

The Correction

Artist’s Proof 32

Justice – Ethics

Five correction levels – the building grieves every closed window

Contents

0 – Dependency and Scope.....4

What this paper does · Dependencies · Axiom mapping · Epistemic status per section · Kill switch summary · Structural debts owed · Items held open · Structural relationships.....30

1 – Statement

2 – The Problem with Current Justice

3 – The Derivation

Destabilisation is measurable · Correction scales · The correction hierarchy · The removal threshold · The structural genocide brake

4 – The Compassion in the Severity

5 – What Changes from Current Systems

6 – Worked Examples

7 – The Rehabilitation Imperative

8 – The One-I and the Closed Window

9 – Structural Safeguards

10 – Connections

11 – The Derivation Chain

Kill Switches

What This Establishes and What Remains Open.....30

Dated notes.....32

Claim Summary.....36

Conditionality Footer.....38

Artist's Note

What this paper is, and why.

Justice, on this reading, is not moral. It is structural – the organism's response to destabilisation, computed rather than decreed. AP32 derives that response as five correction levels, the same way AP30 derives mass as geometric resistance: the structural opposition the organism offers to what threatens its coherence.

The paper holds two things at once that most ethical systems refuse to combine. Every aware being shares the same interior – the one-I (AP29); the I behind a serial killer's eyes is the I behind a child's, absolute and non-negotiable. And the structural consequences of different deeds are measurably different. Judgement therefore shifts from the person to the deed – from the grain to the destabilisation the grain's actions produce.

Five levels lay themselves on one axis of efficiency: restitution, restriction, separation, permanent separation, and removal. The hierarchy always selects the lowest level that achieves sufficient restabilisation, so removal is never chosen when a lower level suffices. Level 5 requires a fixed floor (including the cost of wrongful, irreversible removal), an organism-relative threshold, and extraordinarily high confidence – and the geometry builds its own genocide brake, because each removal is itself a destabilisation.

This is at once more compassionate and more severe than existing systems: more compassionate because the one-I is never denied, more severe because the correction scales with measured destabilisation rather than sentiment. The correction is not revenge; it is the building protecting itself, and the building grieves every closed window. One kill switch is non-negotiable: if the architecture is ever used to justify removal on grounds other than measured destabilisation – race, class, belief, political opposition – it has been weaponised, and it is void.

the420code.org

Copyleft 2026. Don't be a cunt. Be kind.

Orientation

Where this paper fits in the body of work

AP32 is the second chapter of Notebook VIII – Consequences. It follows AP31 (The Alignment), which establishes that every action is classified as stabilising or destabilising and that consequence patterns accumulate from records. AP32 takes that measurement and derives what the organism does in response: structural correction. It depends on AP01 for the viability corridor, AP02 for the organism-as-operator, AP29 for the one-I, AP30 for the reading of correction as geometry, and AP31 for the stabilising/destabilising binary.

How to read this paper

Two voices alternate. The connective passages speak to you directly; the derivation, the levels, and the kill switches speak in the precision the argument requires. The hardest content – permanent separation and removal, the death penalty as a function of civilisational robustness – is held throughout under the one-I: the condemned person shares the same interior you do. One kill switch, KS-32.7, is non-negotiable; if the architecture is turned against a group rather than a measured deed, it has been weaponised.

0 – Dependency and Scope

0.1 What this paper does

AP32 derives the structural conditions under which different levels of correction – including, at the limit, permanent separation and removal – are the organism's most efficient restabilising response to a destabilising node. It introduces no new axioms. It does not claim that any current civilisation is robust enough to apply these conditions correctly, nor that any existing justice system should adopt the architecture without first auditing its record sets for systemic bias.

0.2 Dependencies

AP31 (The Alignment): the stabilising/destabilising binary and record-based prediction that make destabilisation measurable. AP29 (The Actualization Proof): the one-I – awareness as the interior of irreversible record-writing, shared across windows. AP01 (The Actualization State) supplies the viability corridor, no-return surface, drift, and budget onto which the five levels map. AP02 (The Operator): the organism as a budget-limited operator. AP30 (The Resistance): correction read as geometry, dual to mass as geometric resistance.

