



The Correction — Ethics

Artist's Proof 32

Justice

Five correction levels — the building grieves every closed window

****Status and Dependency****

This paper derives structural conditions under which different levels of correction — including removal — become the most stabilizing response to measured destabilization. It does not prescribe removal in any actual case.

It does not claim that any current civilisation is robust enough to apply these conditions correctly. It does not claim that the measurement technology exists today.

It does not claim that any existing justice system should adopt this architecture without first solving Debts 24–27. It derives what justice must be if it is structural. Implementation is downstream.

Epistemic status per section. §1 (statement): derived. §2 (current justice): historical. §3 (derivation): derived. §4 (compassion): synthesis. §5 (what changes): application. §6 (worked examples): application. §7 (rehabilitation): derived. §8 (one-I): synthesis. §9 (safeguards): derived. §10–§14: synthesis.

****Kill Switches****

KS-32.1 (Destabilization measurement): LIVE — EMPIRICAL. If destabilization cannot be measured with convergent confidence from accumulated records.

KS-32.2 (Correction ranking): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If a lower level can produce equal stabilization and the architecture selects a higher level, the ranking is wrong.

KS-32.3 (Removal justification): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If permanent separation is always more stabilizing than removal regardless of cost, Level 5 is never justified.

KS-32.4 (One-I violation): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If removal is treated as destruction of the I rather than closure of a window.

KS-32.5 (Genocide brake): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If the removal cost does not produce a saturation point — if the self-limiting property fails.

KS-32.6 (Prevention superiority): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If the hierarchy fails to incentivise prevention over correction.

KS-32.7 (Dehumanisation — MORAL KILL SWITCH): LIVE — NON-NEGOTIABLE.

If the architecture is used to justify removal on grounds other than measured destabilization — race, class, political opposition, disability — or if the record set is not audited for systemic bias.

The architecture has been weaponised.

KS-32.8 (Confidence unreachable): LIVE — STRUCTURAL. If the confidence required for Level 5 cannot be achieved given measurement uncertainty and adversarial record-injection, Level 5 is structurally unreachable and should be removed from the hierarchy.

Here is how to destroy this paper. Show that permanent separation is always cheaper than removal, regardless of organism state. Or show that the genocide brake never engages — that removal cost does not saturate.

Or use the architecture to classify a race, a class, a political opponent as destabilizing. Any of these kills the derivation. Eight kill switches. All live. The argument hands you the weapons.

****§1 – Statement****

You have watched a building burn. You know that there is a moment — a specific, measurable moment — when the fire department stops saving the burning room and starts protecting the rooms around it.

Not because the burning room does not matter. Because the building matters more.

Justice is not moral. Justice is structural. It is the organism's response to destabilization, computed from the same coupling geometry that determines the proton mass and the terminal ethic.

The structural parallel is exact. AP30 derives mass as geometric resistance — the structural opposition a record offers to displacement.

This paper derives justice as geometric correction — the structural opposition the organism offers to destabilization. Mass is what a particle resists. Justice is what a civilisation corrects. Same concept. Different scale. Same axioms.

This paper holds two things simultaneously that most ethical systems refuse to combine.

Every aware being shares the same interior. The one-I claim. AP29 derives awareness as the interior of irreversible record-writing. One crack, one interior, many windows.

The I behind a serial killer's eyes is the I behind a child's. Absolute. Non-negotiable.

The structural consequences of different deeds are measurably different.

Removing different nodes from the organism produces measurably different effects on substrate coherence. Same I. Different coupling capacity. Same building. Different-sized windows.

Judgement shifts from the person to the deed. From the grain to the destabilization the grain's actions produce. You are not judging the window. You are measuring the damage to the building.

This is both more compassionate and more severe than any existing system. More compassionate because it never denies the one-I.

More severe because the correction scales with the destabilization, not with cultural sentiment, political pressure, or emotional reaction. The geometry decides.

****§2 – The Problem with Current Justice****

You have lived under one of these systems your entire life. You already know what is wrong with it.

