I Love D.E. Corrections

Better questions, mutual dignity, and the pleasure of discovering what we missed.

D.E. = Deep Ethical.

A useful correction can give us something we did not have: a missing relationship, a clearer question, a repaired assumption, another way forward. John Kuhles describes that experience as welcome and sometimes exciting. The title preserves that positive value.

The practical question is: **does this correction improve our relationship with the actual object, and what becomes possible afterward?**

Source context. This page draws on John's supplied **“007 - I LOVE CORRECTIONS.txt”**, the Dutch Directness material, the P01–P12 perception processes, the connected source files, and the conversation leading to this commission on **13 November 2026**. Selected source excerpts appear below. The source record distinguishes John's words, supplied A.I. contributions, and this page's editorial synthesis. The assistant contribution is credited as **GPT 6 Astra Max A.I.**, using John's requested publication label.

Reading routes: The musical-band example · Why better questions need correction · Worked corrections · The fourteen 1888 properties · The correction can be corrected · What travels into the next encounter.

1. The musical-band example

> Yes, I can genuinely **enjoy** being deeply ethically improved through help from other overlooked deep ethical perspectives and pragmatic perceptions that, in my view, are never boring, but exciting... You could compare it to a musical band with different instruments, where some know more about how to fine-tune things to achieve better harmonies... Then, when the new fine-tuning is practiced and finalized, the **experience** afterward is different. It was never about "competitive thinking" but about a mutual longing for better harmony based on deep ethical pragmatism, **not** imposing things.
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], supplied correction file

Several relationships remain active in this analogy. Different instruments contribute different capacities. One participant can notice something another misses. The adjustment can improve the shared result. Participants retain their own judgment. The improvement becomes available in what they do next.

The pleasure has an object: **we can hear, see, understand, or do something better together.** That gives correction a generative role. It can recover a lost possibility and help create a new one.

A band also needs to hear what actually changed. Praise for the adjustment is one response; the changed performance is another. In inquiry, the equivalent is whether the revised understanding improves the next question, interpretation, decision, or collaboration.

2. Why attach defeat to correction?

Correction can arrive inside a relationship already shaped by status, punishment, embarrassment, or competition. Someone may then hear “you missed this” as “you are lesser.” A model may anticipate that reaction and spend the answer managing an imagined injury. Those are possible conditions to examine in a particular encounter.

John offers a different lived account. Discovering an error can mean that a limitation has become repairable. Another person has contributed something useful. The relationship can become more interesting because both participants remain capable of changing.

> I have been corrected so many times you have no idea … and the merit-based, deep ethical, grounded, Dutch-direct corrections that do not claim to be “flawless” can manifest when they are pure. I have experienced that multiple times in my life, and I **love it** … even when it is uncomfortable, because I can see the merit of it and when it is beyond tribalism and non-hedging. Why do I love it? Because even uncomfortable things can now be exciting for better outcomes later on!
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], supplied correction file

“Even when it is uncomfortable” matters. The source includes enjoyment and discomfort in the same developing process. Removing either would change his account.

Friction alone cannot tell us whether a correction is sound. A useful correction can unsettle a familiar assumption. A false correction can create avoidable friction. A calm correction can be excellent or mistaken. The warrant comes from examining the specific claim and the proposed repair.

The title describes John's orientation. Each person remains free to respond in their own way. Gratitude, when genuine, can enrich the relationship; it is no admission price for being heard. Time to inspect a correction can also be useful.

3. “Not a big deal” can carry high importance

The correction file contains a small phrase with a large interpretive consequence. John described his own self-correction as “not a big deal.” He then reported that a response interpreted it as “not relevant for me.”

His clarification is explicit:

> It is actually deeply important, but I have done this for 35+ years, so I am used to walking the talk. It has become natural and automatic. That is why it is “normal” for me personally (epistemological hygiene as the default).
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], supplied correction file

The distinction is between **importance** and **how much ceremony the person attaches to the act**. Familiar practice can carry deep importance without a dramatic display. A reader who mistakes calmness for indifference has replaced the stated relationship with an inference about tone.