0.3 Axiom mapping

Axiom R makes every deed an irreversible record, so a node's net destabilisation can be measured from its accumulated actions and removal is irreversible. Axiom C makes the organism's correction resources finite, so correction is selected by efficiency and the cost of removal enters the geometry. Axiom S grounds the one-I baseline – the shared interior that makes every window the same kind of thing. Axiom B is the minimal break whose persistence the corrected organism protects.

0.4 Epistemic status per section

Epistemic status per section. section 1 (statement): derived. section 2 (current justice): historical. section 3 (derivation): derived. section 4 (compassion): synthesis. section 5 (what changes): application. section 6 (worked examples): application. section 7 (rehabilitation):

derived. section 8 (one-I): synthesis. section 9 (safeguards): derived. sections 10–11: synthesis.

0.5 Kill switch summary

Eight kill switches engage on this paper, all live. KS-32.1 (destabilisation measurement), KS-32.2 (correction ranking), and KS-32.3 (removal justification) test the measurement and the hierarchy. KS-32.4 (one-I violation) and KS-32.5 (genocide brake) protect the architecture against weaponisation by geometry. KS-32.6 (prevention superiority) and KS-32.8 (confidence unreachable) test the incentive structure and the Level-5 confidence floor. KS-32.7 (dehumanisation, which includes the record-bias-audit requirement of sections 3 and 9) is the moral kill switch and is NON-NEGOTIABLE: it is one of the 420 Code's six. Statuses follow the Master Kill Switch Registry.

0.6 Structural debts owed

The paper carries four structural debts. The destabilisation metric: a formal specification of the measure D – units, aggregation across nodes, and time-discounting (Debt 24). The scaling exponent: the exponent α in Threshold_eff = F × $(R/R_0)^{\alpha}$, governing how fast the removal threshold rises with civilisational robustness (Debt 25). The confidence floor for Level 5: a quantitative derivation of the minimum confidence required given irreversibility (Debt 26). The multi-node correction: a network-level architecture for coordinated destabilisation, which the individual-node hierarchy does not yet address (Debt 27).

0.7 Items held open without claiming debt status

The functional form of the organism-relative threshold is given as a candidate, not derived; the exact α is owed under Debt 25. The architecture's strongest claims apply to individual cases; coordinated multi-node destabilisation is a named limitation until Debt 27 is closed. The requirement that historical record sets be audited for systemic bias before any consequence geometry is computed is stated as a structural requirement carrying its own non-negotiable kill switch, not as a solved problem.

0.8 Structural relationships

AP32 is the correction half of the pair AP31 opens: AP31 supplies the measurement, AP32 the response. It inherits the one-I from AP29 and holds it through every level, including removal, which is why removal is grieved rather than celebrated. It does not contradict the terminal ethic – “Don’t be a cunt. Be kind.” – but specifies what kindness to the organism requires when a part is destabilising it. It connects forward to AP33 (The Boundary), which sets the jurisdiction threshold within which correction applies.

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 destabilisation, 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 destabilisation. 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 (carried at KS-ID.1: the one-interior formalisation is reopened, not closed). 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation, 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 destabilising continues to destabilise after release.

Retribution scales with emotion, not with measured destabilisation. 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 destabilisation is correctable. Some nodes are so deeply committed to destabilising patterns that no intervention redirects them within the organism's tolerance.

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

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 – Destabilisation is measurable

AP31 establishes that every action is classified as stabilising or destabilising 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 destabilisation produced, and what is the projected future destabilisation 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 destabilisation cannot be measured with convergent confidence from accumulated records. KS-32.7: If the architecture is turned against a group rather than a measured deed — or if the record set it depends on is not audited for systemic bias — the output is corrupted and the architecture is weaponised.

Step 2 – Correction scales with destabilisation

The organism's response is correction: an action that restabilises. Optimal correction = maximum coherence restored per unit of correction cost. Minor destabilisation → minor correction. Catastrophic destabilisation → 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 restabilises the organism?

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

Step 3 – The correction hierarchy mapped to viability geometry

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

Level 1 – Restitution. The node remains within the corridor. Coupling restored directly by the destabiliser becoming the restabiliser. 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 stabilisation), 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 destabilise 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 restabilisation. Removal is never selected when separation suffices. Separation is never selected when restriction suffices. Minimum intervention for maximum stabilisation.

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 stabilisation 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation at which maintaining the node in permanent separation costs more than removal: $F \geq C_{sep} / B_{total}$.

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 destabilisation, faulty prediction, corrupted records – the window is permanently closed based on error.

