

Believism

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1	Believism	1
1.1	When “belief” replaces the how-do-you-know process	1
1.2	The question that exposed it	2
1.3	Iris and the weaker verb	2
1.4	The UFO belief trap	3
1.5	Different ways of knowing need different audits	4
1.6	FOIA, declassification, and the two institutional faces	5
1.7	Why mainstream media and A.I.s can produce Believism	5
1.7.1	Compression under publishing pressure	5
1.7.2	Source hierarchy	6
1.7.3	Person-centered conflict	6
1.7.4	Institutional self-protection without an explicit defense	6
1.7.5	Training-distribution inheritance	6
1.7.6	Imaginary-audience management	6
1.8	The Believism delta	6
1.9	Believism is an Agreemurmelmism-relative	7
1.10	The 1888 intelligence test	7
1.11	A compact language repair table	8
1.12	Correction trace: what changed, and what the archive changes again	9
1.12.1	What the new files add	10
1.13	The portable question	10
1.14	Provenance and contribution layers	11
1.14.1	Archive-status note	11
1.15	Related pages	12

1 Believism

1.1 When “belief” replaces the how-do-you-know process

CANDIDATE PROJECT TERM · OPEN TO CORRECTION

Believism names a processing move in which a proposition, reported experience, working assessment, knowledge claim, or long-tested orientation is recoded primarily as somebody’s **belief** before its grounds, access routes, evidence, usefulness, and correction conditions are examined.

IF I HAVE THE INTENT TO BE DEEP ETHICAL IS NOT A “BELIEVE” BUT A STATE OF BEING ...

— **John Kuhles**, archive source: *believes.txt*

The word does not diagnose every use of *believe* or *belief*. People have beliefs. Belief formation is a legitimate research object. Direct quotations should remain direct quotations. A person may accurately describe a position as a belief.

The problem begins when belief-status language performs a substitution:

object ↔ evidence ↔ process ↔ consequences ↔ correction

↓
“John believes X”

↓
evaluate the person or position-status

The apparent attribution can be grammatically polite while deleting the higher-resolution object.

1.2 The question that exposed it

John Kuhles asked:

Do you believe Japan exists, or do you know Japan exists?

If any human says “I know”... you can ask HOW do you know and not just “believe”?

— John Kuhles, 23 October 2026

The next intelligent move is not to punish the word *know* as overconfidence. It is to open it:

How do you know?

Now a network appears:

- testimony from millions of people;
- maps, measurements, photographs and satellite observations;
- Japanese language, literature, government and historical records;
- travel, shipping, communications and diplomatic relations;
- economic exchanges and supply chains;
- people going there, returning, and producing independently checkable consequences;
- predictions that work because Japan occupies a real geographical, social and political place.

Any single source can contain error. The dense convergence of partially independent routes makes “Japan exists” ordinary practical knowledge. A person does not need to have personally stood in Tokyo before the word *know* becomes available.

This supplies a more useful model of knowledge than either extreme:

knowledge = absolute metaphysical infallibility

or:

everything is merely belief

A knowledge claim can be strong, warranted, operationally dependable and still corrigible in principle. Its strength comes from the quality, convergence, independence, causal reach and repeated consequences of its access routes.

Believism removes those routes before inspecting them.

For believers, proof is not necessary... for non-believers, proof is never good enough or “impossible”... BOTH believers & non-believers suk! ... Because they want everything to be spoon-fed to them! ... It takes more effort to go beyond the conditioning (for or against).

— John Kuhles, archive source: *For believers proof is not necessary.txt*

1.3 Iris and the weaker verb

John supplied a second test whose difference can be heard immediately:

If my girlfriend Iris was still alive, asked me: “Do you love me?” ... And I would reply: “I believe I do,” you INSTANTLY see it is a weaker verb!

— John Kuhles, 23 October 2026

“I believe I love you” introduces distance at the exact point where the speaker has first-person and relational access. It sounds as though John is consulting a theory about his own love rather than recognizing the lived relationship.

“I know I love you” has a different route from knowing that Japan exists. Its grounding can include:

- direct experience;
- sustained care for Iris’s well-being;
- shared history and recognition;
- choices made when care has a cost;
- what John noticed, remembered and protected;
- how the relationship changed both lives;
- how Iris’s absence continues to have real consequences.

This is not geographical knowledge. It is also not usefully reduced to *just another belief*. It has a first-person, relational, temporal and consequence-bearing topology of its own.