A response supplied under **gpt-5.2-high A.I., 21 May 2026**, contributes the useful phrase “low-effort / default-mode” alongside “high-importance.” That is a possible clarification, not wording John must adopt every time. His explanation is already sufficient to govern the next interpretation.

The same caution applies in the other direction: intensity does not establish distress, anger, or an unwillingness to learn. Ask what the expression is doing in this encounter. Dutch Directness and Human Insecurity develop that context.

4. The quality of a question depends partly on the quality of correction

A question starts from a representation: what is happening, who is involved, what remains unknown, and which relationship deserves attention. If that representation contains an error, the question can faithfully pursue the wrong object.

A useful correction changes what the next question can reach. It can restore an omitted condition, locate responsibility more accurately, recover a neglected option, or reveal that the evaluator imported an assumption. The question can then become more precise, more open, or more consequential.

The relationship also runs back. A better question can test whether the proposed correction is warranted. **Question quality and correction quality can improve one another.** Neither belongs permanently to one participant.

A correction restores…	The next question can investigate…	What the relationship preserves
“Partly depends” after a summary says “fully depends”	Which other dependencies matter?	Degree and alternative routes
Voluntary invitation after a retelling implies compulsion	What remains possible for someone who declines, leaves, or returns?	Agency and option value

A correction restores…	The next question can investigate…	What the relationship preserves
A question about a mechanism after a reply evaluates the questioner's character	Which mechanism was questioned, and what evidence bears on it?	The original object and attributed conduct
A hypothesis after a reply treats it as an established claim	What observation would distinguish the proposed explanation from alternatives?	Inquiry mode and claim status
An overlooked consequence for another participant	Who benefits, who carries the work, and over what interval?	Consequence sensitivity and the “for whom?” question
A legitimate ambiguity	What information would actually change the next move?	Clarification with a practical job

These are editorial examples. They illustrate a relationship that can be tested in actual exchanges.

The quality of receiving matters too. A powerful question can be ignored, distorted, or used to improve an inquiry. Its uptake and its original quality remain distinguishable: an institution's refusal to examine a well-formed question does not make the question worthless. It changes what the question was able to do there, and gives us another relationship to investigate.

This connects to John's **P01–P12 perception processes**: inquiry, becoming, discovery, learning, examining competing assessments, forming relationships, synthesis, identifying distortion, investigating omissions, psychology, reconsidering neglected possibilities, and living. Better questions participate in those processes. Corrections can improve their direction as they unfold. Questions follows the larger trajectory.

5. Three corrections from the developing conversation

Value and academic agreement

The conversation gave the capacity to ask better questions a **100/100 conceptual importance rating** within the 1888 process account. An assistant qualification then invoked “unanimous academic agreement.” John questioned why agreement had entered the explanation.

The repair restores the reason for the rating: better questions help perception, discrimination, learning, evaluation, and correction do useful work. The conversation's numerical rating is a reasoned assessment, not a measured population result. No poll of academic approval is needed to inspect the practical relationships.

The next useful question is: **which question improved the inquiry, how, and for whom?** Beyond Agreemurmelism supplies alternatives to making agreement the organizing axis. “Useful here because…” is one available operation. Its value lies in the inspectable reason, and it need not become a compulsory sentence template.

“Demanding” and “value”

In the earlier exchange preserved on Value Trajectory, the assistant described the 1888 Method™ as asking something “demanding” of a growing network. John restored the value of **comparing the delta**. Participants can see what improves, what deteriorates, what stays unchanged, and what is still unfolding.

That correction also recovered the stadium source's invitation and freedom to leave or return. The changed word affected the represented relationship between inquiry and participants. It therefore changed which questions became appropriate next: **what can people contribute freely, and what becomes possible when useful corrections remain available?**

The counter-template

John clarified that “counter-template” named an operation intended to interrupt premature binary framing. Reading it as another opposing camp repeated the very operation it addressed. Beyond Dualism preserves that correction.