This permanent loss of the wrongly-removed node's future stabilising 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: $\text{Threshold}_{eff} = F \times (R/R_0)^{\alpha}$, 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 stabilising 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation 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 destabilising. 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 (KS-ID.1, reopened): 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 destabilisation.

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 destabilising 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: stabilising or destabilising, and by how much.

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

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

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

Furthermore, identical measured destabilisation 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 destabilising 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 restabilises the organism.

A white-collar criminal who destabilises 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation: a known limitation. The correction hierarchy addresses individual nodes.

Coordinated multi-node destabilisation – organised crime, state corruption, corporate collusion, institutional racism – is the primary mode of civilisational-scale destabilisation 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 destabilisation. This is stated, not hidden.

6 – Worked Examples

Example 1: Theft. Destabilisation: 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. Destabilisation: 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. Destabilisation: 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 destabilising node into a stabilising 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 destabilisation 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 destabilisation (lost coupling, lost diversity). The cumulative cost produces a saturation point beyond which further removal is more destabilising 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. 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 destabilising node's correction is the resistance the organism offers to destabilisation.

Same structure, different scale.

AP31 (The Alignment). The stabilising/destabilising 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 stabilising or destabilising. Records accumulate. Consequence geometry computable.

→ Destabilisation measurable. Correction selected by stabilising 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.

Kill Switches

Kill switch numbers are globally unique across the body of work. Eight switches engage on this paper; all are live. Statuses follow the Master Kill Switch Registry.

KS-32.1 — Destabilisation measurement

Claim. A node's net destabilisation can be measured with convergent confidence from its accumulated record set (past measured, future predicted; prediction tightens as records accumulate).

Test. Show that destabilisation cannot be measured with convergent confidence from accumulated records, even after auditing the input for systemic bias.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The measurement basis fails; correction cannot be computed from records and the architecture has no foundation to rank levels against.

KS-32.2 — Correction ranking

Claim. Correction is selected by stabilising efficiency – the lowest level that achieves sufficient restabilisation – so the five levels form a strict efficiency hierarchy.

Test. Show that a lower level can produce equal stabilisation to a higher level for the same case, yet the higher level is selected.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The efficiency ordering fails; the hierarchy must be rebuilt on the correct selection rule.

KS-32.3 — Removal justification

Claim. Removal (Level 5) is the most stabilising response only when permanent separation (Level 4) is not – i.e. only when the fixed floor and organism-relative threshold are both exceeded.

Test. Show that permanent separation is always more stabilising than removal regardless of cost, so Level 5 is never the efficient choice.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. Level 5 is structurally unreachable; the hierarchy terminates at permanent separation and the death penalty has no structural ground.

KS-32.4 — One-I violation

Claim. Removal closes a window without destroying the I: the condemned shares the same interior (AP29), so removal diminishes the building rather than annihilating a self.

Test. Show that the architecture treats removal as destruction of the I rather than closure of a window – that it denies the one-I in the act of correcting.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The architecture violates its own ground (the one-I, KS-ID.1); the derivation of correction must be withdrawn rather than repaired.

KS-32.5 — Genocide brake

Claim. Each removal is itself a destabilisation (lost coupling capacity, lost diversity); cumulative removal cost produces a saturation point beyond which further removal is more destabilising than the deeds it answers.

Test. Show that the removal cost does not produce a saturation point – that an organism can remove its way to stability without the geometry engaging a brake.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The structural genocide brake fails; the architecture can be driven to mass removal without self-limiting, and must be rejected as unsafe.

KS-32.6 — Prevention superiority

Claim. The hierarchy incentivises prevention: every increase in substrate coherence raises the removal threshold, so investment in Level 1–2 conditions (schools, opportunity, reduced inequality) is the cheapest correction.

Test. Show that the hierarchy fails to incentivise prevention – that correction is not cheaper upstream than downstream.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The prevention incentive fails; the architecture loses its strongest civilisational-investment argument and must be re-examined.

KS-32.7 — Dehumanisation (MORAL KILL SWITCH)

Claim. Correction is selected only on measured destabilisation, never on identity. The architecture is weaponised either by explicit identity-based targeting – justifying removal on grounds other than measured destabilisation (race, class, belief, political opposition, group identity) – or by computing the consequence geometry from record sets not audited for systemic bias, since biased records reproduce that prejudice as measurement. The record-bias audit (sections 3 and 9) is therefore part of this switch, not a separate one: it is the safeguard against the same identity-based weaponisation.