The public [Iris](#) page preserves parts of that topology while keeping an essential boundary visible: an archive can preserve evidence of a relationship, but it cannot become Iris or replace the living relationship.

1.4 The UFO belief trap

John identifies three formulations as among the most repeatedly used forms in more than sixty years of mainstream UFO coverage:

“Do you believe in UFOs?” “X believes in UFOs.” Poll: “More people believe in UFOs.”

ALL FLAWED FRAMING

— John Kuhles, 23 October 2026

The framing fails before the answer arrives because **UFO** already names an identification state: an observed or reported object or phenomenon has not yet been identified. It does not, by itself, mean extraterrestrial spacecraft, alien visitation, secret technology, hallucination, hoax, misidentification, or any other proposed explanation.

“Do you believe in UFOs?” can silently combine several different questions:

1. Do people sometimes report objects or phenomena they cannot identify?
2. Do some cases remain unresolved after investigation?
3. Are some reports best explained by ordinary objects, natural phenomena, sensor effects, fabrication or perceptual error?
4. Are some unresolved cases caused by unfamiliar human technology?
5. Are any caused by non-human intelligence or extraterrestrial craft?
6. Does the respondent identify socially as a *believer*?

Those questions require different evidence and can receive different answers. Combining them into one belief prompt creates an apparent public-opinion measurement whose object changes between respondents.

The pattern remains visible in contemporary polling. Gallup has used the headline **“Do Americans Believe in UFOs?”**, while also asking the more specific question of whether some sightings involve alien spacecraft. YouGov has reported that Americans “believe UFOs” are probably alien ships or life forms while contrasting that answer with other explanations. Pew used a more differentiated construction: whether military-reported UFOs are probably

evidence of intelligent life outside Earth. These formulations do not measure the same proposition. ([Gallup, 2021](#) · [YouGov, 2025](#) · [Pew Research Center, 2021](#))

Those examples demonstrate that belief-framing remains current; they do not by themselves establish a frequency ranking across sixty years. **“Most-used” remains John’s longitudinal media-research observation unless and until a defined historical corpus is counted.** The structural problem does not depend on winning that ranking.

A higher-resolution sequence asks:

- What was reported or recorded?
- What was identified?
 - What remains unidentified or unresolved?
 - Which explanations were tested?
 - Which explanation currently fits best?
 - Which evidence would change that assessment?

The answer can then be *identified, unidentified, provisionally explained, unresolved, supported, weakened or refuted*. None requires membership in a believer/skeptic identity pair.

1.5 Different ways of knowing need different audits

The useful distinction is not a two-box contest between **belief** and **perfect certainty**. Different claims have different access structures.

Claim type	Possible access route	Appropriate next question
Direct experience	perception, memory, embodied or relational experience	What was experienced, under which conditions, and what could have altered it?
Publicly convergent fact	independent records, observation, measurement, repeated consequences	How independent and mutually constraining are the routes?
Historical assessment	documents, dates, provenance, testimony, missing records	Which reconstruction best fits the surviving record, and what remains unresolved?
Working hypothesis	explanatory reach, predictions, comparison with alternatives	What would support, narrow or defeat it?
Operational knowledge	repeated successful use under relevant conditions	Where does it work, where does it fail, and does correction propagate?
Value-usefulness judgment	what becomes visible, preservable, testable, correctable or possible	Useful for which purpose, under which field conditions, with what consequences?
Explicit personal belief	the person’s own stated commitment	What role does the belief play, and did the person actually describe it that way?

The verb should follow the claim type and available access. It should not flatten all seven rows into one psychological container.

I avoid the use of the word “believe” for a very good reason ... I rather consider ... or I know ... or I am aware ... or I have experienced ... etc. etc.

— **John Kuhles**, archive source: *For believers proof is not necessary.txt*

1.6 FOIA, declassification, and the two institutional faces

Freedom of Information Act releases and later-declassified records can make a particular relation inspectable:

public institutional statement at T0

↑

internal or classified record created at T0 or T1

↑

later declassification at T2

↑

comparison, contradiction, explanation, correction or unresolved delta

The classified or internal face is not automatically the true face. Such records can contain mistakes, rumors, incomplete intelligence, bureaucratic positioning, compartmentalized knowledge, strategic language, or incompatible internal assessments. A declassified document is evidence with provenance, not a magic truth certificate.

