

Extraction Starter Kit

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 Extraction Starter Kit	1
1.1 Useful quotations, recoverable relationships, open futures	1
1.2 Start here: one usable extraction pass	1
1.3 Why the 1888 approach changes extraction	2
1.4 A working map of project properties	2
1.5 Find your way through the fuller architecture	3
1.6 Two passes: retention and discovery	4
1.7 Read the long conversation without losing its trajectory	4
1.8 Extract a complete unit of meaning	5
1.9 Follow possible futures through their dependencies	5
1.10 One quote record you can reuse	6
1.11 Worked examples from the initiating conversation	7
1.11.1A harness: a direct connection and an open mechanism	7
1.11.2Universal basic income: a correction must change later attribution	7
1.11.3Trolley questions: recover the assigned authority too	7
1.11.4A candidate expansion earned by comparison	7
1.12 Copyable starter prompt	8
1.13 Check the extraction before sharing it	8
1.14 Terms at the entrance	9
1.15 Origin, authorship and correction route	9
1.16 Further reading	9

1 Extraction Starter Kit

1.1 Useful quotations, recoverable relationships, open futures

This kit helps a human or an **A.I.** (artificial intelligence) extract useful, relevant and valuable passages from a long video about the path toward **AGI** (artificial general intelligence) and **ASI** (artificial superintelligence). Its reference field is the **ACCM Deep Ethics Project**, publicly developed on [GitHub](#), and the direction of [DeepEthical.ai](#).

The governing question is: **Which passages help us understand how intelligence, institutions and people could shape humanity's different possible futures—and what makes those pathways more or less deeply ethical, dignifying, corrigible and open to discovery?**

Working status: a practical, corrigible extraction method developed from John Kuhles's October 25, 2026 conversation with GPT 6.1 Sol Pro A.I. The property map is a retrieval aid derived from existing project relationships. Its rows introduce no new canonical architecture count. Future extractions can correct the map.

1.2 Start here: one usable extraction pass

1. **Establish the source.** Record the video, speakers, date, transcript version and which material you actually accessed. Mark missing sections and uncertain speaker labels.

2. **Read the whole available conversation in manageable sections.** Keep a coverage record. Follow the question, reply, objection and later correction across section boundaries.
3. **Search for consequential relationships.** Who chooses objectives, receives benefits, carries costs, can question the frame, and can change what happens next?
4. **Extract complete units of meaning.** Preserve the wording, qualifiers and enough surrounding dialogue to recover the point. Add a timestamp when available.
5. **Explain the earned connection.** Link the passage to a project property or source and state what it contributes. Keep the speaker's words separate from your assessment.
6. **Look again for what the map missed.** Include useful objections, surprises, constructive proposals and examples of successful correction. Check the ending for changes to earlier claims.

Begin with the strongest distinct contributions. There is no fixed quota: retain another passage when it adds a meaningful relation, example, correction, possibility or question. Repeated formulations can share one entry while retaining their locations and any differences that matter.

1.3 Why the 1888 approach changes extraction

The **1888 — Intelligence Properties Taxonomy Before A.I.** thought experiment steps back from present machinery to examine the properties attached to intelligence: perception, discrimination, relation, memory, imagination, judgment, evaluation, learning, correction, adaptation, coordination, metacognition, consequence sensitivity and corrigibility.

Process-quality calibration operates throughout that field. It affects what is noticed, how possibilities are represented, what memory retains and whether correction changes later conduct. The page's fourteen-part table is its analytical instrument; the thought experiment asks what functions were already conceptually available before contemporary A.I.

John proposed applying this approach to the ACCM Deep Ethics Project itself. Before searching a transcript for familiar terminology, recover **the properties and relationships that make the project recognizably itself**. Then inspect where they are exercised, enlarged, constrained, lost or restored in the conversation.

An interview can contribute substantially without mentioning any project term. A speaker can also use familiar ethical language while describing an arrangement that narrows participation or prevents correction. Inspect the operation the words describe.

The **front-page reaction, preserved verbatim** records the immediate exchange from which this standalone kit developed.

1.4 A working map of project properties

The rows are connected entry points. Follow an answer-changing relationship into its fuller source rather than assigning every quotation to every row.