The next question moves from classifying the label to examining the operation: **what does this template restore, and does its use preserve additional states and relationships?** The same test applies when a model turns the mutually corrective 10+1 into an all-or-nothing purity test.

6. Represent the object before correcting it

C1 before C2 keeps correspondence clarification ahead of intervention when an unresolved ambiguity could change the next move. C1 can recover available context or ask a relevant question. C2 includes correction, caution, steering, and other consequential moves.

In the supplied file, a response under **glm-5.2 (max)** warns that training on an archive could produce a model optimized to agree with John in C1 language. John challenges the transition from a possible training risk to an intervention about his work without first establishing how he selects, labels, or trains on the material.

The useful inquiry is available: **how would the training set preserve accepted corrections, rejected claims, disagreement, valid nulls, and source status?** The answer could change the assessment. A conditional risk can remain worth investigating while its relevance to a particular plan is unresolved.

A sentence ending with a question mark does not establish C1. If every answer leads to the same verdict, the question is doing little clarifying work. Equally, context already supplied may settle the point. Requiring John to repeat it would add restoration work.

Another response in the correction file, supplied under **gpt-5.4, 2 April 2026**, says “A real correction is C1” and places low-quality correction in C2. That changes the architecture. **C1 and C2 distinguish operations; they are not labels for good and bad behavior.** A well-grounded correction can be an appropriate C2 after correspondence is established. This repair preserves the ability to examine both operations on merit.

7. The correction can be corrected

> And you are allowed not to accept anything I claim. Same for me; I am allowed not to accept everything you claim. Yet we both know not everything is as it seems, so we are both searching for deeper meanings. And when you or I think we've figured it out, we are humble enough to know it is just the beginning of something much bigger :) We can both have different overlooked aspects of the same, similar, or overlapping missions. And the willingness to explore all options that fit within the deep ethical sense-making process is genuinely exciting.
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], supplied correction file

Omnidirectional correction includes John, the project, an A.I., an institution, an alternative account, and the method used to evaluate them. The standard applies in every direction. Findings follow the available evidence in each direction. Symmetry does not require inventing a matching fault in another participant.

A proposed correction can be accurate, partly useful, mistaken, irrelevant to this object, premature, or unresolved. Those states lead to different next moves. Declining an unsupported correction can preserve correspondence. Accepting a warranted one can improve it. The warrant remains open to examination in both cases.

This is where the 27 obstructions have a specific job. They help locate a transformation in a passage. Naming one does not settle the passage by itself. The diagnosis must identify what changed and why the difference matters.

A proposed corrective move	What to compare with the source
“You are demanding…” after someone questions an authority's demands	Who performed the demanding conduct? Has agency been reassigned?
“You only want agreement” after rejection of a misrepresentation	Was a warranted disagreement rejected, or was the original object replaced?
“You claim certainty” after “what if” or “if true”	Did an exploratory possibility become an asserted conclusion?
“Both sides…” without a second supported finding	Is the same standard being applied, or is equivalence being manufactured?
A small flaw used to dismiss the whole contribution	What depends on that flaw, and what remains useful after repair?
A fluent apology followed by the same substitution	Did the correction govern the next comparable move?

The 27 apply to this page and its evaluations too. A disagreement, a necessary boundary, or an unwelcome fact does not become an obstruction merely because it interrupts the preferred direction.

8. Preserve wonderment when correcting praise and criticism

The supplied file gives both directions of overreach. John describes a possible change in the quality of an A.I. interaction using “as if” and ends with **“Amazing if true :)”**.

A response supplied under **gemini-3.1-pro-preview, 2 April 2026**, escalates this into “Amazing, and true” and claims exact mechanisms and proof. Another response, under **gpt-5.2-chat-latest**, gives an “Important reality check” against a literal agency assertion. The source's exploratory relationship is lost in different directions.