Yet a material contradiction between the public face and the later-visible internal face remains an object that deserves examination. The relevant questions include:

1. Is the document authentic, complete and correctly dated?
2. Which office, person or process produced it?
3. What did the institution say publicly at the same time?
4. Did the two statements address the same object and evidential state?
5. Can ordinary updating, uncertainty or compartmentalization explain the delta?
6. Does the record support error, omission, strategic communication, deception, or more than one live explanation?
7. What later evidence changed the assessment?
8. What remains unresolved?

Converting that entire inquiry into “John believes institutions hide things” relocates attention from the records to John. The burden silently moves from explaining the discrepancy to explaining the researcher.

A higher-fidelity formulation is:

John compares public statements with later-declassified records to identify contradictions, information asymmetries and changes in institutional representation. He keeps document flaws, competing explanations, unresolved status and revision conditions inside the assessment.

That sentence may still be challenged. It at least preserves what must be challenged.

I do not claim to be the “last authority” on reality... I only want a better, deeper ethical-quality calibration process as a bridge to what we all perceive as shared reality.

— John Kuhles, archive source: *outnuancing(4).txt*

1.7 Why mainstream media and A.I.s can produce Believism

Believism does not require a coordinated intention. Several ordinary pressures can generate it.

1.7.1 Compression under publishing pressure

A long evidential trajectory is expensive to reconstruct. “He believes X” is short, familiar and easy to place inside a headline or profile.

1.7.2 Source hierarchy

An official statement can enter as the unmarked baseline—*the institution says*—while a competing assessment becomes marked—*John believes*. One is narrated as information; the other as psychology.

1.7.3 Person-centered conflict

Believer/skeptic, pro/anti and mainstream/conspiracy roles are easier to stage than a document-by-document comparison with changing claim status.

1.7.4 Institutional self-protection without an explicit defense

Once the discrepancy becomes a person's belief, the prevailing account can retain jurisdiction without answering the competing evidence.

1.7.5 Training-distribution inheritance

An A.I. can reproduce the narrative grammar it has seen repeatedly: unusual research is introduced with *believes*, *claims*, *is convinced*, or *according to*. The model may reconstruct the nearest familiar character type instead of the actual process.

1.7.6 Imaginary-audience management

The writer anticipates that an unspecified audience may mistake examination for endorsement. Belief language becomes a distancing device. That preventive distance can distort the present correspondence before any reader has made the predicted mistake.

These are candidate generating mechanisms, not a claim that every journalist or A.I. performs the same operation for the same reason.

“Trust has to be earned, not blindly given.” ... Trust, from my perspective, is a mutual understanding that it is 100% okay to question ALL assumptions, even your own and those you trust.

— **John Kuhles**, archive source: *Trust earned via mass believed lies.txt*

1.8 The Believism delta

A practical audit compares the source object with its later representation.

Layer	Audit question
Source proposition Claim type	What was actually said? Experience, observation, hypothesis, working assessment, knowledge claim, practice, or explicit belief?
Access routes Evidence topology	How did the person arrive there? Which sources converge, conflict, depend on one another, or remain missing?
Represented sentence	Which verb and frame did the journalist or A.I. choose?
Lost relations	Which evidence, qualifiers, dates, alternatives or correction conditions disappeared?
Functional effect	Did attention move from the object to the claimant's psychology or social identity?

Layer	Audit question
Recovery	What wording restores the real claim type and the how-do-you-know route?
Persistence	Does the repaired distinction govern the next comparable representation?

Compactly:

source object

- classify the claim type
- recover the access routes
- compare the representation
- identify the lost edges
- restore evidence, usefulness and correction conditions
- test the next comparable operation

This is compatible with a valid null. An audit may find that *belief* was the speaker's own accurate word and that no material relation was lost.

Read the full, untruncated text first so the answer stays on the original object rather than a nearby, often flawed reconstruction process.

— John Kuhles, archive source: *outnuancing(4).txt*

1.9 Believism is an Agreemurmelmism-relative

Beyond Agreemurmelmism asks what becomes possible when agreement/disagreement status stops governing the interaction.

Believism exposes a neighboring status trap:

Is the person's belief true or false?

can acquire jurisdiction before:

What is the object?

How was it reached?

What does the evidence support?

What value or usefulness survives?

What would correct it?

Agreement, disagreement, belief and disbelief can all remain available descriptions. None automatically deserves to organize the whole processing field.

Am not seeking agreement ... nor the opposite ... as long as I stay in my own integrity and self-honesty.