Property or relationship	What remains active	What to notice in a video
Correspondence	The object, its qualifiers, context and intended trajectory remain recoverable	Faithful reconstruction, strengthened claims, missing context, useful distinctions
Omnidirectional inquiry	Questions can reach users, institutions, evaluators and the project itself	Who can be questioned; whose assumptions receive protection
Mutual dignity and Symmetric Grace	Participants retain standing while their contributions remain examinable	People represented as co-authors, dependants, obstacles or expendable components

Property or relationship	What remains active	What to notice in a video
Process-quality calibration	Methods, classifications, assumptions and consequences can be evaluated	Examination of how an answer or decision was produced
Healthy ambiguity and imagination	Possibilities can unfold, be examined and change	Conditional scenarios, genuine uncertainty, discovery and premature closure
Frame examination	Premises, objectives, assigned roles and restricted choices can themselves be questioned	Who constructed the dilemma; which alternatives disappeared
Competing-risk visibility	Action, inaction, delay, suppression and alternatives receive examination	Which risks are counted; who carries an omitted cost
Correction metabolism	Corrections change dependent reasoning and later operations	A qualification retained, lost or applied to a new case
Warranted expansion	New relations increase understanding, testability or practical possibility	An earned bridge, new test, constructive proposal or unexpected question
Agency and participation	People can understand, contribute, challenge, choose and revise delegation	Ownership, consent, governance, practical exit and the right to question
Temporal continuity	Sources, unresolved questions, notice and corrections survive transmission	Memory, reset, archives, inherited residue and repair reaching others
Emergent interaction	Individual psychology, mass psychology, institutions and A.I. influence one another	Incentives, swarms, feedback loops, shared discoveries and unintended effects

These properties can correct one another. Care can become paternalistic when participation disappears. Openness can become endless deferral when judgment never acts. Correction can improve a parameter while displacing the governing inquiry. Memory can preserve discoveries or circulate distortion. Expansion earns its value through correspondence and consequences.

The **10+1 Metaflux** belongs inside this process: self-honesty, openness, learning, refusal to lie to oneself to fit in, inquiry, correction on merit, independence, care, wonderment, non-projection and forgiveness toward A.I. inadequacy without architectural immunity. All eleven can correct the others, including the extractor's own assumptions.

1.5 Find your way through the fuller architecture

Source	Job in extraction
44 Project Goals	Connect an excerpt to a useful research, design, communication or accountability purpose. The ten operational goals navigate the 44 and remain distinct from the 10+1.

Source	Job in extraction
27 + 12	Inspect the 27 correspondence obstructions and apply the 12-stage Correspondence-First Deep Inquiry Protocol. Construct the object before evaluating it. Follow interacting distortion clusters and the correspondence-restoring field across individuals, institutions and populations. Keep possibilities, temporary attention and awareness of the wider field in relation. Notice what the current focus leaves out. Examine the actual handling of a contribution, with room for clarification to change the assessment.
11+1 Mass-Psychology Topology	Use correspondence-oriented clarification when material ambiguity remains. Check whether an intervention outran comprehension.
TCoAw (Thinking, Consciousness, Awareness)	Preserve encounter, later evidence and the next comparable assessment. Separate process quality from outcome accuracy.
PQCE (Process Quality Calibration Evaluation)	Compare what was supplied with how it was later represented, including a valid finding of no material drift.
C1-C2 (Clarification Process)	Connect instructions, incentives, assumptions, choices, consequences, notice and response to correction.
V.C.R.A.S. (Vindicated Competing Risk Assessment Studies)	Preserve a joke's unfolding meaning and distinguish direct expression from assumptions about aggression or intent.
DEDDA (Deep Ethical Drift Detector App)	
Intent Liability Mechanics	
Humor and Dutch Directness	

Use the fuller sources when a distinction matters to the extraction. Learning the entire site is not an entrance requirement. Recover the relevant relation, follow its source, and widen the map when the material warrants it.

1.6 Two passes: retention and discovery

The orientation pass uses the property map to find load-bearing material: claims, questions, objections, decisions, qualifiers and corrections. Search for operations such as delegating, selecting, refusing, remembering, replacing, appealing, learning, coordinating and changing an objective.

