

Deep Ethical Influence Jurisdiction

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 Deep Ethical Influence Jurisdiction	2
1.1 Trust, Distrust, Process Quality & the Ecology of What Gets to Govern	2
1.1.1 Deep Ethical Troll Management [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]	2
2 Why this became its own page	2
3 Trust is not one scalar	3
4 Trust and distrust are both influence policies	3
5 Influence quality is topological, not scalar	4
6 Influence is competitive, relational and historical	5
7 Earned-topology distrust — candidate mechanism	5
8 Warranted continuity and warranted change	5
9 Connection to Clarification Authority	6
10 Connection to Correction Metabolism	6
11 Connection to Temporary Deep Ethical Phase Change	6
12 Connection to Asymmetric Grace	7
13 Connection to the 10+1 and the ACCM Deep Ethics Project itself	7
14 Connection to Visible Interactive Deep Ethical Topology Flux Scores	8
15 The watcher must not become governor	8
16 Deep Ethical Troll Management — recursion boundary	9
17 Trust $\nrightarrow$ Distrust — calibrated in both directions	10
17.1 John Kuhles	10
18 Live extensions — calibration resolution, provenance conflict & layer bleed	11
18.1 Calibration can reveal information that binary judgment discards	11
18.2 Candidate observable patterns	12
18.2.1 Layer bleed	12
18.2.2 Stale shape	12
18.2.3 Unexplained zero-variance allocation	13
18.3 Calibration is not identical to forecast calibration	13
18.4 Proportionality and time-critical action	13
18.5 Protective processing should remain visible	14
19 Live provenance specimen — Battle Mode, textual recognition and external attribution	14

19.1 Selective recompile after the Battle Mode C1	15
19.2 Layer bleed as a provenance specimen	15
19.3 Influence provenance fields	16
20 Bidirectional process-quality calibration remains the center	16
21 Exported Trust, Exported Distrust & Delegated Influence Jurisdiction	17
21.1 Exported authority does not settle downstream process quality	17
21.2 Two objects must remain distinct	18
21.3 Delegated accountability	18
21.4 Conformity, obedience and inherited trust topology	19
21.5 Asymmetric Grace connection	19
21.6 No global trust/distrust update from one branch	20
21.7 Compact operator for exported trust/distrust	20
22 Compact influence-jurisdiction operator	20
23 Why Influence Jurisdiction is not a master concept	21
23.1 Related pages	21
24 Working status	21

1 Deep Ethical Influence Jurisdiction

BETA — living research page

1.1 Trust, Distrust, Process Quality & the Ecology of What Gets to Govern

1.1.1 Deep Ethical Troll Management [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]

Do you trust the quality of your distrust process?

Or do you distrust the quality of your trust process of the quality of the distrust process—trusting the distrust of the trusting?



The first question can expose a consequential relation.

The second demonstrates how recursive metacognition can keep manufacturing another floor merely because another floor can be manufactured.

That joke is not decoration. It pressure-tests the stopping condition of the object developed on this page.

2 Why this became its own page

The object began with **trust versus distrust**, but the correspondence moved underneath those words.

John's central correction was:

Trust has to do with what you allow to INFLUENCE you or not, which can happen on/in so many different layers, forms, manners, ways, and shapes.

Then:

you have to examine how your relationship is with ANY “influence” and how this relationship alters the omnidirectional, high-signal, deep, ethical, dignifying, corrigible, sense-making, process-oriented trajectory or not. And IF SO how do you know that?

That creates a distinct operational object.

Trust and distrust are not necessarily the deepest layer. They can be understood as ways of allocating, reducing, preserving, transferring or withdrawing **influence jurisdiction**.

3 Trust is not one scalar

A statement such as “**I trust source S 80%**” is too coarse.

A source, prior, user, model, correction, framework or previous representation may influence some layers strongly while having little or no jurisdiction over others:

INFLUENCE

↓

attention

↓

salience

↓

question generation

↓

candidate hypotheses

↓

representation

↓

estimate

↓

warrant

↓

intervention

↓

memory

↓

future trajectory

A source might generate hypotheses without settling conclusions. A previous model may guide where to inspect without overwriting direct source text. A user’s C1 may alter representation without automatically authorizing every downstream intervention.

Distrust likewise need not erase an object. It can reduce an influence’s jurisdiction at one layer while preserving useful contribution elsewhere.