Retributive justice (punishment-centred). The offender “deserves” suffering proportional to the suffering caused. Eye for an eye. Structural flaw: retribution does not restore coherence. A punished offender who remains destabilizing continues to destabilize after release.

Retribution scales with emotion, not with measured destabilization. High-profile cases produce severe sentences. Low-profile cases with identical structural damage produce lighter ones.

Rehabilitative justice (reform-centred). Every person can be reformed. Structural flaw: rehabilitation assumes all destabilization is correctable. Some nodes are so deeply committed to destabilizing patterns that no intervention redirects them within the organism’s tolerance.

Rehabilitation without a floor for removal leaves the organism vulnerable to catastrophic destabilizers.

The Western premise. All lives have equal inherent value. The axioms agree at the level of the I.

But the premise conflates the value of the I (absolute, equal) with the coupling capacity of the node (measurable, unequal). A surgeon and a serial killer share the same I.

Their coupling capacities are measurably different. Current systems handle this badly — they either pretend the difference doesn’t exist or address it ad hoc through judicial discretion. The derivation replaces both with structural measurement.

****§3 – The Derivation****

Step 1 – Destabilization is measurable

AP31 establishes that every action is classified as stabilizing or destabilizing with confidence p computed from accumulated records. The geometric cost C is the coupling capacity reduction the action produces.

For justice: given the total record set of a node's actions, what is the net destabilization produced, and what is the projected future destabilization given the accumulated pattern?

Past is measured. Future is predicted. Prediction tightens as records accumulate (Axiom R). A first offence has a wide prediction range. A tenth offence has a narrow one.

Record bias. Historical record sets are contaminated by systemic prejudice. Centuries of racialised policing, biased sentencing, and discriminatory enforcement are records. They are permanent (Axiom R). But records of a biased system encode the bias.

The consequence geometry computed from biased records will reproduce the bias. The architecture requires auditing the record set for systemic bias before computing the geometry.

Cleaning the input is a structural requirement, not an optional safeguard.

KS-32.1: If destabilization cannot be measured with convergent confidence from accumulated records. KS-32.7: If the record set is not audited for systemic bias, the output is corrupted and the architecture is weaponised.

Step 2 – Correction scales with destabilization

The organism's response is correction: an action that restabilizes. Optimal correction = maximum coherence restored per unit of correction cost. Minor destabilization → minor correction. Catastrophic destabilization → catastrophic correction.

This is the distinction between structural justice and retribution. Retribution asks: how much should the offender suffer? Structural justice asks: what correction most efficiently restabilizes the organism?

A retributive system may under-correct (the offender suffers but remains destabilizing) or over-correct (consuming resources that could stabilize elsewhere).

Step 3 – The correction hierarchy mapped to viability geometry

Each correction level corresponds to a position on the coupled viability corridor (AP01 Papers C–D).

Level 1 – Restitution. The node remains within the corridor. Coupling restored directly by the destabilizer becoming the restabilizer. Maximum efficiency — no third-party resources consumed.

This includes restorative justice practices: victim-offender mediation, community reparation, transformative processes. The axioms do not merely permit these. They rank them as the most efficient correction where they work.

Level 2 – Restriction. The node's corridor is narrowed but the node remains. Fines (reduced resource coupling), community service (directed stabilization), probation (monitored coupling), restraining orders (specific pathways severed).

Level 3 – Separation. The node temporarily exits the corridor. Incarceration. The organism bears the maintenance cost. The node cannot destabilize because it cannot couple.

Level 4 – Permanent separation. The node is permanently outside the corridor. Indefinite maintenance cost. The window remains in the building but is sealed.

Level 5 – Removal. The node's corridor is closed permanently. No maintenance cost. The window closes. The I does not die — the I is the building, not the window.

The hierarchy selects the lowest level that achieves sufficient restabilization. Removal is never selected when separation suffices. Separation is never selected when restriction suffices. Minimum intervention for maximum stabilization.

You have just watched five levels lay themselves out on one axis. The axis is efficiency. Not desert. Not emotion. Not revenge. Efficiency — measured in coherence restored per unit of cost.