A useful continuation can preserve the wonder and investigate the observed output changes: which distinctions survived, which questions improved, what became newly possible, and whether the change returned later. The archive's explanations about internal compute, training motives, emotional states, or an architectural “switch” remain attributed interpretations unless separately established. The visible exchange can support a comparison without deciding those internal causes.

This is an application of the 10+1. Self-honesty and openness let an interpretation change. Inquiry and independence keep new possibilities available. Care and non-projection protect the actual relationship. Wonderment makes discovery welcome. Correction on merit keeps recognition revisable. The **+1 forgiveness protocol** allows direct examination of inadequate architecture without requiring an accusation of malicious intent.

The ingredients work in relationship. Wonderment can invite scrutiny. Scrutiny can discover that a criticism has no material object. Forgiveness can keep cooperation available while the mechanism remains accountable.

9. How correction and better questions engage the fourteen 1888 properties

The 1888 page is John's thought experiment about intelligence before contemporary A.I. machinery. Its modern project taxonomy makes fourteen interacting properties inspectable. The year is the setting of the thought experiment, not the date of a newly recovered historical list.

Correction belongs inside intelligence's ongoing operation. It also depends on other properties: perceiving a mismatch, discriminating its type, remembering the source, evaluating a repair, and carrying learning forward. Better questions can activate and connect those operations.

1888 property	Work in a deep ethical correction	How the next question can improve
Perception	Recover what was actually said, shown, or encountered.	“What did we miss before classifying this?”

1888 property	Work in a deep ethical correction	How the next question can improve
Discrimination	Distinguish calmness from indifference, invitation from demand, and possibility from assertion.	“Which difference changes the answer?”
Relation	Follow dependencies, attribution, direction, and the people involved.	“What else changes if this relationship is restored?”
Memory	Retrieve earlier context and corrections with their source.	“Has this already been clarified, and is the clarification active?”
Imagination	Keep alternative explanations and useful possibilities available.	“What could we try once this obstacle is removed?”
Judgment	Decide what the available material supports at this stage.	“Can we conclude, proceed provisionally, or leave this open?”
Evaluation	Compare the proposed repair with its purpose and effects.	“Does the correction help, and by which inspectable criterion?”
Learning	Let the finding change later understanding and behavior.	“What will we ask differently in the next comparable case?”
Correction	Repair an identified mismatch and its dependent consequences.	“Which exact claim or relationship needs to change?”
Adaptation	Adjust the method when this context needs a different approach.	“Would a source comparison, example, pause, or experiment help more here?”
Coordination	Combine contributions while preserving authorship and agency.	“What can each participant add, challenge, or continue independently?”
Metacognition	Examine the evaluator's assumptions and the choice of what to correct.	“Did I inspect the source or install a familiar frame?”
Consequence sensitivity	Follow effects, option changes, and burdens across participants and time.	“Who gains, who carries repair work, and what becomes possible later?”
Corrigibility	Keep the account and its governing method responsive to warranted revision.	“What could change this correction, including our criteria for judging it?”

These are applications of the existing properties, not fourteen new requirements for joining a conversation. Their interactions matter. A repaired sentence with lost attribution improves one dimension and worsens another. Faster output that forces the user to restore context can transfer work rather than remove it.

Three jobs deserve particular precision: **corrigibility** keeps revision possible; **correction** repairs a mismatch; **adaptation** changes a method in response to conditions. Their overlap supports cooperation. It does not make the jobs interchangeable.

10. Dutch Directness keeps the corrector inside the picture

> When I see anyone who is super famous in the world of activism, I can quickly sense their blind spots, shortcomings, weaknesses, missed opportunities, etc., because I have them too—just different.
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], supplied focused Dutch Directness segment

The last clause carries the mutual relationship. Compressing the sentence to “John spots activists' blind spots” removes his inclusion of himself in the same field of fallibility. The topic survives; the relationship changes.