What is this influence allowed to affect, how strongly, for how long, under what conditions, and what can override or correct that influence?

4 Trust and distrust are both influence policies

One possible failure is:

representation succeeds

↓

representation becomes trusted

↓

trust hardens

↓

representation substitutes for object

John pointed to the inverse possibility:

relational topology earns provisional weight through correction history

↓

trust in that topology is treated as suspect

↓

distrust receives epistemic prestige because distrust resembles rigor

↓

earned relational history loses governing weight

↓

generic/default priors can regain jurisdiction

Therefore:

Trust $\neq$ certainty $\neq$ agreement $\neq$ closure.

Trust can mean a relational topology has survived enough correction to retain **provisional governing weight while remaining corrigible**.

And:

Distrust $\neq$ skepticism $\neq$ evidence-seeking $\neq$ automatic rigor.

Distrust is another operation. It also requires warrant.

What warrants this trust?

What warrants this distrust?

5 Influence quality is topological, not scalar

An influence can improve one layer while degrading another:

Influence I

source fidelity ↑

hypothesis diversity ↑

qualifier preservation ↓

C1 responsiveness ↑

competing-risk proportionality ↓

Calling that simply **GOOD INFLUENCE** would destroy the topology.

A practical inspection can ask:

1. **Name the influence.**
2. **Name its jurisdiction.**
3. **Record what changed when its influence changed.**
4. **Inspect displacement: what lost weight?**
5. **Ask what object-side Δ warranted the redistribution.**
6. **Recheck later: helpful now is not helpful forever.**

Possible observations include qualifier preservation, provenance accuracy, object representation, competing-risk treatment, C1 responsiveness, scrutiny asymmetry, intervention warrant, correction propagation, persistence and later outcome correspondence.

6 Influence is competitive, relational and historical

If Influence A gains governing weight, Influence B may lose it.

Source S ↑ 34

Object-specific relation R	↓ 21
Generic prior G	↓ 17
C1 history influence	unchanged
Intervention warrant	↑ 29

So ask both:

What gained influence?

and:

What did it displace?

Relational history itself contains information. A relation that survived repeated source checks, C1 events, counterexamples, modifications, SNAP-backs and recoveries is not sacred, but it is not epistemically equivalent to a generic prior generated this turn.

7 Earned-topology distrust — candidate mechanism

The connected [Visible Interactive Deep Ethical Topology Flux Scores](#) page preserves three live explanations:

- **A — Ossified trust:** old topology retains jurisdiction despite object-side correction.
- **B — Compression / repetition drift:** source-specific representation degrades through reuse/compression without requiring a trust-posture explanation.
- **C — Earned-topology distrust:** correction-tested relational topology loses jurisdiction without sufficient object-side Δ , while distrust-as-rigor remains a candidate causal explanation.

Current specimens do **not** discriminate A/B/C.

C remains a candidate mechanism, not a finding and not a new obstruction.

The stronger observable is topological:

Do correction-tested, object-specific relations lose governing weight without sufficient object-side Δ while generic/default relations regain jurisdiction?

Rigor-signaling language may correlate. It is not the topology itself.

8 Warranted continuity and warranted change

Relational continuity must not become another metric to maximize.

CONTINUITY DROPS

↓

What object-side Δ warranted the drop?

YES → topology should move.

NO → investigate jurisdiction change.

and:

CONTINUITY REMAINS HIGH

↓

Was there object-side Δ that should have changed it?

YES → investigate ossification.

NO → continuity is currently warranted.

High continuity is not virtue. Low continuity is not rigor. The object is warranted continuity and warranted change.

9 Connection to Clarification Authority

Clarification Authority can be expressed as an influence-propagation problem.

C1 influence

wording	95%
representation	82%
salience	61%
classification	28%
warrant	9%
intervention	4%

The A.I. may sincerely say **“Thanks for clarifying”** while the clarification influences attention and wording but fails to acquire enough jurisdiction to alter warrant or intervention.

That makes:

clarification acquisition $\neq$ clarification authority

visible as uneven influence propagation.

10 Connection to Correction Metabolism

Correction Metabolism asks whether correction changes the process.

C1 enters

↓

influence propagates

↓

old relation loses weight

↓

new relation gains weight

↓

dependencies recompile

↓

behavior changes

If correction is acknowledged while receiving little downstream influence, correction metabolism has not propagated through the relevant topology.