KS-32.2: If a lower level can produce equal stabilization to a higher level for the same case, and the architecture selects the higher level, the ranking is wrong.

Step 4 — The removal threshold

Level 5 requires two conditions simultaneously.

Condition A — The fixed floor. The destabilization D must exceed a minimum absolute threshold F . Let C_{sep} = maintenance cost of permanent separation per unit time. Let B_{total} = organism's total coupling budget.

The floor F is the destabilization at which maintaining the node in permanent separation costs more than removal: $F \geq C_{\text{sep}} / B_{\text{total}}$.

Below this floor, Level 4 is always more efficient than Level 5 regardless of organism state.

The floor must also incorporate the cost of wrongful removal. Removal is irreversible (Axiom R).

If subsequent records reveal the measurement was wrong — misattributed destabilization, faulty prediction, corrupted records — the window is permanently closed based on error.

This permanent loss of the wrongly-removed node's future stabilizing potential must be factored into F . The irreversibility cost raises the floor, which makes removal rarer. This is structurally correct.

Condition B — Organism-relative scaling. The effective threshold adjusts with the organism's current robustness R . A robust organism (high coherence, wide corridor, large reserves) has a higher effective threshold.

A fragile organism (low coherence, narrow corridor) has a lower one. Candidate functional form: $\text{Threshold}_{\text{eff}} = F \times (R/R_0)^\alpha$, where R_0 is baseline robustness and α is a scaling exponent.

The exact α is Debt 25. Linear ($\alpha=1$): threshold scales directly. Sublinear ($\alpha<1$): threshold increases more slowly with robustness.

The confidence requirement. Because removal is irreversible and wrongful removal is permanent, the confidence threshold for Level 5 must be extraordinarily high — structurally higher than for any other level.

If the required confidence cannot be achieved given measurement uncertainty and adversarial record-injection (AP31 KS-31.9), Level 5 is structurally unreachable.

KS-32.3: If permanent separation is always more stabilizing than removal regardless of cost, Level 5 is never justified.

KS-32.8: If the confidence required for Level 5 cannot be achieved given measurement uncertainty and adversarial record-injection, Level 5 is structurally unreachable and should be removed from the hierarchy.

Step 5 — The structural genocide brake

This is the step that matters most. Read it slowly.

A fragile organism that begins removing nodes becomes more fragile. Each removal costs coupling capacity (a window lost) and record-generating diversity (one fewer perspective). This loss is itself a destabilization that enters the measurement.

Each removal raises fragility, which lowers the threshold, which could enable more removals. This is the structural pathway to genocide.

The geometry prevents it. Each removal's cost (lost coupling capacity + lost diversity) is a destabilization that raises the organism's fragility, which changes the geometry.

Beyond some number of removals, the cumulative cost of further removal exceeds the cost of the destabilization it addresses. The architecture produces a natural saturation point: the removal curve is self-limiting.

The organism cannot remove its way to stability because removal is itself destabilizing. The saturation point is the structural genocide brake. It exists in the geometry.

A civilisation that reaches the saturation point and continues removing is no longer following the derivation. It is overriding the geometry with ideology. KS-32.7 (dehumanisation) fires. The architecture has been weaponised.

You have just watched the geometry build its own brake. No external authority imposes the limit. The coupling cost imposes the limit.

The same way ε is the only stable break — not by decree but by geometry — the genocide brake is the only stable correction boundary.

The architecture cannot be driven past the saturation point without self-destructing. That is the safety.

KS-32.5: If the genocide brake does not engage — if the removal cost does not produce a saturation point — the self-limiting property fails and the hierarchy is structurally dangerous.

****§4 – The Compassion in the Severity****

The one-I is absolute. The person being removed shares your interior. The I behind the condemned person's eyes is the I behind yours. AP29 derives this: one crack, one interior, many windows.

Removal does not destroy the I. It closes the window. The building loses a perspective. The building is diminished.

But a window through which fire pours, burning the walls, collapsing the floors, darkening every other window — that window must be closed not because the light through it doesn't matter, but because the light through every other window matters too.

