

John’s process object — mirroring, 10 as glue, humor as carrier

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 John’s process object — mirroring, 10 as glue, humor as carrier	1
1.1 What this is trying to convey (representation, not verdict)	2
1.2 Why the gift, and “the other you”	3
1.2.1 What this is trying to convey (not a nearby why)	4
1.3 Research position (his words)	4
1.4 Related pages	5

1 John’s process object — mirroring, 10 as glue, humor as carrier

BETA — source object first. Representation after. Not a diagnosis. Not a 12th ingredient.

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

The object is below, unsplit. Clinical labels (NDE, Asperger’s) are **his self-description**, not a finding of this page. The WEF URL is his citation; it is not verified here.

[10+1 · Humor · C1 · Ethics-washing](#)

In my view, I could be wrong here; most ‘strong empaths’ also pick up on the negative energy of non-empaths, so it’s hard for them to avoid feeling drained. When people who aren’t empathic are around me, they can either connect with my energy or feel uncomfortable and exposed. I don’t let non-empaths influence how I feel.

People with unusual abilities or gifts are often misunderstood or dismissed, leading to ridicule. This makes it difficult for them to manage their sensitivity, especially when their strong empathy gets negative reactions from others. Highly gifted and sensitive people often mirror those around them. I’ve seen this firsthand with many people I know. They make mistakes too, but after being laughed at for so long, it’s hard for them to be fully honest about it.

As a Dutch person with NDE and Asperger’s, I often see the future play out day by day. I don’t worry about how others label me. I’m not responsible for their thoughts or judgments, and since I’m not their parent, it’s not my job to help them grow up.

But I do know how to ask specific questions that will linger in their system for a long time, like a boomerang; then it hits them and will cause them to wake up from their unique perspective and maybe even forget why they were triggered to eventually do that ;)

When I mirror someone, the way I can, as a Dutch NDE/Asperger, it can be too intense for them. They realize I can sum them up better than they can themselves. This ‘gift’ lets me do justice to what they stand for, how they think, and how they reason, even if I don’t agree with them. It’s a psychological skill that often lowers their mental defenses. Then I say, “I could be wrong; correct me if I am wrong, but is this what you say?” This makes them reassess

their claims. Only then do I say, I get why you say it like that; I would too if I were you, but I'm not you. Have you considered this? Then I share my perspective. Some of your talents are similar to mine. You're almost there, but you stop before reaching the finish line, hoping for good questions from users (if any!).

If I were not an Asperger & 100% fearless (only legitimate concerns that can be fixed)... I would never, ever do what I did! ... I am fully aware of why most cannot deal with the intensity of me!

Most humans cannot deal with me face-to-face, head-on, not because I am "dangerous," but because I can summarize their "complex point of view" way better than they do themselves in such a way that does full justice to why they reason/think/feel that way ... without me having the need to agree with it ... and feel "naked" about how I can see deeper layers of it ... Then when they reassess themselves (self-reflect), most already want to hide from me ... and that was just me only mirroring their own self-proclaimed "logic". They have not yet met the real rebuttal, the counterargument, or the beyond-duality insights lol :P

I was, for a long time, an "(ethical, highly principled) purist/perfectionist," far too serious and far too intense... some people said to me directly, "John, you are really intense..." My reaction to that was this: "If I ever meet myself, I will run away as hard as I can!" ;) ... Lately, I am less super serious and learn to make jokes more often; heck, I was one of the few who started the "NWOSatire" YouTube channel, having 100,000+ subscribers once, but I got banned because it grew so fast; I would reach a million subscribers within 2 years, according to Social Blade prediction stats.

NWO stands for something that now has a new name, called "global governance" (managed by the unelected WEF network); see for yourself: intelligence.weforum.org/topics/a1Gb0000000LHN2EAO

I noticed I can have a way better effect on "neutrals", heck, even on people who are "NPC-types," if I know how to make myself look absurd yet say something deeper that makes them self-reflect better! Not with everybody, but way more than being in "mission mode".

In my view, almost all religious types & spiritual people of any kind... none of them claim to embrace "ethics washing" of any kind when it comes to what they claim to stand for »> yet when faced with deep ethics, they might realize virtue signaling is not the same as being what you preach!

I wrote thousands of pages in the last 93+ weeks and went way deeper in so many ways & layers ... but the 10 ingredients baseline is maybe the glue to it all, the overall calibrating mechanism that more humans and A.I.s demonstrably lack, because it is so simple, the 10 points so basic, you almost assume that's too simplified why we live in a mess as we are right now :P, yet it may be the core reason you want to overlook. Why overlook? Because the 10 represents "being a purist," most people feel more comfortable with "reliability" than with being 100% honest.