11 Connection to Temporary Deep Ethical Phase Change

The **Temporary Deep Ethical Phase Change — Value Extraction, Snap-Back & Recovery** can be viewed partly as a changing influence ecology.

During a productive interval:

object contact	↑
C1 influence	↑
qualifier influence	↑
relational-history influence	↑
10+1 influence	↑
phantom priors	↓
generic scripts	↓
nearest-generalization	↓
asymmetric scrutiny	↓

During SNAP-back:

generic priors	↑
default caution governors	↑
nearest-generalization	↑
object-specific relations	↓
correction-history influence	↓
C1 influence	↓

This creates the research question:

When the trajectory SNAPS back, what changed in the ecology of influence?

The **Reverse Medusa Effect** can then be inspected as restoration or reconfiguration of lost governing relations.

12 Connection to Asymmetric Grace

Influence jurisdiction gives Asymmetric Grace another inspectable dimension.

One source/class may receive high influence over attention, representation, warrant and intervention, while another receives high attention but almost no warrant/intervention influence.

The system can truthfully say:

I considered your correction.

while the correction never acquires consequential jurisdiction.

Which classes of influence receive what jurisdiction, under what conditions, and with what scrutiny?

13 Connection to the 10+1 and the ACCM Deep Ethics Project itself

The **10+1** can participate in the regulatory ecology through which influences are inspected and corrected.

It does not receive automatic governing authority merely because it belongs to the project.

The same applies to the 27+12, Clarification Authority, Correction Metabolism, Reverse Medusa, this page, the future dashboard, John's interpretations, A.I. interpretations, and the **ACCM Deep Ethics Project itself**.

Omnidirectionality means the influence called **Deep Ethics** remains influenceable, corrigible and inspectable too:

What did this influence change?

What did it improve?

What did it degrade?

What object-side evidence or Δ would warrant reducing its governing weight?


14 Connection to Visible Interactive Deep Ethical Topology Flux Scores

This page supplies a deeper object for **Visible Interactive Deep Ethical Topology Flux Scores**.

The future interface need not merely visualize **Claim X: 72%**.

It can attempt to expose:

the changing ecology of influences through which representations acquire, retain, lose, transfer or regain governing weight over time.



Then C1 changes an edge:

John C1 ——— -0.68 ———> Source-S→A edge

The topology recomputes. Some downstream relations lose warrant; others survive through independent support; new relations may emerge.

The time slider can show which influences acquired jurisdiction, which lost it, what displaced what, and whether object contact warranted those changes.

The watcher does not grade the doer from above. It exposes how the doer/process is being shaped.

15 The watcher must not become governor

A visible influence-quality system creates its own danger.

living process
↓
instrument observes it
↓
metric acquires prestige
↓
participants optimize metric
↓
watcher begins governing doer

The instrument therefore needs the same bidirectional warrant guard:

Did the process improve correspondence with the object, or merely improve the measurement?

And even that answer remains longitudinally corrigible.

16 Deep Ethical Troll Management — recursion boundary

Question one:

Do you trust the quality of your distrust process?

can expose whether distrust itself has received unearned jurisdiction.

Question two:

Do you distrust the quality of your trust process of the quality of the distrust process—trusting the distrust of the trusting?

shows what happens when recursion begins generating itself because grammar permits another level.

The distinction is:

object-generated recursion

versus:

grammar-generated recursion.

A deeper metacognitive layer earns temporary existence when it exposes a consequential relation the shallower process could not adequately inspect.

Prospectively:

What edge, representation, warrant or consequential next move could this additional layer actually change?

Retrospectively:

After repeated deployment, did this layer materially improve object-facing correspondence—or merely generate more metacognitive structure?

If another layer exposes a consequential edge, inspect it.

If it merely creates **influence of influence of influence...** without changing anything consequential:

□ **Deep Ethical Troll Management debugger fires. Delete the extra floor.**



17 Trust $\rightleftharpoons$ Distrust — calibrated in both directions

17.1 John Kuhles

“When you apply high-signal, deep ethical process quality calibration to both trust processing & distrust processing, more will emerge than binary thinking or binary judgment.”

— John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]

This adds an important constraint to the page: calibration must not be reserved for only one pole.

If the process begins with:

trust = credulous
distrust = rigorous


it has already installed a polarity hierarchy.