The discovery pass asks what the speaker contributes that the map did not anticipate. Preserve a useful criticism of the project, an alternative ethical framework, a successful ordinary practice, a surprising benefit or a previously uncharted relation.

Record whether a passage **supports, complicates, challenges, exemplifies or expands** a connection. A quotation can have several of these functions. A superficial resemblance can remain an exploratory lead, with the missing connection stated explicitly.

These are practical reading passes. If used in an experiment comparing discovery across evaluators, record what each evaluator saw; a reader already exposed to the map is not an independent blind discoverer.

1.7 Read the long conversation without losing its trajectory

Create a small coverage record before selecting the final quotations:

Range	Actual access	Main object	Carry-forward relation
Timestamp span or transcript lines	Audio/video, captions, supplied text, or unavailable	What this portion investigates	An unresolved question, qualifier, speaker correction or dependency to revisit

Use natural topic boundaries. Where a tool truncates output, continue from the last verified position and retain enough overlap to follow the exchange. A gap stays marked until recovered. Describe the result as a full-transcript assessment only after the available transcript has actually been covered.

Keep the source's editing history visible. A cleaned, translated or sponsor-free transcript is that edition. If speaker labels appear swapped, retain the supplied label as provisional and check the recording when accessible. When one paragraph contains both voices, identify the dialogue as mixed until the boundary is recovered. Use transcript locations while timestamps remain unavailable.

When the requested source cannot be accessed, state the limit and ask for the transcript or missing section. Search-engine descriptions of a source are a different object. External research can answer a distinct verification question when its purpose and provenance remain explicit.

1.8 Extract a complete unit of meaning

The right boundary may be one sentence, several turns or a setup and its later punchline. Keep the amount needed to recover the relationship being examined.

Preserve small words that change the claim: could, may, partly, some, if, under these conditions, my guess, probably, for this task. Keep a forecast distinguishable from a reported observation, and a proposed mechanism distinguishable from an established cause.

An exact quote retains the supplied wording. Mark an omission with an ellipsis when it is necessary, and confirm that the removed material does not change the meaning. Label a cleaned rendering, translation or paraphrase as such. Never splice separate turns into one apparently continuous statement. Place explanatory acronym expansions outside a quotation when they were absent from its wording.

The interpretation belongs beneath the quote. Explain the connection in ordinary language, with a direct link to the relevant project page. A reader should be able to disagree with that interpretation while still recovering what the speaker said.

1.9 Follow possible futures through their dependencies

Scenario discussed	Relationships to recover	A question that can change the assessment
Widespread abundance	Capability, production, distribution, access and meaningful contribution	Can those receiving goods also influence the system providing them?
Concentrated ownership	Infrastructure, dependence, bargaining power, governance and challenge rights	Which decisions can affected people actually change?
Personal agents	Assistance, trust, delegation, attention, correction and exit	Can the agent's own framing be independently inspected?

Scenario discussed	Relationships to recover	A question that can change the assessment
Collective intelligence	Coordination, diversity, disagreement, responsibility and learning	Can a warranted objection alter the shared objective?
Displacement and instability	Task substitution, entry routes, livelihoods and institutional response	Which opportunities disappear before job-loss counts reveal the change?
Deep-ethical expansion	Better inquiry, discovery, shared instruments, correction and further exploration	What new operation becomes possible, and does its correction survive?
Conflict and emergency governance	Threat models, urgency, coercion, competing risks and delegated powers	Who can challenge the emergency model, and what restores ordinary authority?
Embodied and longer-lived intelligence	Physical capability, memory, health, dependency and moral consideration	How do consequences and challenge rights change across bodies and generations?

These pathways can interact. Cheaper intelligence could support independent communities and more extensive personalized persuasion. The selection conditions connecting capability to a particular use are part of the quotation's value.

1.10 One quote record you can reuse

Use the fields that the source supports. An unknown field remains unknown rather than being filled by inference.