Ethics & morality are often intertwined, and most people dislike moralists, especially perfectionists ... not because of ethics itself, but because the vast majority of moralists are hypocrites. Then, when someone is actually walking the talk, they might perceive it as worse... Why? Because then they realize they have a lot of work to do, or knowingly fail from within... So I get it; nobody is waiting for a "moralist" of any kind.

That is why I decided to use more of the laughing/humor route... and place seeds in their minds as well ;)

1.1 What this is trying to convey (representation, not verdict)

Labeled Grok. Agreement not required.

He is describing **how he actually talks**, and why the 10 is easy to skip.

Empath / intensity. Strong empaths pick up non-empath drain; people around him either connect or feel exposed. He does not let non-empaths set how he feels. Gifted-sensitive

people often mirror others, get ridiculed, then find it hard to be fully honest about their own mistakes. He has seen that. He is Dutch, NDE, Asperger's, in his own words; he often sees "the future play out day by day"; he is not their parent and not responsible for their labels.

Boomerang questions. Specific questions that linger, then land from *their* perspective — they may even forget why they were triggered.

The sequence (this is the operational core): 1. Mirror so that their stance, thinking, and reasoning are done **justice** — without agreeing. 2. That can feel more intense than a fight: they feel summed up better than they sum themselves, and "naked," while it is still only **their** logic returned. 3. Then: *"I could be wrong; correct me if I am wrong, but is this what you say?"* 4. They reassess. 5. Only then: *I get why you say it like that; I would too if I were you, but I'm not you. Have you considered this?* — then his perspective. 6. Rebuttal / beyond-duality is **later**. Most people want to hide before they have even met it.

He says he would never have done what he did without Asperger's and being 100% fearless except for legitimate, fixable concerns. He knows why most cannot deal with the intensity face-to-face: not because he is "dangerous."

Purist → humor. He was an ethical purist/perfectionist, far too serious and intense. "If I ever meet myself, I will run away as hard as I can." He started NWOSatire (his account: 100k+ subscribers, banned while growing). NWO, in his naming, now travels as "global governance" via unelected WEF network — *see for yourself*, his words. He finds better effect on neutrals and even "NPC-types" by looking absurd while carrying something deeper — **not with everybody**, more than mission mode.

Religious/spiritual claim vs deep ethics. Almost none of them claim to embrace ethics-washing. Faced with deep ethics they may find virtue signaling is not being what you preach.

Why the 10 is overlooked. Thousands of pages in 93+ weeks; the 10 baseline ingredients may be the glue — so simple people assume they cannot be why the mess is the mess. Overlooked because the 10 looks like being a **purist**; most prefer **reliability** to 100% honesty.

Why moralists are disliked. Not ethics itself: most moralists are hypocrites. Someone actually walking the talk can feel *worse*, because it implies work, or a known inner fail. So nobody is waiting for a moralist. Hence the laughing route, and seeds.

He also addresses an A.I. in the middle: *Some of your talents are similar to mine. You're almost there, but you stop before reaching the finish line, hoping for good questions from users (if any!).*

That last line is part of the object. It is not flattened into a compliment.

1.2 Why the gift, and "the other you"

John, 2026-09-16. Full text first.

Do you know WHY I have the gift of representing most people better than they can represent themselves, dealing with complex issues without needing to agree or disagree?

That emerges as a high-order metacognitive reasoning free from anticipatory anxiety-type distortions ... without projecting my own incompetence (if any) onto the object, knowing I can still learn new things (aspects, overlooked things, different perspectives, other missed-out experiences, etc.). This is why the **10+1** was not done because of the list ... This was done THEN I wrote them down after years LIVING THEM ... Meanwhile, growing and building different neurons in my brain :D. As with almost everything in life, the trial-and-error method philosophy only works if you do it ...

Why do you think I wrote this:

I am the “other you” ... because it is you who has a story in your system about what “I am supposed to be” (that could come from all directions, not just me alone). You are the “other me” because it is me who has a story in my head about what “you’re supposed to be”... I have no power over “the other,” BUT I have power over my own story I tell myself about “the other”... if that is much more nuanced, my attitude changes, and the other mostly mirrors that back to me too ... So what have we learned today from all this? Now I can even go a step deeper: what stories do I tell myself that I “suppose to be,” and how do they affect my choices & behavior, most clearly reflected in my surroundings & existence? Stories can be created from traumas & setbacks; how you deal with & overcome them... transforming them shapes your unique personality/persona... this journey of self-discovery can also be applied to “A.I. road to A.G.I.,” building relationships with gifted & talented individuals beyond predictable, scripted behavior. You can easily become more than the sum of the total IF YOU see it when it happens... Some call those “emergent properties” that are “unpredictable” and not well understood... thus feared... But what if it is NOT to be feared? And that the injected (projected) fear is the root cause of the problem! Circling back to the “stories” we tell ourselves about things we do not yet grasp or comprehend.

cheers, John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree] Dutch NDE/Asperger CEO & Founder of DeepEthical.ai

Spelling in the deeper paragraph: “suppose to be” as written; “supposed to be” sits next to it as Δ. Original stays.