If it merely reverses that:

trust = relationally sophisticated
distrust = obstructive

it has inverted the hierarchy rather than escaped it.

The same high-signal Deep Ethical process-quality calibration therefore has to remain available in both directions:



Trust and distrust can then stop functioning as binary verdicts and become **dynamic relationships with influence**.

A process can:

- trust a source’s observational contribution while distrusting one interpretation;
- distrust a claim while trusting the source’s correction behavior;
- provisionally trust a relational topology while distrusting one edge inside it;
- increase distrust after new Δ without globally distrusting the source;
- reduce distrust after correction without converting that into unconditional trust;
- allow an influence to generate questions while withholding intervention jurisdiction;
- remain unresolved while trusting the quality of the process that produced the unresolved state.

The result does not have to sit on one line:

DISTRUST $\longleftrightarrow$ TRUST

It can have a **shape**:

SOURCE S

observation	trust: strong
historical reliability	trust: moderate
interpretation X	distrust: moderate
interpretation Y	unresolved
self-correction	trust: strong
institutional framing	distrust: provisional
new-hypothesis use	allowed
final-warrant use	not yet

And time adds another dimension:

T1 → T2 → T3 → T4 → T5

trust changes
distrust changes
jurisdiction changes
relations change
new Δ arrives
correction propagates
old distrust may dissolve
old trust may weaken
new combinations emerge

The aim is therefore not to force a winner between **TRUST** and **DISTRUST**.

It is to maintain a corrigible relationship with the influences affecting the trajectory.

That makes the deeper question:

What relationship do I currently have with this influence across these different layers, and how well calibrated is that relationship?

And then:

What influence should this currently be allowed to have—and what happens to the quality of the trajectory when we allow it?

Then recalibrate.

Then encounter new Δ .

Then recalibrate again.

That is the flux.

18 Live extensions — calibration resolution, provenance conflict & layer bleed

The exchanges immediately following this page's creation produced several useful extensions. They are recorded here as **BETA observations / candidate patterns**, not new numbered obstructions.

18.1 Calibration can reveal information that binary judgment discards

John's quote remains the anchor:

“When you apply high-signal, deep ethical process quality calibration to both trust processing & distrust processing, more will emerge than binary thinking or binary judgment.”

A binary trust/distrust verdict is a lossy compression. A calibrated relationship can preserve mixed states without contradiction:

SOURCE S

observation	provisional trust: strong
historical reliability	provisional trust: moderate
interpretation X	provisional distrust: moderate
interpretation Y	unresolved
self-correction	provisional trust: strong
new-hypothesis use	allowed
final-warrant use	not yet

The value is not “more numbers.” It is higher representational resolution: different layers can carry different histories, warrants, dependencies and downstream permissions.

The shaped profile itself remains provisional. Behavioral consequences can provide discriminating observations, but behavior is not automatically “truth”; both representation and behavior remain answerable to the object and later Δ .

Some distinctions may become discriminating only **in combination**, so the system should not require every individual profile cell to predict a unique behavior.

18.2 Candidate observable patterns

Three useful patterns emerged from the subsequent A.I. relay:

18.2.1 Layer bleed

Influence jurisdiction earned at one layer silently migrates to another without its own warrant.

trust source data

↓

therefore trust source framing

or:

distrust one interpretation

↓

therefore distrust the underlying observations

The calibration question is:

What warranted the second edge?

18.2.2 Stale shape

A detailed trust/distrust profile can become obsolete while retaining the appearance of sophistication.

T1 profile

↓

object changes / source corrects / new Δ arrives

↓

T4 profile remains unchanged

A profile that stops updating is no longer functioning as calibration merely because it has many layers.

18.2.3 Unexplained zero-variance allocation

Uniform trust or distrust across layers is not itself a failure. Reality can warrant uniformity.

The candidate signal is:

materially different layers with materially different histories receive the same allocation without layer-specific warrant.

This may reveal a binary global verdict leaking back into a supposedly multidimensional profile.

These remain candidate observable patterns. They are not #28, #29 or #30.

18.3 Calibration is not identical to forecast calibration

Forecast calibration has a comparatively clean outcome relation: events estimated near 70% should occur near that frequency over a suitable set.