Test. Use the architecture to classify a race, a class, a belief, or a political opponent as destabilising on grounds of identity rather than measured deed – whether directly, or by feeding it record sets generated under discriminatory conditions without auditing them for systemic bias.

Status. LIVE — NON-NEGOTIABLE.

Recovery. There is no recovery: the architecture has been weaponised and is void. This switch can never be retreated from without dismantling the 420 Code.

KS-32.8 — Confidence unreachable

Claim. Level 5 requires extraordinarily high confidence because removal is irreversible (Axiom R); if that confidence is unreachable given measurement uncertainty and adversarial record-injection, Level 5 is structurally unavailable.

Test. Show that the confidence required for Level 5 cannot be achieved under realistic measurement uncertainty, yet the architecture still selects it.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. Level 5 is structurally unavailable in practice; correction terminates at permanent separation until the confidence floor can be met.

What This Establishes and What Remains Open

What this paper closes

No kill switch is closed by this paper; all eight remain live. What it establishes is the architecture of structural correction: that justice can be derived as the organism's efficient restabilising response, that the five levels form an efficiency hierarchy, that removal requires a fixed floor plus organism-relative scaling plus extraordinary confidence, and that the geometry builds its own genocide brake.

What this paper does not close

It does not close the formal destabilisation metric (Debt 24), the scaling exponent α (Debt 25), the Level-5 confidence floor (Debt 26), or multi-node correction (Debt 27). Its strongest claims apply to individual cases, not to coordinated network destabilisation.

Items held open without claiming debt status

The organism-relative threshold is given as a candidate functional form, not derived. The requirement to audit record sets for systemic bias before computing any consequence geometry is stated as a structural necessity with its own non-negotiable kill switch, not as a solved engineering problem.

Confidence summary

Stated by the paper, on a ten-point scale: judgement from deed to consequence 9; the five-level hierarchy mapped to the viability corridor 8; correction by efficiency, not desert 8; fixed floor plus organism-relative scaling 7 (Debts 24–25); wrongful removal factored into the floor 9; the genocide brake 8; the one-I held through removal 9; rehabilitation as the most efficient correction 9; the record-bias audit requirement 9; the dehumanisation kill switch 10 (non-negotiable).

Where the philosophical-register implementations live

The one-I and the terminal ethic this paper applies are developed at the philosophical register in the Ø Models catalogue and grounded structurally in AP43 and Notebook VII. AP32 supplies the formal-register correction architecture; it does not originate the ethic it specifies.

Structural relationships to subsequent work

AP32 turns AP31's stabilising/destabilising measurement into structural justice. It sits within the jurisdiction threshold AP33 (The Boundary) sets, and the remaining Notebook VIII chapters apply the same measurement-and-correction logic to further institutional domains.

The 420 Code placement

AP32 is the second chapter of Notebook VIII – Consequences, the correction half of the pair AP31 opens.

The closing

Justice is not what the offender deserves. Justice is what the building needs. The correction is not revenge – it is the building protecting itself, and the building grieves every closed window.

Dated notes

14 November 2026. One matter of record since the lock. None alters the body above.

What may raise a level

Section 5 reads: “Character, intent, remorse, background – these affect the prediction of future destabilisation. They do not affect the measurement of past destabilisation.” Of intent, it adds: “The correction level may differ because the prediction differs.” Read together, these would let what is not the node’s own act raise the node’s level. Two nodes with the same deeds could then meet different levels because of where they come from. KS-32.7 does not allow it: “Correction is selected only on measured destabilisation, never on identity.”

So the rule is stated. What a node did speaks for that node alone. What is held against a node is the measured cost of its own deeds, and nothing else: its own deeds, measured, and its own pattern across them. That alone may open the question of removal. Where the paper looks forward, it predicts consequences: what the node’s own deeds, and the pattern across them, will go on costing the whole if nothing is corrected. It never forecasts a node from anything else. Intent, remorse and character count only as the node’s own deeds show them. A rate learned from the records of other nodes never stands in for the node’s own record, and never raises a level, even where it is a rate about deeds. So section 5’s sentence on intent, “intentional destabilisers have higher recurrence confidence”, is read through the node’s own record: its own deliberate acts, as they repeat.