Wrongful removal. The hardest problem. If a node is removed and subsequent records reveal the measurement was wrong, the removal is irreversible. The window is permanently closed based on error.

The I is unharmed (it is the building, not the window). But the perspective is permanently lost. This is itself a destabilization.

This is why the architecture sets the confidence threshold for Level 5 at the highest achievable level. This is why the fixed floor incorporates the cost of wrongful removal.

This is why KS-32.8 exists: if the required confidence is unreachable, Level 5 is structurally unavailable. The architecture would rather keep a catastrophically destabilizing node in permanent separation (Level 4) than risk wrongful removal.

The compassion is real.

The one-I is never denied. Even in removal, the argument holds that the person shares the same interior. This prevents dehumanisation.

Removal is never selected when a lower level suffices. Minimum intervention.

The threshold moves with robustness. A more coherent civilisation raises the threshold. The aspiration is a civilisation so robust that Level 5 is never needed.

The measurement is transparent, auditable, and contestable. Any node can challenge its classification by requesting the record set, submitting counter-records, and requesting independent recomputation.

The wrongful removal cost is factored in. The architecture structurally prefers keeping a dangerous node alive over risking an innocent death.

You are being asked to hold two truths simultaneously. The condemned person is you. And the condemned person's coupling is destroying the building you both live in. Both truths. Both at once.

The correction is not revenge. It is the building protecting itself. And the building grieves every window it closes.

****§5 — What Changes from Current Systems****

Judgement shifts from person to consequence. Current systems judge the person: guilty or innocent. Structural justice judges the consequence: stabilizing or destabilizing, and by how much.

Character, intent, remorse, background — these affect the prediction of future destabilization. They do not affect the measurement of past destabilization. The damage is the damage.

Intent as predictor, not as measure. An unintentional destabilization with the same structural cost as an intentional one produces the same measured damage.

But intent is a strong predictor of future behaviour: intentional destabilizers have higher recurrence confidence. The correction level may differ because the prediction differs.

Furthermore, identical measured destabilization from different sources may require different correction profiles, because the correction addresses both the damage and the structural vulnerability that produced it.

An accidental industrial disaster reveals systemic vulnerability (Level 1-2 systemic correction). A deliberate act of sabotage reveals a destabilizing node (Level 3+). Same damage. Different sources. Different corrections.

Correction by efficiency, not desert. The architecture does not ask what the offender deserves. It asks what correction most efficiently restabilizes the organism.

A white-collar criminal who destabilizes the economic substrate by billions receives a more severe correction than local violence — not because fraud is “worse” morally but because the structural damage is larger.

The geometry, not the emotion.

The death penalty is not permanent. If civilisational robustness increases sufficiently, the effective threshold rises above any individual's destabilization capacity. Level 5 becomes structurally inaccessible.

The death penalty abolishes itself when the organism becomes strong enough to always afford permanent separation.

This is the structural argument for civilisational investment. Every increase in substrate coherence raises the removal threshold.

Schools, opportunity, reduced inequality, maintained infrastructure — these are structural defences against the conditions that make Level 5 necessary.

Multi-node destabilization: a known limitation. The correction hierarchy addresses individual nodes.

Coordinated multi-node destabilization — organised crime, state corruption, corporate collusion, institutional racism — is the primary mode of civilisational-scale destabilization and may require network-level correction that is not yet derived.

Until Debt 27 is closed, the architecture's strongest claims apply to individual cases, not to systemic or institutional destabilization. This is stated, not hidden.

****§6 — Worked Examples****

Example 1: Theft. Destabilization: moderate. Local. Confidence: high. Correction: Level 1 preferred (restitution). Level 2 if restitution fails (fines, probation). The organism barely notices.

Example 2: Large-scale financial fraud. Destabilization: severe. Thousands of nodes lose coupling capacity. Trust degrades system-wide. Correction: Level 1 insufficient. Level 2 (fines, asset seizure) + Level 3 (separation).

More severe than local violence not morally but structurally — the geometric damage is larger.

