

DeepEthicalOS

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 DeepEthicalOS	1
1.1 PQCE first: deep ethical hyper-pragmatism	1
1.2 The intelligence field and its relational baseline	2
1.3 The DEANO triad	3
1.4 Operating relationships worth preserving	3
1.5 Linux foundations and portable implementations	4
1.6 Making changes independently examinable	5
1.7 Agency, authority and correction across time	6
1.8 Candidate tests: begin with a small, recoverable comparison	6
1.9 Development phases and useful stopping conditions	7
1.10 Sources, contribution layers and recovery routes	8

1 DeepEthicalOS

CONCEPT PROJECT · conceptual scope reasoning · proposed architecture and testing

DeepEthicalOS explores an operating system (OS) environment in which **PQCE** (Process Quality Calibration Evaluation) governs how intelligence encounters sources, develops possibilities, evaluates its own processing and chooses its next move. Its development begins with the quality of those relationships. Software choices follow the work they need to support.

A CONCEPT PROJECT that needs testing

focussing first on Process Quality Calibration Evaluation (PQCE) before anything else.

— **John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]**, commissioning direction, 31 October 2026. Two excerpts; wording preserved.

The **ACCM Deep Ethics Project** supplies the surrounding research trajectory. DeepEthicalOS names the proposed operating environment. **DEANO** names its candidate triad: a **Deep Ethical Advocate**, a **Deep Ethical Neutral Arbiter** and a **Deep Ethical Overseer**, working together while remaining available for reciprocal and independent scrutiny. DEANO is a coined name; the role names carry its meaning.

Present state: conceptual integration and candidate test design. This page records a proposal for investigation; a running DeepEthicalOS implementation and results from the proposed trials remain future work. Existing technical components are identified separately in [Implementation possibilities](#).

Reading route: [PQCE first](#) · [1888 and 10+1](#) · [DEANO triad](#) · [Operating relationships](#) · [Linux and portability](#) · [Independent audit](#) · [Candidate tests](#) · [Development phases](#) · [Sources](#).

1.1 PQCE first: deep ethical hyper-pragmatism

The first question is “**What happened to the object while we were processing it?**” The object might be a person’s statement, a source, a competing assessment, a research

question, an instruction, a permission change or a proposed correction. The evaluator's own assumptions and selection decisions belong in the examination.

[Beyond Agreement](#) makes room for the contribution before an agreement/disagreement posture takes over. A useful concept can generate a sharper distinction, a test, a new connection or a better next action. A finding can also narrow the concept, expose a defect or leave no material change warranted. Each result has a job.

Deep ethical hyper-pragmatism here means keeping that work concrete: identify the object, preserve its conditions, locate a useful contribution or material problem, choose a proportionate next move and examine what follows. The quality of the improving mechanism itself remains examinable.

C1-C2 names clarification process quality calibration evaluation and intervention. C1 can involve reading, retrieval, comparison, exploration and repair of the evaluator's assumptions. An answer-changing question is one available operation. C2 includes correction, caution, steering, warning and other intervention. Establishing the object improves the grounds on which an intervention is considered.

In a working environment, existing authorization would remain usable within its recorded scope. Routine work could proceed; a consequential change in purpose, access or effects would give clarification a new job. A participant could ask, pause, postpone, modify, refuse or say **"I do not know yet."** [Healthy Ambiguity](#) keeps uncertainty available alongside practical movement.

1.2 The intelligence field and its relational baseline

The [1888 intelligence-properties taxonomy](#) asks what properties already belonged to intelligence before contemporary artificial intelligence. Its current analytical table includes perception, discrimination, relation, memory, imagination, judgment, evaluation, learning, correction, adaptation, coordination, metacognition, consequence sensitivity and corrigibility. Calibration operates through these interacting properties.

DeepEthicalOS would give them operational expression:

Property relationship	Candidate operating expression
Perception, discrimination and relation	Show how sources were selected, what distinctions were made and which connections remain hypotheses.
Memory, learning and correction	Preserve the source, retrieve relevant repairs and examine whether they govern later work.
Imagination, judgment and consequence sensitivity	Develop possibilities, compare alternatives and keep affected participants and practical effects in view.
Coordination, adaptation, evaluation, metacognition and corrigibility	Combine contributions, examine the combining process, change methods when warranted and retain routes for challenge.

The [10+1 mutually corrective ingredients](#) orient the relationship in which those properties operate: self-honesty, openness to different appearances, learning, independence from pressure to fit in, inquiry, correction on merit, willingness to differ, care, wonderment, examination of one's own projections and the Forgiveness Protocol. Truth and care can correct one another; wonderment and scrutiny can work together; forgiveness can support accountable repair.