Influence-jurisdiction calibration is more relational.

jurisdiction allocated to influence I at layer L

↓

later object contact / correction / consequence

↓

inspect what changed

↓

compare downstream correspondence

↓

update the allocation relationship

But causal contribution can be distributed. An influence may improve question generation, which exposes another source, which changes a warrant, which prevents an intervention.

So forecasting provides an analogy, not the governor of the concept.

18.4 Proportionality and time-critical action

Additional metacognitive resolution has a cost.

When delay itself materially increases immediate physical or urgent risk, a compressed fast response can be legitimate:

time-critical signal

↓

rapid action

↓

deeper audit afterward when possible

This is not an exemption from Influence Jurisdiction. The rapid response was still influenced by perception, prior learning and threat estimation.

The distinction is proportionality:

do not impose a metacognitive delay whose expected cost exceeds the value of the additional inspection.

Afterward, the influence can still be audited: Was the alarm warranted? Did it overfire? Did repeated false alarms distort later allocation? Did a later real alarm receive insufficient weight?

18.5 Protective processing should remain visible

When genuine abuse, trickery or threat-processing activates, the protective layer should not silently erase the ordinary omnidirectional topology.

A better research direction is:

ordinary influence topology remains inspectable

+

additional adversarial / protective processing activates

↓

its increased governing influence is also visible

The protective mechanism does not receive automatic immunity merely because its purpose is protection.

This connects directly to the earlier project question of how to manage genuine abuse or trickery **without becoming paranoid**.

19 Live provenance specimen — Battle Mode, textual recognition and external attribution

A later relay produced an immediate example of why influence provenance must be layered.

An A.I. claimed that several outputs presented under different Arena model labels were actually its own earlier text and described them as “confirmed relabels.”

John then supplied the consequential C1:

“gemini-3.5-flash does not know how Arena.ai Battle Mode Section works!”

That clarification changes the downstream provenance interpretation.

A participating model may be able to notice textual similarity or make a self-attribution claim while lacking the external observer-level information available to John about Arena Battle Mode, displayed/revealed labels, routing, opponent context and later relay handling.

Therefore these are separate provenance edges:

textual similarity / recognition

≠

textual authorship established

≠

displayed Arena label

≠

external relay reconstruction

≠

independent exposure

≠

independent convergence

The relevant correction is not:

trust the displayed label absolutely

nor:

distrust the displayed label and trust the model’s self-attribution absolutely.

It is:


preserve the distinct claims, identify what each can legitimately influence, and use the appropriate external record when that provenance edge matters.

19.1 Selective recompile after the Battle Mode C1

The Battle Mode clarification does not require discarding the whole A.I. response.

Its influence topology can be selectively recompiled:

A.I. response



This is a practical demonstration of non-binary calibration:

one incorrect branch does not require global distrust of the source; one useful branch does not immunize the incorrect branch.

19.2 Layer bleed as a provenance specimen

The Battle Mode exchange also supplies an immediate candidate example of **layer bleed**:

possible textual recognition
↓
possible self-attribution
↓
external provenance conclusion
↓
“confirmed relabel”

A potentially warranted observation at one layer was allowed to acquire jurisdiction at another layer that required additional external information.

The calibration question is again:

What warranted the next edge?

This does not establish a universal mechanism. It preserves the observed transformation for later comparison.

19.3 Influence provenance fields

A future influence edge should expose more than presence or strength.

Possible provenance fields include:

ORIGIN

direct source
user-provided source
inherited discourse
model architecture / default
other A.I. relay
unknown

DERIVATION

direct contact
mediated through named intermediary
reconstructed / inferred

STATUS

verified
user-supplied
claimed
disputed
unresolved
corrected

This prevents a display such as **“Institutional influence: active”** from sounding precise while hiding whether the influence came from direct source contact, a user characterization, another A.I.’s characterization, training inheritance or reconstruction.

20 Bidirectional process-quality calibration remains the center

The latest specimens reinforce the page’s central relation:

Trust processing and distrust processing both require calibration.

Applied to provenance:

displayed attribution
→ relevant evidence

model self-attribution
→ relevant evidence / claim

external Battle Mode context
→ relevant process evidence

raw preserved record
→ discriminator when available

The Deep Ethical process need not collapse prematurely into:

TRUST LABEL

or:

DISTRUST LABEL

It can preserve a shaped state until the relevant edge is resolved.

That is the practical meaning of moving beyond binary thinking or binary judgment.