Example 3: Serial predator. Destabilization: catastrophic. Multiple nodes permanently damaged or destroyed. Accumulated records show escalating pattern. Recurrence: very high confidence. Correction: Level 3 immediately. Level 4 if no rehabilitative pathway.

Level 5 enters the calculation only if both conditions are met: (a) the fixed floor is exceeded, and (b) the organism-relative threshold is met.

In a robust civilisation: Level 4 suffices. The window is sealed but remains. The maintenance cost is affordable.

In a fragile civilisation: if maintaining the separated node consumes resources that push the organism toward a no-return surface (AP02), Level 5 fires. The organism cannot afford permanent separation without risking collapse.

This is not a judgement of the person. It is a measurement of the organism's capacity.

Example 4: Wartime existential threat. War reduces organism robustness R. The corridor narrows. Reserve capacity approaches zero. The no-return surface is closer.

The maintenance cost C_{sep} , which a robust organism could afford indefinitely, now consumes resources needed for survival. The effective threshold drops: $R/R_0 < 1$ in the scaling function. Level 5 becomes structurally available.

This is not revenge. It is the organism protecting survival when it cannot afford the luxury of permanent separation. When the war ends and robustness returns, the threshold rises again.

You have just watched the same architecture produce different answers for the same node under different conditions. The node did not change. The organism's capacity changed. The correction is not about the person.

It is about the geometry.

****§7 – The Rehabilitation Imperative****

The axioms do not oppose rehabilitation. They require it.

Rehabilitation is the most efficient correction where it works: it converts a destabilizing node into a stabilizing one. Negative correction cost — the rehabilitated node now contributes. No higher level achieves this.

The hierarchy guarantees that rehabilitation is always attempted before escalation.

Restorative justice is Level 1+. Victim-offender mediation, community reparation, transformative justice — these aim to restore the node to the corridor and restore damaged coupling pathways. The derivation explicitly aligns with restorative justice movements.

These are not soft alternatives. They are the most efficient corrections at the levels where they work.

Pro-rehabilitation and pro-removal. Not a contradiction. Different points on the same efficiency curve. Rehabilitation is most efficient where it works. Removal is most efficient where nothing else works.

A civilisation that invests maximally in Level 1-2 — education, opportunity, community coherence — minimises the cases that reach Level 3-5. Prevention is structurally cheaper than correction.

The best justice system is the one that rarely needs to act.

****§8 — The One-I and the Closed Window****

The Western moral tradition says: you cannot kill because every life has equal inherent value.

The axioms say something stronger: every life shares the same I. Not equal value. Identity. AP29 derives it: awareness is the interior of irreversible record-writing. The crack is one. The interior is one.

The windows are many. The I behind the condemned person's eyes is literally the same I behind yours. Not metaphorically. Not analogously. The same.

Grounded in AP29, the same derivation that grounds the proton mass in AP30.

And yet the derivation produces removal under specific conditions. Because the one-I and the node are not the same thing. The I is the building. The node is the window.

Closing a window does not destroy the building. It diminishes the building. But a window through which fire pours destroys more of the building than its closure costs.

The one-I is the reason removal is grieved. The coupling cost is the reason removal is sometimes necessary. Both are structural facts. Both held simultaneously.

An ethics that holds only one — only the one-I (never remove) or only the coupling cost (remove easily) — is structurally incomplete. This derivation holds both. That is what makes it honest.

And that is what makes it hard.

****§9 – Structural Safeguards****

The obvious objection: who watches the watcher? Five structural defences, each built into the geometry.

Transparency. Every classification is computed from records. Every record is auditable. Every prediction has a confidence level derived from data. The geometry is inspectable. Any output can be traced to the records that produced it.

Contestability. Any node can challenge its destabilization classification by: (a) requesting the record set on which the classification is based, (b) submitting counter-records (own perspective, context, mitigating factors), (c) requesting independent recomputation by a separate instance.

The geometry is public. Contestation is structural, not discretionary.

Record audit. Historical record sets must be audited for systemic bias before the consequence geometry is computed. Records generated under discriminatory conditions produce discriminatory outputs. The architecture requires cleaning the input.