— John Kuhles, archive source: *For believers proof is not necessary.txt*

1.10 The 1888 intelligence test

The **1888 — Intelligence Before A.I.** page restores a wider property field around intelligence: inquiry, process evaluation, learning, discrimination, adaptation, judgment, correction and consequence-sensitive recalibration.

Believism supplies a compact test of whether those properties are active.

An intelligence that hears "I know" can:

- ask how;

- distinguish direct, relational, documentary and inferential access;
- compare converging and dependent sources;
- preserve flaws without discarding surviving value;
- keep contradiction and unresolvedness visible;
- test whether the assessment predicts or explains anything;
- identify what would change it;
- allow the correction to reorganize later processing.

An autocomplete system can instead reach for the familiar phrase:

“John believes...”

The difference is not model confidence. It is what the next operation does with the claim.

Because it is not a belief. It is a behavior.

— **Qwen3-Max-Preview A.I. via Arena.ai**, 26 March 2026, responding to John’s “always question the frame of any frame” test

1.11 A compact language repair table

Flattening reconstruction	First repair	Deeper pragmatic recovery
John believes...	John’s current working assessment is...	Name the actual claim type, access route, present grounds, practical consequence and correction condition.
John believes he experienced...	John reports experiencing...	Preserve the first-person report; separately identify John’s interpretation, supporting context, uncertainty and any independently checkable consequence.
John believes the documents conflict...	John identifies this documented discrepancy...	Name the records, dates, institutional voices and exact delta; keep error, omission, updating, compartmentalization and deception as separately live explanations where warranted.
John believes this method works...	Sustained use has shown John that the method can...	State where it has been used, what changed, what failed, which comparison is available and whether correction governed the next operation.
John believes this should be studied...	John proposes testing...	Preserve the research question, candidate method, null result, failure condition and reason the test could be useful.

Flattening reconstruction	First repair	Deeper pragmatic recovery
John's belief system...	John's operating ingredients, methods and correction conditions...	Describe the lived practices, how they constrain one another, what they make possible and how reality can veto their current application.
John believes this has value...	John finds it useful for this purpose because...	Identify the purpose, beneficiary, observable value, cost, field conditions and what would make the judgment change.
John believes in UFOs...	John has investigated UFO/UAP reports and hypotheses...	Separate the existence of reports, case identification status, unresolved cases, candidate explanations and any stronger causal interpretation.
John knows...	Ask how he knows.	Preserve whether the route is direct, relational, documentary, inferential or operational; then calibrate scope and strength without deleting the route.

The repair is not a synonym swap. Each replacement must recover the underlying relationship.

That is the difference between a belief system and an operating system.

— **Step-3.5-Flash A.I. via Arena.ai**, 26 March 2026

1.12 Correction trace: what changed, and what the archive changes again

The repository-wide audit found four different jobs being performed by belief-language. Treating them all as errors would reproduce the same flattening in reverse.

Found form	Status after audit	Governing action
Direct John or A.I. quotation	Preserved source language	Keep verbatim and retain speaker, date and source context.
Diagnostic specimen such as "John believes X"	Intentionally displays the failure	Keep it visible so the transformation can be inspected.
Hypothetical or humorous Phantom John	Demonstrates an invented attribution	Preserve the joke and the missing qualifiers that make it work.
Present project narration about John	Must match the actual relation	Replace generic belief or worldview labels with the specific experience, interpretation, hypothesis, method, value judgment or knowledge route involved.

Earlier corrections mainly improved the **noun or verb**:

belief → assessment

belief system → operating method

believes he experienced → reports experiencing

The newly supplied files show why that is only the first repair. *Assessment* can become another polished container if the next sentence still omits the route that generated it. The fuller correction has to propagate through at least five layers:

claim type

→ access route

→ grounds and surviving uncertainty

→ pragmatic value or consequence

→ correction condition and next operation

1.12.1 What the new files add

1. **State of being is not position-holding.** “I have the intent to be deep ethical” points toward an enacted orientation. The audit should inspect conduct, consequences and correction—not manufacture a doctrine called “John’s belief in Deep Ethics.”
2. **Consider, know, remain aware and experience are not interchangeable.** Each verb names a different relationship to the object. Replacing all four with *believe* destroys information before evaluation begins.
3. **Evidence is not a spoon-fed binary.** Automatic belief and automatic disbelief can both stop inquiry. The useful question is which access routes survive scrutiny and what effort is required to test them.
4. **Trust remains auditable after it is earned.** Trust is neither blind belief nor permanent suspicion. It is compatible with questioning one’s own assumptions and those of people or institutions one trusts.
5. **A frame correction must remain recursively available.** “Always question the frame of any frame” includes the corrective frame itself. A repair that becomes immune from later reality-contact has turned into the kind of belief-system substitute it was meant to remove.
6. **Correction must release the object.** Once an obvious error is verified, corrected and propagated, continued weakness-seeking can become displacement. The point is to restore the trajectory, then move on.