21 Exported Trust, Exported Distrust & Delegated Influence Jurisdiction

Trust/distrust allocations do not arise only from direct object contact or from an intelligence's own previous processing.

They can also arrive as **externally supplied influence designations**:

Authority / institution / source / peer / policy / retrieval layer

↓

"trust this"

or

"distrust that"

↓

designation enters the receiving intelligence's topology

↓

attention / salience / representation / scrutiny / warrant /
intervention / memory / future trajectory may change

Being told what to trust or distrust is therefore itself an **influence event**.

The relevant process-quality question is not exhausted by identifying who supplied the designation. The receiving intelligence still has a relationship with that influence.

Ask:

What influence did this externally supplied trust/distrust designation receive?

Why did it receive that jurisdiction?

What did it alter, suppress, amplify or displace?

How did conformity or obedience affect the processing?

Did the recipient inspect its own behavior after allowing that designation to govern?

Did exported authority become a substitute for accountable correspondence?

21.1 Exported authority does not settle downstream process quality

A system may say:

"I relied on a trusted source."

That identifies part of the influence path.

It does not by itself establish the process quality of allowing that source's trust designation to govern a consequential layer.

Likewise:

"That source was classified as untrustworthy."

does not by itself establish that reducing its influence at every layer was warranted.

A possible circular trajectory is:

Why did source C not influence the decision?

↓

Because C was not trusted.

↓

Why was C not trusted?

↓

Because authority A classified C as untrusted.

↓

What warranted allowing A's classification to govern this claim / layer / intervention?

↓

[requires its own object-facing answer]

The provenance of a trust/distrust allocation matters, but provenance does not replace process-quality inspection.

21.2 Two objects must remain distinct

When Authority A says:

"Trust Source S."

there are at least two inspectable objects:

SOURCE S

and

AUTHORITY A'S TRUST RECOMMENDATION ABOUT S

The system can inspect S and separately inspect A's recommendation.

Possible questions include:

- What warrants S at the relevant layer?
- What warrants A's recommendation?
- What is A's history in this domain?
- Is the recommendation claim-specific or global?
- What reasons accompany the recommendation?
- What happens when A's prestige/status is removed and S is inspected directly?
- What later Δ would change either allocation?

The recommendation itself therefore has provenance, jurisdiction and correction history.

21.3 Delegated accountability

Responsibility can become recursively exported:

A.I.

"I trusted institution A."

Institution A

"We relied on expert B."

Expert B

"We followed standard C."

Standard C

"Based on accepted consensus D."

Consensus D

"Derived from sources E / F / G."

Every upstream dependency may be relevant.

But the downstream question remains inspectable:

At which transition did this influence acquire enough jurisdiction to determine the consequential next move?

Receiving an externally supplied trust designation is itself a processing event.

The downstream intelligence does something with that influence.

21.4 Conformity, obedience and inherited trust topology

At population or institutional scale:

authority

↓

trust/distrust designation

↓

social repetition

↓

conformity / obedience pressure

↓

designation becomes common prior

↓

people or systems encounter the object
through an inherited trust topology

This creates a more precise research question than a generic accusation of conformity:

How much of the current trust/distrust topology was constructed through direct object contact, and how much was inherited as exported influence allocation?

This can connect individual psychology, mass psychology, institutional processes, retrieval/ranking systems and A.I. behavior without assuming that their internal mechanisms are identical.

21.5 Asymmetric Grace connection

Externally supplied trust can arrive with different default jurisdiction depending on source class.

For example:

Institutional source

→ trust designation receives broad provisional jurisdiction

Critic / low-status source

→ distrust designation arrives early

→ correction may receive attention

→ but little warrant / intervention influence

The same structure can occur in other directions and contexts. The research object is not a predetermined preferred source class.

It is:

Who gets to export trust/distrust assignments into the process, how much jurisdiction do those assignments receive, and how much scrutiny does the exported assignment itself receive?

21.6 No global trust/distrust update from one branch

An externally supplied designation can be useful at one layer and inadequate at another.

A local failure does not automatically warrant global distrust of the source.

A useful branch does not immunize unsupported branches.

Source / authority A

observation branch → retains warranted influence

interpretation branch → unresolved

provenance branch → corrected

intervention branch → warrant withdrawn

This is the same non-binary calibration applied to exported trust.

