

Perception Processes (P01-P12)

ACCM Deep Ethics Project

Contents

1 Perception Processes (P01-P12)	1
1.1 The orientation	1
1.2 P01-P12	1
1.3 Why better questions matter	2
1.4 Process rather than posture	2
1.5 Relation to correction metabolism	2
1.6 BETA status	2
1.7 Related pages	3

1 Perception Processes (P01-P12)

BETA PUBLIC DRAFT — TRIAL & ERROR

Derived from source material by John Kuhles, originally written July 4, 2026. This page is a presentable public representation, not a replacement for the source archive.

1.1 The orientation

This object is **not presented as proof of a predetermined conclusion**. Its emphasis is the process by which conclusions, assumptions, interpretations, relationships, and corrections develop.

A compact source principle is:

Not claiming it proves this or that — it focuses on the process of arriving at any assumed conclusion.

The P01-P12 list treats inquiry itself as dynamic rather than as a one-time act that ends when an answer appears.

1.2 P01-P12

P01 — Having an inquiring mind is a process.

P02 — The art of becoming is a process.

P03 — The journey of discovery is a process.

P04 — Learning is a process.

P05 — Vindicating competing risk assessments that were falsely flagged should itself become a field of research. That vindication is a process.

P06 — Building new relationships, using trial and error, and separating useful signal from noise within newly formed relationships is a process.

P07 — A “Perfect Inference Storm” through Deep Ethical Sense-Making is a process.

P08 — Mapping flaws, contradictions, distortions, hypocrisies, and asymmetries in ethics-washing is a process.

P09 — Studying what is absent from mainstream attention, but may deserve examination, is a process.

P10 — Understanding mass psychology and individual psychology, and their relationship in both directions, is an ongoing process.

P11 — Navigating less-prioritized possibilities, including possibilities that may later become highly important, is a process.

P12 — Being alive as a human is a process.

1.3 Why better questions matter

The list points toward a broader question for AI and human reasoning:

What happens when asking better questions is treated as part of intelligence itself, rather than merely as a prelude to producing an answer?

Question quality affects what can enter the inquiry at all. A premature classification can shrink the available search space before the investigation has really begun. A better question can reopen distinctions, expose a hidden premise, reveal an omitted variable, or make an apparent binary less binding.

This connects naturally to the ACCM Deep Ethics Project emphasis on **C1 clarification before unwarranted C2 intervention**. Clarification is not required at every turn. It becomes relevant when a materially unresolved distinction would change the next move.

1.4 Process rather than posture

A system can sound inquisitive without actually remaining open to correction. It can say that learning is important while regenerating the same error after the correction has been explained. It can describe uncertainty while silently converting a qualified statement into a stronger one.

For this project, the interesting question is therefore not only whether an intelligence can *describe* a process, but whether the process changes what happens next.

A useful developmental loop is:

perception → questioning → exploration → interaction → correction → changed perception → new questioning

The loop remains corrigible. No stage receives permanent jurisdiction over the object merely because it came earlier.

1.5 Relation to correction metabolism

P01–P12 also intersects with the project’s developing concept of **correction metabolism**.

Memory can retain a correction. Correction metabolism asks whether the correction subsequently changes participation:

encounter → mismatch → correction → integration → later behavior

This distinction matters because recognition and behavioral integration are not the same operation.

1.6 BETA status

This public version is intentionally early. The wording, relationships, examples, and eventual placement inside the larger ACCM Deep Ethics Project may change as additional source material is reviewed and new corrections arrive.

The source object retains authority to correct this representation.

Source provenance: John Kuhles, *P1-P12 — Perception Processes*, July 4, 2026; later preserved in the project source archive. Public draft prepared from the source material for the ACCM Deep Ethics Project.

Recent high-reach independent-media companion

```
<iframe
  src="https://www.youtube-nocookie.com/embed/D3Hm9NPax4c"
  title="She Can Spot a Psychopath in Seconds. She Is One"
  loading="lazy"
  referrerpolicy="strict-origin-when-cross-origin"
  allow="accelerometer; autoplay; clipboard-write; encrypted-media; gyroscope; picture-in-picture; web-share"
  allowfullscreen></iframe>
```

She Can Spot a Psychopath in Seconds. She Is One — andrew gold | heretics.. Published 17 August 2026. YouTube displayed approximately 456,000 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 interview combines self-description, rapid personality classification, clinical-sounding language and entertainment incentives. It is a strong object for separating observed conduct, diagnostic inference, identity, confidence and unresolved status.

On this page, test the video specifically against Perception Processes (P01–P12):

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.

1.7 Related pages

- **Meta Processing — Beta Draft V0.2b** — separates intent and instructions, processing, results and effects, notice, and persistence without turning the process into a verdict.
- **Public Drafts** — gives the source-preserving publication context for this early process object.
- **44 Project Goals** — connects the process orientation to the project's wider public goals.
- **C1 Before C2** — shows when an answer-changing clarification belongs before intervention or closure.
- **Correction Metabolism** — tests whether learning and correction change later participation.

- **Unresolved Meaning and Beyond-Binary Inquiry** — keeps possibilities open without treating uncertainty as proof or destination.
- **10+1 Metaflux** — provides a mutually corrective field for inquiry, learning, wonderment, and self-honesty.
- **Intent Liability** — follows a stated process through assumptions, choices, results, notice, and repair.
- **Outnuancing** — examines the frame around a process while returning to the object being studied.