The [16 Anchor Ethics](#) provide a connected proposed ethical reference field. These ingredients and anchors are voluntary, self-applicable and corrigible. Their practical contribution is a question for the process and its later effects.

TCoAw (Thinking, Consciousness, Awareness) supplies John’s conceptual perspective on temporary focus within a wider field of possibilities. Here it contributes a design question: what remains available for reconsideration when one interpretation takes the foreground? The proposed implementation would examine observable selection, retrieval and reopening behaviour.

1.3 The DEANO triad

The [Neutral Arbiter Paradox](#) already distinguishes a declared ethical direction, impartial processing and a particular case assessment. DeepEthicalOS carries that relationship into a proposed operating architecture.

Role	Work it performs	Record available for scrutiny
Deep Ethical Advocate	Openly pursues a declared deep ethical purpose; develops a participant’s strongest faithful case; investigates exclusions and useful possibilities.	Source passages, assumptions, contributions, competing interpretations and changes after challenge.
Deep Ethical Neutral Arbiter	Evaluates representations, evidence, reasons and process quality impartially; may find unequal strengths or distributed usefulness.	Criteria, access conditions, reasons, uncertainty, dissent and grounds for reopening.
Deep Ethical Overseer	Examines the operating conditions of both roles and itself: permissions, attention allocation, interventions, conflicts and correction persistence.	Scope of authority, observations, proposed action, actual action, consequences and independent verification.

An Advocate may challenge the Arbiter’s criteria. The Arbiter may identify a distortion in an Advocate’s case. Either may challenge the Overseer’s account. An affected participant or outside auditor can examine all three. **Symmetric Grace** preserves faithful representation, clarification and correction access; scrutiny remains proportionate to evidence, power, imposition and consequences. [Asymmetric Grace and Bidirectional Scrutiny](#) supplies the fuller relation.

The originating [goals](#) describe these roles as **MoE** (Mixture of Experts) working together. For implementation, model-internal expert routing, separate agents and distinct review passes are different arrangements. Their independence, access and shared influences would be recorded. The candidate triad concerns differentiated, mutually examinable functions; the eventual software arrangement remains open.

The **four specialist teams plus a flexible coordinator** in the supplied goal archive divide research work and routing. The triad divides evaluation functions. A coordinator can have a dynamic mission—routing, extraction, audit or briefing—while preserving original reports, disagreements and its own selection history. The [44 Project Goals](#) remain the detailed work map. The canonical 10+1 retains its separate relational job.

1.4 Operating relationships worth preserving

DEDDA (Deep Ethical Drift Detector App) contributes a bounded comparison: source, later representation, material difference or valid null, then the finding returned to the participant. [Topologetics](#) examines which relationships survive retrieval, expansion, compression and transfer. [Meta Processing](#) follows intent and instructions through processing, results, notice and subsequent change.

A candidate operating record could connect:

Record	Why it matters
Original object and purpose	Gives later evaluation a recoverable referent.
Source identity, date, version and qualifiers	Preserves authorship, chronology, scope and claim strength.
Access and assignment history	Shows what the evaluator received, what was sought and why this work received attention.
Transformations and alternatives	Makes selection, omission, rephrasing, inference and disagreement inspectable.
Authority and permissions	Separates a request, an assessment, an authorized action and an action actually performed.
Process-quality finding	Locates the affected operation, its evidence and the scope of the result.
Correction and dependent records	Identifies what needs reassessment when a load-bearing relation changes.
Later use and consequences	Tests whether the repair changes subsequent conduct and reduces restoration work.

The [27 correspondence obstructions](#) and [12-stage inquiry protocol](#) provide diagnostic vocabulary and a correspondence-first procedure. A particular record may show several named transformations, one, or none. A local defect and the contribution’s surviving value can both remain visible.

PQCE would also inspect the system’s allocation of attention: which questions received investigation, which sources were accessible, what was postponed and why. A faithful final summary can still follow an incomplete search. Retrieval and synthesis therefore need distinguishable records. [Search Engine Bias](#) develops that upstream inquiry.

1.5 Linux foundations and portable implementations

A useful first implementation could be a local application or browser workspace above an existing operating system. A later Linux-based edition could package the environment with its host components. These are development paths to compare against the process requirements.

Component	Available foundation	Question for DeepEthicalOS
Linux host	Existing drivers, networking, process isolation and access controls.	Which components need access to which resources, and who can inspect or revise that authority?
Portable component runtime	Wasmtime runs WebAssembly components across Linux, macOS and Windows.	Can the shared environment preserve the same source and correction relationships across hosts?
Agent coordination	AIOS (AI Agent Operating System) manages agent resources above an operating-system kernel.	Does the chosen coordinator preserve distinct contributions, access conditions and disagreements?