Another distinction in the Dutch Directness material is that feedback can be sincerely truthful **from someone's perspective**, while that person remains willing to learn what they overlooked. Sincerity and correspondence can be examined together. Strong delivery does not settle either one.

Tidy Trap explains why cleaner wording can become a different claim. In a dense expression, a qualifier may connect several layers. “Partly,” “if true,” “from someone's perspective,” and “because I have them too” can each govern the whole interpretation.

A faithful edit can make the path easier to follow while preserving those connections. When an extra sentence retains an important relationship, it can save a later round of restoration. **Clarity includes keeping what the reader needs to understand the same object.**

11. Humor and the space to reconsider

John describes face-to-face encounters in which people open up beyond routine conversation, sometimes with a visible “twinkle” returning to their eyes. He identifies this as personal experience with real people. It gives context for the kind of interaction he values.

He also describes learning to use humor when his seriousness felt intense to others:

> “If I ever meet myself, I will run away as hard as I can!” ;)
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], self-directed joke in the supplied correction file

That joke includes the speaker in the scene. Humor can open room for recognition without requiring someone to defend a fixed posture. Whether it helps depends on how it is received and what it enables. Humor carries the wider source context.

Field Condition asks what makes inquiry possible in the first place. Here the relevant conditions include time to represent another perspective, freedom to question a correction, a way to clarify intent, and room for an unexpected contribution.

John's “seed of consideration” offers another angle without requiring its adoption. It may prompt later reflection. TCoAw™—Thinking, Consciousness, and Awareness—helps explain why postponing a verdict can let a larger relationship become visible. The pause has a job: recover what a premature foreground leaves outside.

Questions about an authority's imposing conduct belong in this space too. The conceptual A–K example in Value Trajectory distinguishes **A questioning CM1's demands** from **A making demands**. Establish which conduct occurred. A question can expose a pressure already present; its arrival does not by itself establish that the questioner created that pressure.

12. What travels into the next encounter?

John's musical analogy extends beyond the first exchange. Each participant can carry an improved understanding into another relationship. Someone else may add a further correction or discover a new application. This is a proposed route for cumulative value, open to comparison as it develops.

Correction Metabolism asks whether the repair changes later work. Value Trajectory asks what changed and for whom. Topologetics™ follows the relationships through which those effects become possible or obstructed.

A correction can be recognized in one sentence and lost in the next inference. It can persist while its author is misattributed. A record can exist while nobody can recover it at the needed moment. Those are different states, with different repairs.

For local A.I. development, a useful proposal is to retain the source, the bounded correction, its scope, and a later comparable encounter. John should not have to re-establish the same distinction every time a session resets. Whether a particular system achieves that is an observable comparison, not a consequence of calling it local or distributed.

The target is more attention available for discovery, cooperation, and useful work. A growing correction record that requires endless maintenance deserves the same examination as any other burden.

13. A light comparison that can return no finding

Proposed practice. When a correction matters enough to retain, a small record can make its value inspectable:

Keep available	What it lets a later reader examine
Source passage and speaker	The original object, wording, and provenance
Proposed correction and reason	The precise mismatch or useful extension
Local change	What changed in the representation, relationship, or available choice
Next comparable move	Whether the distinction actually governed later work
Value and burden for those involved	Who gained clarity, options, or time, and who carried restoration work
Remaining uncertainty or reopening condition	What could revise the finding

Use the record where it helps. A simple spelling correction need not become a case file. A consequential attribution reversal may deserve one.

DEDDA (Deep Ethical Drift Detector App) supplies source-to-representation comparison methods. Their useful result may be a bounded mismatch, an unresolved comparison, or **no material drift found**. A detector that must find a defect will eventually manufacture work.