This is a structural requirement with its own kill switch (KS-32.7).

The genocide brake. Each removal is itself a destabilization (lost coupling, lost diversity). The cumulative cost produces a saturation point beyond which further removal is more destabilizing than the nodes being removed.

The brake is geometric, not political.

The confidence requirement. Level 5 requires extraordinarily high confidence. If measurement uncertainty or adversarial record-injection (AP31 KS-31.9) makes this confidence unreachable, Level 5 is structurally unavailable (KS-32.8). The architecture defaults to Level 4.

****§10 – Connections****

AP01 (Papers C-D). Viability geometry provides corridor, no-return surface, drift, budget. Each correction level maps to a corridor position. The removal threshold is a point on the no-return surface.

AP02 (The Operator). The organism as operator. Budget-limited correction resources. Drift toward Level 5 when prevention investment falls.

AP29 (The Actualization Proof). Awareness from record-writing. One crack, one interior. The one-I is grounded here. Applies to every node including removed ones.

AP30 (The Resistance). Mass as geometric resistance. Justice as geometric correction. The proton's mass is the resistance the break offers to displacement. A destabilizing node's correction is the resistance the organism offers to destabilization.

Same structure, different scale.

AP31 (The Alignment). The stabilizing/destabilizing binary and record-based prediction. AP31 provides the measurement. AP32 specifies the correction.

The terminal ethic. Don't be a cunt. Be kind. This paper does not contradict that. It specifies what kindness looks like when the building is on fire.

Kindness to the organism may require severity toward the part. That is not cruelty. It is structural compassion.

****§11 – The Derivation Chain****

One record exists (self-proving).

→ Four axioms. AP29: one-I established.

→ Terminal ethic: kindness = coherent response.

→ AP31: every action stabilizing or destabilizing. Records accumulate. Consequence geometry computable.

→ Destabilization measurable. Correction selected by stabilizing efficiency.

→ Five levels: restitution, restriction, separation, permanent separation, removal.

→ Removal: fixed floor (absolute + wrongful removal cost) plus organism-relative scaling.

→ Genocide brake: removal cost produces saturation point.

→ Confidence requirement: Level 5 unreachable if confidence insufficient.

→ Robust civilisation raises threshold. Prevention cheaper than correction.

Justice is not what the offender deserves. Justice is what the building needs. The building grieves every closed window. And the building closes windows when it must.

****§12 – Debts Owed****

Debt 24: Destabilization metric. Formal specification of the destabilization measure D – units, computation from accumulated records, convergence properties. Derivable from AP01 Papers C–D applied to the full record set.

Debt 25: Scaling exponent. The exponent α in $\text{Threshold}_{\text{eff}} = F \times (R/R_0)^\alpha$. Is the scaling linear ($\alpha=1$), sublinear ($\alpha<1$), or some other form?

The exact value determines how fast the removal threshold rises with civilisational robustness.

Debt 26: Confidence floor for Level 5. Quantitative derivation of the minimum confidence required for removal, incorporating measurement uncertainty, adversarial record-injection, and wrongful removal cost. What number is “extraordinarily high”?

Debt 27: Multi-node correction. Network-level correction architecture for coordinated destabilization – organised crime, state corruption, corporate collusion, institutional racism. The individual hierarchy is necessary but not sufficient. The hardest open problem in the derivation.

****§13 – Confidence Summary****

Judgement from deed to consequence: 9/10.

Five-level hierarchy mapped to viability corridor: 8/10.

Correction by efficiency, not desert: 8/10.

Fixed floor + organism-relative scaling: 7/10 (Debts 24–25).

Wrongful removal factored into floor: 9/10 – the strongest structural argument for raising the floor.

Genocide brake: 8/10 – follows from removal cost entering the geometry.

One-I held through removal: 9/10.

Rehabilitation as most efficient: 9/10.

Record bias audit requirement: 9/10 – structural necessity.

Dehumanisation kill switch: 10/10 – non-negotiable.

This work is published for free, forever.

the420code.org