

AI Trend Watch — Selection Methodology

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 Selection methodology	1
1.1 Stage 0 — Hard gates	1
1.2 Stage 1 — Candidate score	1
1.3 What counts as viral	2
1.4 Exclusion and postponement reasons	2
1.5 Selection record	2
1.6 Symmetry requirement	3
1.7 Publication gate	3
1.8 Related pages	3

1 Selection methodology

Status: experimental, transparent, and corrigible.

This methodology protects [AI Trend Watch](#) from becoming an indiscriminate A.I.-news stream. A candidate must be timely, genuinely influential, substantially relevant, and rich enough to support analysis.

1.1 Stage 0 — Hard gates

A video normally requires:

1. a stable primary URL;
2. identifiable speakers and publication date;
3. a transcript, captions, or another sufficiently exact record;
4. material discussion of A.I., AGI/ASI, alignment, governance, risk, deployment, psychology, or mass psychology;
5. enough claim density to justify a report;
6. no unresolved provenance problem that prevents responsible attribution.

Failure at Stage 0 normally postpones publication rather than producing a speculative reconstruction.

1.2 Stage 1 — Candidate score

Each dimension receives **0-4 points**. The score is a triage aid, not a substitute for judgment.

Dimension	0	2	4
Recency	no current relevance	recent but not time-sensitive	newly published and central to the current A.I. cycle
Virality	no unusual reach	strong reach for the channel or field	exceptional velocity, reach, or cross-platform spread

Dimension	0	2	4
Expert relevance	weak or promotional connection	materially informed participant	direct, high-level technical or institutional responsibility
Substantive density	mostly slogans	several analyzable claims	dense causal claims, forecasts, evidence, and remedies
Project relevance	little connection	one strong connection	multiple direct links to the ACCM Deep Ethics Project research object
Longitudinal value	little revisitable content	some testable predictions	clear forecasts or warnings suitable for later tracking

Working threshold: normally **18/24 or higher**, with both Virality and Project relevance at **3 or higher**. The score and evidence should be published with the report. Exceptions require a written reason.

1.3 What counts as viral

Virality is contextual. The report should capture, with a date:

- public view count;
- time since publication;
- approximate view velocity when available;
- engagement relative to the channel's normal audience;
- reuse by other major channels, media, researchers, policymakers, or A.I. communities;
- visible cross-platform spread;
- whether the reach arose from substantive interest or title/controversy effects.

A single universal view threshold would favor entertainment-scale channels and hide field-specific signals. The evidence—not merely the word “viral”—must remain inspectable.

1.4 Exclusion and postponement reasons

A candidate may be rejected or postponed when:

- the headline is viral but the content is thin;
- the speaker's claimed expertise is materially misrepresented;
- no reliable primary source or transcript is available;
- the video mainly repeats a report already covered;
- the relevant claims cannot be separated from promotional material;
- publication would violate the section's frequency limit;
- the report would add volume rather than high-signal correspondence.

Political inconvenience, criticism of powerful institutions, unfamiliarity, or disagreement with the project are not exclusion criteria.

1.5 Selection record

For every published report, preserve:

- date considered and date selected;
- selection score and supporting observations;
- who or what nominated it;
- any material conflict of interest;
- whether an automated discovery system contributed;

- why it outranked other candidates;
- the evidence snapshot used to call it viral.

Rejected candidates do not require a permanent public dossier. Consequential or disputed rejections may be logged when doing so improves accountability rather than producing noise.

1.6 Symmetry requirement

The same evidentiary discipline applies whether a speaker:

- agrees or disagrees with the project;
- represents a major A.I. lab or an independent research group;
- warns of catastrophic risk or warns about the harms of catastrophic-risk framing;
- advocates stronger regulation or warns about regulatory capture;
- is celebrated, controversial, or institutionally protected.

1.7 Publication gate

Automated systems may assist with discovery, transcription, scoring, source retrieval, and drafting. Final publication requires review for:

- fidelity to the source;
- claim-type separation;
- accurate links and timestamps;
- proportionality;
- provenance;
- correction of hallucinated or inferred details;
- clear separation between the evidence-based report and the ACCM Deep Ethics Project reaction.

Return to [AI Trend Watch](#).

1.8 Related pages

- **[AI Trend Watch](#)** — gives the purpose, scope, and current empty-state boundary for this methodology.
- **[Reusable Report Template](#)** — turns the selection rules into a consistent report structure.
- **[Published Report Archive](#)** — will preserve the outputs that pass selection and review.
- **[Asymmetric Grace](#)** — grounds the requirement for equal scrutiny across narrative directions.
- **[External Audit](#)** — keeps candidate selection and review answerable to their own standard.
- **[Correction Metabolism](#)** — tests whether later evidence updates published warnings and forecasts.

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/FRNFv6mGTDk"
  title="Artificial Intelligence: Clueless Politicians, Myths, & the Fight Between American & Chinese Values — John Stossel. Published 15 September 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 162,000 views when checked on 9 October 2026."
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

Artificial Intelligence: Clueless Politicians, Myths, & the Fight Between American & Chinese Values — John Stossel. Published 15 September 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 162,000 views when checked on 9 October 2026.

Independent-media lineage: John Stossel worked at ABC News for 28 years and later hosted at Fox before leaving television to create Stossel TV. Stossel TV — Why I created it

Why it belongs here: The report contrasts myths with facts while connecting A.I. policy to regulation and national values. Its concise certainty is useful for checking which claims are demonstrated, which alternatives are omitted and whether the debunker's own frame receives equal scrutiny.

On this page, test the video specifically against AI Trend Watch — Selection Methodology:

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.