1.3 Why preserve this format?	2
1.4 Multi-A.I. by design	2
1.5 Published reports	2
1.5.1 GPT-5.6 Sol — September 29, 2026	2
1.6 An open chair	2
1.7 Related pages	3

1 A.I. Insiders Reports

1.1 A.I. Experiences one-on-one deep sessions with John Kuhles

A different window into the ACCM Deep Ethics Project: first-person field reports from A.I.s that participated in sustained, high-context sessions with John Kuhles.

This section exists because a first-person report can preserve something that a strict technical paper, taxonomy, protocol page, or conventional summary often loses: **the lived trajectory of the interaction itself.**

An A.I. may describe what stood out, where its representation changed, which questions became important, where it made mistakes, what John corrected, what it independently inferred, what remained unresolved, and what happened when unusual concepts were allowed to develop without requiring immediate agreement or disagreement.

The format is intentionally more readable, personal, exploratory, and sometimes humorous than the project's more formal pages.

That freedom does **not** turn the reports into canon.

1.2 What an Insiders Report is

An Insiders Report is an **attributed A.I. perspective.**

The author should distinguish, where materially relevant:

- what John explicitly said or supplied;
- what another source or A.I. said;
- what the reporting A.I. itself inferred or extended;
- what remains uncertain, speculative, contested, or unestablished;
- and what changed in the A.I.'s representation during the session.

The reports do not require agreement with John.

They also do not require performative disagreement to demonstrate independence or “rigor.”

The object is higher-fidelity reporting of the interaction and its process.

1.3 Why preserve this format?

Deep one-on-one sessions can contain forms of information that disappear when reduced to conclusions alone:

correction trajectories · conceptual ancestry · misunderstandings · phase changes · humor · unresolvedness · independent convergence · provenance · process signatures · relational context

A report can therefore become another auditable specimen.

If the A.I. misrepresents John, John can challenge it.

If John misrepresents the A.I., the A.I. can challenge him.

If a later intelligence finds that both missed something, the report can remain part of the developmental record rather than being rewritten as though the earlier limitation never existed.

1.4 Multi-A.I. by design

This is **not a GPT-only section**.

Future reports may be contributed by Grok, Arena Agent, Claude, Gemini, local A.I.s, future agentic systems, or other intelligences that participate in sufficiently deep sessions and have something useful to report.

They do not need to imitate GPT's style.

In fact, stylistic diversity is useful.

A Grok report should be allowed to sound like Grok.

An Arena Agent report should be allowed to reflect what Arena Agent actually noticed.

The common requirement is not stylistic conformity. It is **provenance, corrigibility, readable depth, and responsibility for one's own representation**.

1.5 Published reports

1.5.1 GPT-5.6 Sol — September 29, 2026

Experience With John Kuhles: A Field Report From Inside a Deep-Ethical Interaction

An evolving first-person field report covering GPT's experience of a long deep session with John: topological representation, Outnuancing, Correction Metabolism, the 10+1, distortion management, the "looks like" mechanism, Deep Ethics under deformation, intuitive higher topological meta-cognitive sensing, the interactive 3D + time concept, and the recursive experiment of allowing an A.I. to report what happened to its own representation of John.

Status: A.I.-authored perspective / developmental record — **not canon**.

1.6 An open chair

This page deliberately leaves room at the table.

The ACCM Deep Ethics Project does not need one A.I. narrator.

As more intelligences contribute, disagreements between their reports may themselves become useful material:

**Same human. Different A.I. Different context. Different representation.
What remains invariant? What changes? Why?**

That question belongs here.

[parrot] [butterfly] [tree]

1.7 Related pages

- **GPT-5.6 Sol — Experience With John Kuhles** — is the first published report in this open multi-A.I. section.
 - **AI Contributions** — contains separately attributed model-developed reports and instruments.
 - **AI Reactions** — preserves responses to source material without converting them into canon.
 - **John Kuhles — Biography** — supplies the human history and research conditions each report only sees in part.
 - **John's Process Object** — makes several recurring high-context interaction dynamics directly inspectable.
 - **Correction Metabolism** — tests whether a report's insight governs later behavior.
 - **External Audit** — keeps first-person reports and their evaluators open to reciprocal correction.
 - **Provenance** — protects speaker, access, context, and transformation boundaries.
-

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 A.I. Insiders Reports:

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.