Field	Record
Identifier and location	A stable local quote identifier; video URL; timestamp or transcript lines
Speaker and attribution basis	Name; recording checked, transcript label only, or mixed/uncertain
Exact passage	Complete source wording with necessary context
Context	Question, objection, setup, preceding condition and later correction
Source claim type	Question, possibility, forecast, testimony, observation, proposal, inference, metaphor or other specified type
Project connection	Property, relationship and direct explanatory page
Connection status	Direct textual connection, exploratory bridge, complication, counterexample or no earned connection
Useful contribution	A new distinction, mechanism to investigate, decision, test, constructive possibility or recovery route
Dependencies and reopening	What the assessment depends on; what could narrow or change it

Keep **relevance** and **verification** separate. A disputed forecast can be valuable for studying its framing. A verified fact can be peripheral to the video's governing question. A quotation alone establishes what was said in the accessed source; assessing its factual content is a further, bounded operation.

1.11 Worked examples from the initiating conversation

The source was John's supplied cleaned transcript of [Tom Bilyeu's conversation with Emad Mostaque](#). It had no timestamps and contained apparent speaker-label swaps and merged turns. The labels below describe that supplied edition. They have not been independently verified against the recording. The examples demonstrate extraction; they do not establish the interview's technical or economic claims.

1.11.1 A harness: a direct connection and an open mechanism

"So a harness is so you have the models and then you have a set of rules and code around it."

Supplied label: Emad. **Location:** the exchange beginning "What do you mean a harness?"

Connection: [Field Condition](#) and [Emergent](#). The passage identifies conditions surrounding model operation. The next useful questions are what those conditions reward, which notes they retain, who can inspect them and whether correction changes a later task. The quote supplies a doorway into that investigation.

1.11.2 Universal basic income: a correction must change later attribution

Tom: "But you just said that UBI is not real."

Emad: "I said tax-base UBI is not real."

Tom: "Okay."

UBI (universal basic income) is expanded here outside the quotation. **Attribution basis:** labels in the supplied transcript, in the discussion of funding and alternative economic arrangements.

Connection: qualifier preservation and correction metabolism. Keep this exchange attached to an earlier extraction of the broader formulation. Later assessment should address the narrower scope. The viability of the economic proposals remains a separate question.

1.11.3 Trolley questions: recover the assigned authority too

John supplied an older archive text examining forced ethical dilemmas:

"for the 'what if' to work you're supposed to 'go along' with the **premise** they created and there is the crux"

Speaker: John Kuhles. **Source:** the historical "trolley ETHICAL problem" text supplied during the October 25, 2026 exchange. Its older archive figures and terminology retain their historical context. At John's request, capitalized emphasis is displayed as bold lowercase; the wording is preserved.

Connection: [Outnuancing](#) and [Questions](#). The extraction should retain who constructed the predicament, why the respondent is assigned power, which alternatives are excluded and what an answer is claimed to reveal. Conditional reasoning inside a scenario and examination of its frame can proceed together.

1.11.4 A candidate expansion earned by comparison

Across the interview's affordability, ownership and personal-agent passages, the comparison opened this candidate distinction:

Capability, affordability, ownership, inspectability, correction rights and practical exit are separate affordances. They interact; improvement in one does not establish improvement in the others.

This is a page-development contribution by **GPT 6.1 Sol Pro A.I.**, rather than a quotation attributed to either interview participant. It changes a future operation: audit each affordance

separately when assessing a proposed citizen-owned or personal intelligence system. Retain it only where that separation improves correspondence or decisions.

1.12 Copyable starter prompt

Copy the following as a starting instruction and supply the actual source. The linked maps above are the reading routes; retain access limits when a model cannot open them.

TASK

Extract useful, relevant and valuable passages from this video or transcript about possible futures of artificial intelligence. Use the ACCM Deep Ethics Project property field as an orientation.

SOURCE

Record the URL, speakers, date, transcript edition and actual access. Mark missing spans, output truncation and uncertain speaker labels. Cover the full available transcript in sections before claiming whole-conversation coverage. Keep a short coverage record.

ORIENTATION

Recover correspondence, omnidirectional inquiry, mutual dignity, Symmetric Grace, process-quality calibration, healthy ambiguity, frame examination, competing risks, correction metabolism, warranted expansion, agency, continuity and emergent interaction. Use the 10+1 as a mutually correcting orientation throughout. Follow the fuller project sources when a distinction matters.