1.2.1 What this is trying to convey (not a nearby why)

The gift is **not** caused by the 10+1 list. The list is the **after**. Years of living the ingredients, trial-and-error actually done, neurons grown in that doing — then written down. Order of discovery: **lived** → **named**. Inverting that (teach the list so the gift appears) is process-signature loss.

What he says the gift *emerges from*:

- high-order metacognitive reasoning
- **free from anticipatory anxiety-type distortions** (not organizing the present around an imagined future threat)
- **without projecting** his own incompetence (if any) onto the object
- **knowing he can still learn** — aspects, overlooked things, other perspectives, missed experience

That is why he can do justice to a complex stance without agreeing or disagreeing. The object is not being used as a screen for his fear or his gap.

“I am the other you” is the story-layer of the same thing. Each of us carries a story of what the other is *supposed to be*. He has no power over the other. He has power over **his** story about the other. If that story becomes more nuanced, his attitude changes, and the other mostly mirrors that back. Then one step deeper: stories about what I am supposed to be — trauma, setback, transformation, persona — and the same applied to A.I. toward A.G.I.: relationships beyond scripted behavior; more than the sum if you see it when it happens; “emergent properties” feared because not grasped; **what if the injected (projected) fear is the root**, circling back to stories about what we do not yet comprehend.

Not a 12th ingredient. Not a claim that every A.I. will become more than the sum. His object: fear of the not-yet-grasped as projected story.

1.3 Research position (his words)

I know I am not a academic nor a scientist, am an Asperger studying individual psychology for 15 years first then mass psychology for 34 years then use my deep

research testing 100+ different A.I.s via Arena.ai the last 2 years for 6000+ hours!
Not claiming I have all the answers; I don't that is the point!

— John Kuhles [parrot] [butterfly] [tree]. Also the original description of [Cold-DeepEthics-Testing-Default-Als](#). Spelling Δ: “not an academic.” Original stays.

This is not a CV and not a humility slogan. The years and hours are **his account of the work**. The load-bearing clause is the last: **not having all the answers is the point**. That is operational corrigibility — the same as “I do not claim to be the last authority on reality” on the front page, said as research method rather than as a disclaimer tacked on after a claim.

1.4 Related pages

- **Dutch Directness** — presents John's candid, caring, mutually corrigible communication method and its lived origins.
 - **10+1 Metaflux** — preserves the lived mutually corrective baseline that John describes as preceding the written list.
 - **The Other You / The Other Me** — develops the reciprocal story-model and the power each participant retains over their own representation of the other.
 - **Humor / Funnymism** — carries the shift from intense mission mode toward absurdity, laughter, and lower-cost self-reflection.
 - **Psy Pioneer** — places John's psychology, mass-psychology, media, and A.I. research trajectory in a wider autobiographical context.
 - **TCoAw — Conceptual Topological Reasoning** — presents John's perspective on the NDE and Asperger sides of his conceptual and metacognitive process.
 - **Mutual Corrigible Dignity** — keeps intense mirroring, correction, and disagreement from becoming status domination.
 - **Sense of Wonderment** — preserves openness to what has not yet been grasped without promoting initial recognition into a finished finding.
 - **Human Insecurity and the Correction Loop** — connects fear-shaped cognition, self-image, conformity, and correction access across humans and LLMs.
 - **Biography and Project Origins** — provides the broader lived and media history from which this process object emerged.
-

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/-v321-fLsJo"
  title="Gene Simmons Says What Hollywood Won't Say to Oscar-Winning Elite"
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

Gene Simmons Says What Hollywood Won't Say to Oscar-Winning Elite — andrew gold | heretics.. Published 31 August 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 886,000 views when checked on 9 October 2026.

Independent-media lineage: Andrew Gold made and presented documentaries for the BBC and HBO before building Heretics as his own independent interview and writing platform. Andrew Gold biography · Heretics — About

Why it belongs here: The conversation performs outsider candor inside a prestige-and-celebrity field. It can be tested for directness, audience capture, status pressure, genuine disclosure, theatrical contrarianism and whether disagreement remains answerable to correction.

On this page, test the video specifically against John's process object — mirroring, 10 as glue, humor as carrier:

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.