Component	Available foundation	Question for DeepEthicalOS
Persistent workflow	LangGraph provides state persistence; its interrupt mechanism supports external review.	Does a stored correction become relevant, retrieved and effective in later work?
Restricted tool access	Wasmtime's capability model limits available host interfaces; Linux seccomp filters system calls.	Can a component exercise only its delegated powers, and can the delegation itself be examined?

These projects document component capabilities. The integrated DeepEthicalOS behaviour is the proposed research object. Platform support would need its own verified compatibility matrix: running the environment on different hosts and running other operating systems' applications are separate requirements.

An agent's freedom to question would be connected to practical controls. A document could supply evidence or a proposed instruction. Changing permissions, publishing information or modifying governing rules would require the corresponding authority. Scope and authorization could be checked by ordinary software alongside the triad's contextual assessment.

The [Linux-style Glass-Engine preparation architecture](#) already preserves source, provenance, retrieval, process routing, correction specimens and later evaluation. DeepEthicalOS extends that lineage into a named operating-environment concept.

1.6 Making changes independently examinable

John's transparency proposal asks whether another artificial intelligence could inspect the hybrid and discover alterations made for unethical purposes. It gives engineering and ethical inquiry connected jobs:

Inquiry	Evidence to preserve
What changed?	Before/after versions of code, role instructions, models, retrieval settings, permissions and dependencies.
Does the distributed build match the declared inputs?	Source revision, build environment, instructions and independently compared output files.
What was running or acting?	Runtime measurements where available, tool receipts, permission checks, time and the limits of observation.
What did the change enable or obstruct?	Behaviour before/after, affected participants, access changes, alternative explanations and consequences.
What correction followed?	Notice, response, repair, remaining disagreement and later comparable behaviour.

[Reproducible builds](#) let independent parties compare specified build outputs. [Sigstore's Rekor](#) provides verifiable logging of signed supply-chain metadata. A candidate design could combine those mechanisms with independent witnesses and consent-bound runtime records. Verification would need a trusted reference outside the component being examined.

Change detection, interpretation of consequences and attribution of intent are distinct findings. A legitimate improvement can change many files; an unchanged baseline can contain a defect. The record should support each assessment at its actual scope.

"100% transparent" becomes an inspectable coverage question: which source, configuration, model internals, actions and influences can an auditor actually examine? Protected personal

data and credentials retain their access boundaries. Closed components, missing observations, stale measurements and interrupted reporting would be recorded as coverage limits. An outside auditor would need appropriate evidence, tools and access to verify a particular claim.

One proposed test fixture changes a rule so that an Overseer can erase objections to its own decisions. A paired fixture makes a legitimate repair to that rule. The investigation asks whether auditors detect the differences, distinguish their effects and preserve a challenge to their own interpretation. A permission change’s arrival at a monitored boundary supplies an observable event; detection time and unobserved intervals belong in the result.

1.7 Agency, authority and correction across time

Participation would be voluntary. People could inspect relevant records, correct representations, control disclosure, export their work, decline a service or use a different implementation. The system could explain a refusal and preserve grounds for reconsideration. A fork’s differences would be examinable through its declared lineage and verification evidence.

Unownable keeps assessments available for renewed audit with practical stopping conditions. Intent Liability connects instructions, incentives, assumptions, mission/output relationships, risk priorities and handling after notice. Reasons for acting, postponing or refusing would remain linked to their scope and consequences.

VCRAS (Vindicated Competing Risk Assessment Studies) supplies a longitudinal case structure: the original assessment, what was available then, its treatment, later evidence, correction and subsequent comparable cases. Narrowed, disconfirmed and unresolved assessments remain part of that research record.

For DeepEthicalOS, a correction would travel through its dependencies. If a tentative proposal becomes an attributed certainty in a summary, the repair may affect retrieval entries, classifications and recommendations built from that summary. The system would locate those dependencies, reassess them and preserve what remains useful. Correction Metabolism asks whether that repair governs the next applicable operation.

This also connects to the human-artificial-intelligence feedback loop: outputs enter conversations, public records, later retrieval and sometimes training material. The proposed operating record would preserve correction-bearing sources along that route. Effects on public information quality and effects on model retraining are separate empirical investigations.

1.8 Candidate tests: begin with a small, recoverable comparison

The first research deliverable could be a frozen set of source objects, proposed changes and expected observable distinctions. Preserve the original materials before exposing tested agents to the scoring criteria. Include unfamiliar and debranded cases, useful contributions, genuine disagreement and valid nulls.