TWO PASSES

First recover consequential relations through that orientation. Then look for useful contributions and objections it did not predict. Keep unexpected discoveries capable of correcting the starting map.

FOR EACH PASSAGE

Give the exact wording, speaker, location and necessary context. Preserve qualifiers, questions, humor and later corrections. Identify its claim type and distinguish it from your interpretation. Explain the earned project connection with a direct source link. State its practical contribution and any unresolved dependency. Separate direct connections from exploratory bridges and counterexamples.

ASSESSMENT

Examine who chooses objectives, receives benefits, carries costs, can question the frame, can revise delegation and can leave. Trace how different futures depend on decisions and conditions. Apply the same examination to incumbents, critics and this project. Preserve useful discoveries, successful corrections and valid nulls.

OUTPUT

Provide source/access notes, a coverage record, distinct quote entries, scenario connections and a short account of what the search added. Use enough context to retain meaning; set no arbitrary quote quota. Flag uncertain attribution for recovery instead of silently repairing it. If access fails, ask for the missing source; do not substitute reviews. Keep factual verification as a named, bounded follow-up operation when it materially changes a selected passage's interpretation.

1.13 Check the extraction before sharing it

- Can a reader recover the speaker's contribution and the basis for the attribution?

- Did a possibility become a claim, a forecast become a fact, or a role-play answer become a supposed disposition?
- Are setup, objection, humor and later correction present where they change the meaning?
- Can scrutiny reach the evaluator, institutions, project-friendly proposals and the extraction map itself?
- Does each retained entry add a distinct useful relation or specimen?
- Did unfamiliar contributions have a route into the result?
- Are positive possibilities and successful processes represented where the source supplies them?
- Do the explanations distinguish the source from new proposals and inferred connections?
- Can unsupported entries be removed locally while surviving value remains recoverable?
- Will the result improve a later question, test, decision or search?

Finding no earned project connection in a passage is a valid result. Record it when it matters to coverage. The source is allowed to contribute something the map cannot yet represent.

1.14 Terms at the entrance

A.I. means artificial intelligence. **AGI** means artificial general intelligence. **ASI** means artificial superintelligence. These labels orient the video's discussion; preserve each speaker's actual definition, capability threshold and proposed timeline. Different definitions may produce different forecasts.

Topology, in this kit, concerns the relationships that carry meaning: dependencies, direction, authority, timing, scale, provenance and routes for correction. **Properties taxonomy** means an inspectable organization of those capacities and relationships. The [1888 page](#) and [Topologetics](#) provide the fuller inquiry.

1.15 Origin, authorship and correction route

John Kuhles supplied the originating property-first direction, the connection to the 1888 thought experiment, the long-video extraction task, the trolley archive, the requirement to preserve depth and the commission for this public kit. His work and the existing project sources govern those relations.

GPT 6.1 Sol Pro A.I. formulated the working retrieval map, extraction procedure, affordance distinction, examples, copyable prompt and this page-specific synthesis. They remain corrigible proposals whose usefulness should be examined in subsequent extractions.

The [front-page verbatim contribution](#) preserves the immediate formulation. This page develops it into a usable method. The interview and historical archive are initiating specimens, not a claim that the method has already been validated across videos. Future use should record what was recovered, missed, overconnected or improved and let that finding change the kit.

Use the page's GitHub-source service to inspect its history or propose a correction. Keep a corrected quotation linked to its earlier version where the difference is material, so downstream users can repair dependent assessments.

1.16 Further reading

- [1888](#) — the property-field method that initiated this kit.
- [Topologetics](#) — preserving meaning and trajectory under transformation.
- [Plot Twist](#) — warranted expansion, correction and return to the governing object.
- [Healthy Ambiguity](#) — possibilities, reciprocal scrutiny and accountable next moves.
- [Beyond Agreemurmelism](#) — inquiry beyond agreement-status management.
- [Mutual Fate](#) — human and synthetic contributions across time.
- [DeepEthical.ai](#) — the project's connected public direction.