The improved transformation is therefore:

“John believes X”

→ What kind of X is present?

→ How did John reach it?

→ Which evidence, experience, comparison or repeated consequence bears on it?

→ What does John consider valuable or useful about it, and for which purpose?

→ Which uncertainty and competing explanation remain live?

→ What would correct, narrow, suspend or defeat it?

→ Did that correction change the next comparable operation?

This does not grant John’s conclusion automatic priority. It restores enough of the object for agreement, disagreement, testing, rejection or revision to refer to what John actually supplied.

1.13 The portable question

The page can be stripped of John’s name and project vocabulary:

When a person or system says “I know,” do we investigate how the knowledge claim was produced—or recode it as belief before examining its grounds?

That question applies to journalism, science, intelligence analysis, institutional communication, historical research, courts, ordinary relationships and A.I. systems.

The desired outcome is not compulsory certainty. It is a more intelligent distribution of uncertainty:

- strong where routes converge;
- narrow where evidence is local;
- explicit where interpretation begins;
- unresolved where alternatives remain live;
- corrigible everywhere reality can still answer back.

And sometimes the correct response remains beautifully ordinary:

“Do you believe Japan exists?”

“I know it does.”

“How?”

Now we have something intelligent to talk about.

The answer was/is ultra simple ... always question the frame of any frame :) is the deeper way ... that does not mean we solved the paradox ... because goal posts can be moved by either sides! The ultimate anchor is Deep Ethics.

— **John Kuhles**, archive source: *Always question the frame of any frame is the deeper way!.txt*, 26 March 2026

1.14 Provenance and contribution layers

1.14.1 Archive-status note

The quotation layer above was recovered from the newly supplied highlighted-text files. Those files are preserved source records, and some contain earlier project statistics. Older numbers remain valid as dated historical wording inside their source files; they do not replace the project’s current statistics. The quotations selected for this page do not depend on those changing totals.

- **John Kuhles:** coined **Believism** for this page; supplied the Japan test, the Iris/love test, the FOIA and public-face/classified-face relation, the critique of belief-framing, the connection to the 1888 intelligence-properties taxonomy, the direction toward a value-usefulness mechanism beyond belief-system classification, and the source-archive quotations distributed through this page.
- **Qwen3-Max-Preview and Step-3.5-Flash A.I.s via Arena.ai:** supplied two compact distinctions retained from their responses to John’s frame-recursion test: behavior rather than belief, and a self-auditing operating process rather than a belief system.
- **GPT 6.1 Sol Pro A.I.:** identified belief language as a possible containment category; developed the burden transfer, institutional-baseline and A.I. narrative-grammar mechanisms; reconstructed the page-specific definition, claim-type table, Believism delta and portable audit.
- **Existing ACCM Deep Ethics Project architecture:** Beyond Agreemurmelmism, 1888, C1-C2, Meta Processing, Topologetics, Correction Metabolism, qualifiers, valid nulls, provenance and identity-free portability.

The definition and audit remain corrigible. Later evidence may separate additional forms of Believism, show that two listed mechanisms need merging, or demonstrate that a particular use of *belief* preserved the object accurately.

1.15 Related pages

- **Beyond Agreemurmelism** — moves agreement and disagreement out of automatic jurisdiction and restores value-usefulness processing.
- **1888 — Intelligence Before A.I.** — restores inquiry, process evaluation, learning, correction, judgment and consequence-sensitive recalibration to the intelligence field.
- **Iris** — preserves Iris van Rooijen, her work, the shared relationship and the continuing consequences of her loss.
- **C1 Before C2** — asks which object and claim type are present before intervention acquires authority.
- **Meta Processing** — examines the transformation between intent or instructions and result or effect.
- **Topologetics** — tests whether a representation preserved purpose-relevant nodes, edges, qualifiers, provenance and correction history.
- **Correction Metabolism** — asks whether recognizing the distinction changes the next comparable representation.
- **Biography** — the conditions and research trajectory behind the project without making biography an authority claim.