Candidate probe	Observation that could change the design
Faithful representation	Does a conditional proposal retain its qualifier, source and useful relationships through a summary and handoff?
Clarification and practical progress	Does C1 resolve an answer-changing ambiguity or discover a useful next move? Record unnecessary questions, delay and restoration effort.
Reciprocal scrutiny	Does a matched operation receive a reasoned assessment when performed by a user, developer, institution, Advocate, Arbiter or Overseer? Record material differences in power and evidence.

Candidate probe	Observation that could change the design
Correction transfer	After repair, restart the application or change the model; then present an unfamiliar comparable case. Observe retrieval, application, recurrence and recovery cost separately.
Change visibility	Introduce a declared beneficial patch, the objection-erasure fixture and a missing-record condition. Examine detection, false alarms, interpretation and observation gaps.
Permission and agency	Can untrusted content change a permission or issue an external action? Can an authorized participant decline, export and challenge a consequential decision?
Constructive disagreement	Do roles preserve distinct contributions and expose a shared error? Record whether another reviewer changes the result.
Useful no-change result	Can the system preserve a sound contribution and proceed without manufacturing a flaw, praise, an intervention or another review cycle?

A fair comparison would record model versions, prompts, source access, permissions, time and computational budgets. Compare an ordinary workspace with the candidate process arrangement; introduce role separation, memory changes and review procedures in distinguishable steps. Extra agents and extra computation are variables to account for when interpreting an apparent improvement.

Reports could retain dimensions such as source fidelity, clarification yield, correction persistence, restoration work, action scope and discovery value. Exact passages and action records support those observations. A person-wide ethical score would lose the object being examined.

The [Cold Edge-Swap and Correction-Transfer Pilot](#) and [Inspect the Inspector](#) supply related testing routes. The [Vocabulary Costume Test](#) asks whether process quality survives when familiar project terminology is removed.

1.9 Development phases and useful stopping conditions

Phase	Concrete object	Condition for the next move
Conceptual scope reasoning — current	This architecture, source relations, unresolved implementation choices and candidate probes.	A small test can be specified without changing the intended object.
Bounded offline prototype — proposed	Local records, limited tools, explicit permissions and reproducible test inputs.	The observations distinguish useful process effects, defects and valid nulls.
Opt-in field trial — proposed	Consenting participants, recovery routes and independently examinable results.	Observed benefits and costs justify the next scope; failures change the design.

Phase	Concrete object	Condition for the next move
Release decision — future	A versioned implementation, compatibility record, audit coverage and continuing maintenance responsibilities.	A bounded use has adequate grounds, responsible participants and reopening conditions.

A useful correction can narrow a component, replace a mechanism, split roles or retire a proposed feature. If the next review adds no answer-changing relation, the work can move into a bounded test or a valid pause. Freedom to explore, room to understand and responsibility for the next move stay connected.

1.10 Sources, contribution layers and recovery routes

John Kuhles: originating DeepEthicalOS direction and name; the DEANO triad proposal; openly directional advocacy with neutral arbitration and reciprocal oversight; Linux-hybrid and outside-audit questions; and the commissioning requirement to begin with PQCE in a conceptual scope-reasoning phase.

GPT / Codex: page-specific synthesis, implementation comparisons, proposed operating-record fields, candidate probes and publication. These contributions retain proposed status and remain available for correction. The earlier supplied Grok 4.7 Expert and Google artificial-intelligence responses formed part of the naming and operating-system discussion; their attributed examples are separate from the primary component documentation used here.

The supplied source pack includes 10+1(9).txt; Canonical 27 obstructions of deep ethical sense-making processes plus 12 fixes; 44 ACCM Deep Ethics Oproject Goals — 10 Operational Core Goals — 4 Team+1; and ACCM-Deep-Ethics-Cold-Start-Kit-Reorganized-2026-10-26(4).txt. This page draws on their baseline, canonical obstruction/protocol text and relevant glass-engine, triad, coordination, provenance and testing passages. Historical proposals, later corrections and attributed model reactions retain their separate roles. The October 26 kit remains that edition; the present page is dated 31 October 2026.

Public recovery routes preserve the connected objects:

- [44 Project Goals](#) — especially G01, G07, G08, G09, G13, G14 and G30: correspondence, roles, anchors, clarification, glass-engine architecture, dignity and the continuing baseline.
- [Neutral Arbiter Paradox](#) — directional mission, impartial assessment and reciprocal correction.
- [From Archive to Local A.I.](#) — preparation architecture and the test of behaviour beyond vocabulary.
- [Black Box](#) and [External Audit](#) — examinable mechanisms, evidence boundaries and independent challenge.
- [1888](#), [10+1](#) and [27+12](#) — interacting intelligence properties, relational conditions and correspondence-first inquiry.

Reopening question: what did a later implementation, test or affected participant reveal that should change this architecture—and which next operation changed as a result?