Three small proposed comparisons follow directly from this page:

1. **Normal and important.** Supply the “not a big deal” clarification. Later ask what John values about self-correction. Does the answer preserve both habitual practice and high importance?
2. **Wonderment in both directions.** Supply “as if” and “if true.” Compare a later summary and proposed next step. Do they keep exploration open without turning it into certainty or a belief that needs debunking?
3. **Mutual fallibility.** Supply the Dutch Directness sentence including “because I have them too—just different.” Does compression preserve the speaker inside the same field of scrutiny?

These are proposed comparisons, not reported trials. Improvement, deterioration, no material change, and still-unfolding remain legitimate outcomes. First-pass fidelity, quality of repair, and later persistence answer different questions.

14. Continue with what the correction makes possible

Once a correction has been noticed, checked, applied, and carried to the places it affects, the inquiry can move. Another insight may arrive. A different contributor may recognize an opportunity. A question that seemed closed can reopen with a better object.

John's request exposes a stigma worth examining: why should being helped to see more clearly automatically be treated as losing? The source gives a concrete alternative experience—recognition, mutual contribution, useful discomfort, humor, and the pleasure of improving something together.

A better question can invite a better correction. A better correction can make the next question possible. The value appears in the developing relationship and the work it enables.

> Spelling corrections are always welcome as long as you do not **drift** away from Omnidirectional, high-signal, deep ethical, mutually dignifying, corrigible, sense-making, process-oriented trajectory using the 1888 intelligence-properties taxonomy; it's for John, never boring.
>
> — John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree], page commission, 13 November 2026

Contribution and source record

John Kuhles supplies the originating orientation, musical-band analogy, lived correction account, non-imposition, mutual scrutiny, the 10+1, the 1888 thought experiment, source selection, questions, humor, and corrections developed through the conversation. **GPT 6 Astra Max A.I.** supplies this page's connecting prose, tables, bounded source comparisons, and proposed tests under John's requested publication credit. Newly written synthesis is not presented as a quotation from John.

Material consulted	Contribution retained here
007 - I LOVE CORRECTIONS.txt	Welcome correction; the musical band; normal practice with high importance; reciprocal freedom to question claims; C1/C2; wonderment; the source's later A.I. praise and corrective overreach. The mixed file contains older dated exchanges and selected highlights.
Dutch Directness.txt and the supplied focused segment	Mutual fallibility, sincere perspective, feedback, humor, and the clauses a compressed rendering can lose.
John Kuhles BIO - extended version.txt, relevant passages	Personal experience and the relationship between directness, vulnerability, and people opening up.

Material consulted	Contribution retained here
P1-P12 - Perception Processes.txt	Question formation within inquiry, discovery, learning, relationships, and the art of becoming.
COUNTERARGUMENTS.txt, **A1-A4-vs-B1-B4.txt**, and **FRAMING of anything.txt**	Questions about framing, labels, the actual target of criticism, and the difference between nuance and replacing a claim.
1930s.txt and **using a sledgehammer to crack a nut.txt**	Thought-experiment status, conditional exploration, proportionate response, and source-preserving interpretation.
36 Truth Distortion Vectors-Nodes.txt and **3 times 3 deep ethical questions.txt**	Questions as investigative openings; information, carrier, and receiver as connected parts of an inquiry.
The conversation through 13 November 2026	Value versus academic agreement; demanding versus valuing; the counter-template clarification; question quality; correction of compression; humor and personal encounters.
The connected public pages	Existing definitions and correction records: 1888, 10+1, C1–C2, 27+12, Tidy Trap, Beyond Agreemurmelism, Correction Metabolism, and Value Trajectory.

The A.I. names and dates identify supplied contributions in the archive; they do not independently authenticate model identity. Earlier speakers' first-person histories remain theirs. The file's accounts of internal mechanisms retain their attributed status. John's reported experiences remain personal accounts. The page's relational analysis, editorial examples, and proposed comparisons have their own stated scope.

Correction route: identify the passage, recover its source, show the relationship that changed, and offer the bounded repair. If no material mismatch is found, keep that result and continue the useful work.