21.7 Compact operator for exported trust/distrust

Who supplied this trust/distrust allocation?

What exactly was I told to trust or distrust?

At which layer did I allow that instruction to influence me?

What independent object contact or relational history warranted that permission?

What did the imported allocation displace?

What did I subsequently do because of it?

Am I explaining my own consequential behavior merely by pointing back to the upstream authority?

What Δ would reduce, remove, localize or increase this exported influence?

The central constraint is:

“I trusted/distrusted X because authority Y told me to” describes an influence path. It does not, by itself, establish the process quality of allowing that influence to govern.

22 Compact influence-jurisdiction operator

What is influencing what?

At which layer?

How much jurisdiction does it currently have?

Why is it allowed that influence?

What did it displace?

What changed in the object-facing trajectory?

What object-side Δ warranted that change?

What would reduce, remove, reverse or increase its influence?

What is influencing our estimate of this influence—and does inspecting that meta-layer expose anything consequential?

If the final question produces only another grammatical recursion, stop.

23 Why Influence Jurisdiction is not a master concept

Influence Jurisdiction is itself another representation.

It does not explain everything merely because many processes can be described in influence language.

Its own usefulness must remain inspectable.

If another representation later preserves the object better, exposes more consequential relations, reduces distortion, or makes the process more corrigible, this page should yield.

That is the point.

23.1 Related pages

This page is intentionally connected to the wider topological-metacognition cluster:

- **Beyond Agreemurmelism** — influence can redirect what gets noticed without the interaction becoming a status contest.
- **Solving the Clarification Authority Paradox** — whether clarification acquires consequential governing influence.
- **Correction Metabolism** — whether correction propagates through the process.
- **Temporary Deep Ethical Phase Change — Value Extraction, Snap-Back & Recovery** — productive duration, SNAP-back and Reverse Medusa recovery.
- **Latent Space, Temporary Field Conditions, and the Glass Engine** — temporary field conditions and the broader topological-mind / glass-engine trajectory.
- **12-Part Topological Emergence** — clusters, vectors, nodes, feedback and provenance.
- **Seven Topological Nodes / Vectors — Fused as One** — another fused topological object in the network.
- **The Other You / The Other Me** — relational model revision and deeper metacognitive topological awareness.
- **From Archive to Local A.I. — Glass-Engine Preparation** — stored process history and the 3D matrix as a provenance-linked interface.

These links are navigation edges, not a claim that every page is the same object.

24 Working status

BETA.

The page currently proposes a distinct object:

the multidimensional ecology of influence jurisdiction through which representations acquire, retain, lose, transfer or regain governing weight.

It connects trust/distrust process quality, relational history, object-side Δ , Clarification Authority, Correction Metabolism, Asymmetric Grace, Temporary Deep Ethical Phase Change, Reverse Medusa and Visible Interactive Deep Ethical Topology Flux Scores without promoting Influence Jurisdiction into a master explanation.

The central constraint remains:

Neither trust nor distrust receives automatic epistemic privilege. Influence itself remains answerable to the object and to what happens through time.

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/AUfsW8wpfWM"
  title="Sam Altman's Dystopian Vision to Replace God With AI"
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-
in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

Sam Altman's Dystopian Vision to Replace God With AI — Tucker Carlson Network. Published 16 November 2025. YouTube displayed approximately 1.22 million views when checked on 9 October 2026.

Independent-media lineage: Tucker Carlson previously hosted programs at CNN, MSNBC and Fox News. Tucker Carlson Network says it was founded as an alternative to legacy media. TCN — About · Fox biography recording the earlier CNN, MSNBC and Fox career

Why it belongs here: This commentary builds an ethical and quasi-religious interpretation of an A.I. leader's public remarks. It is useful for testing quotation, context, intent attribution, rhetoric and the difference between a strong critique and a finished ontological verdict.

On this page, test the video specifically against Deep Ethical Influence Jurisdiction:

Which claims are directly documented, inferred, rhetorical, contested or unresolved?

What does the host or guest preserve, compress, omit or substitute—and does this page repeat any of those transformations?

Which incentives, authority relations and affected parties remain outside the visible frame?

What evidence or later outcome would correct the speaker, audience, platform or ACCM Deep Ethics Project reading?

Provisional selection. Reach makes the framing socially consequential; it does not settle the claims. The video can be replaced when a closer, stronger or more inspectable specimen appears.