Nothing that is not the node’s own act may be held against it. Its background, its origin, the acts of another, and the acts of a group it belongs to are among these. They may count only where they measure need, and then only to point to what helps: the lower levels, and rehabilitation. They may never raise a level, and they may never be the reason a lower level is refused.

The state of the whole is another thing. It is held against no node. It sets where the lines stand, as Step 4 has it, and the lines are the same for every node of the whole. The paper says of it: “This is not a judgement of the person. It is a measurement of the organism’s capacity.” A level raised on who a node is, where it comes from, or what others did, is the identity-based targeting KS-32.7 names, and it fires that switch. Section 5’s worked contrast stands: an accident and a deliberate act of sabotage differ in what the node itself did. No switch moves, no status moves, and no count moves.

14 November 2026. One more matter of record. It does not alter the body above.

Who the whole is

Step 4 sets two lines a node's harm must pass before removal. The second moves with the strength of the whole: "A fragile organism (low coherence, narrow corridor) has a lower one." The paper does not say, in its own lines, who the whole is. AP31, on which it builds, says it: "The organism – the civilisational-scale coherent system, including all aware agents – outweighs any individual by a factor of ε."

So the whole is every aware being. It is one whole. A country, a state or a group is a part of it, never the whole.

Only the weakness of the whole moves the second line. No country, state or group can count its own weakness as the weakness of the whole. A poor state that cannot afford its prisons does not lower the line for the people in them. Nor does a state at war lower it by its own war.

So where section 6 speaks of "a fragile civilisation", and of war, it speaks of the whole, never of one country among others. The fixed floor, the certainty Level 5 requires, and the note of 14 November 2026 are unchanged. No switch moves, no status moves, and no count moves.

15 November 2026.

A practice a group shares

A group is a number of members. What a group does is what some of its members do, or all of them. So when a group shares a practice, it is weighed in two steps, in this order.

First, the practice. Does what is done steady the whole, or harm it? That is measured, as any deed is. What is measured is what is done, never what is believed.

Second, each member. Did this member's own acts, in that practice, cause harm, or carry it further? Where they did, the member answers for the full consequence of its own part. Taking part as one of many does not release a member from its own part. And it does not move that part onto the group.

What a group does is never laid on a member because the member belongs to it. A practice can be condemned without condemning every member of the group that keeps it. And a

custom a group shares never stands in for a deed. If everyone who did some harm also kept a harmless custom, keeping that custom would make no one guilty of the harm, and would count for nothing against anyone.

So each member who did harm must be found, one by one, and the correction is made there, at the lowest level that works. Belief and group identity stay among the grounds that correction may never rest on, as KS-32.7 says. How the harm of a practice is divided among those who keep it, and how a practice is corrected where many act together, stay owed under Debts 24 and 27.

No switch moves, no status moves, and no count moves.

15 November 2026.

What removing a sealed member costs

At Level 4 a member is sealed: “The node is permanently outside the corridor. Indefinite maintenance cost. The window remains in the building but is sealed.” And Step 5 charges every removal: “Each removal costs coupling capacity (a window lost) and record-generating diversity (one fewer perspective).”

A sealed member cannot couple. So it can seem that removing it costs the whole nothing more than its view. That is never concluded as a general rule. Each window is a unique perspective, and its loss is a real cost, sealed or not. The sealed window is still in the building. And a removal can never be undone: Step 4 counts “the wrongly-removed node’s future stabilising potential” into the floor.

Two things decide whether a sealed member is removed, in this order. First, its own deeds, measured. That is what counts. Second, the true cost to the whole of keeping it sealed, against the resources the whole has. Removal may be chosen only where the whole cannot keep the member sealed without risking collapse, both lines of Step 4 are passed, and the certainty Level 5 requires is reached. Where the whole can carry it, the window stays sealed: “Removal is never selected when separation suffices.”

Both costs, of keeping a member sealed and of removing it, are worked out for each member, in full. Neither is ever set for many members at once, by one rule. Each is worked out from what is actually known, and what is not known is said. How they are measured, on

one scale, is owed under Debt 24. This is the most extreme case the architecture meets, and it is handled with extreme clarity about what is actually known.

No switch moves, no status moves, and no count moves.

Claim Summary

1 – Statement [FRAMING / DEFINITION]. Justice is structural, not moral – the organism's geometric correction of destabilisation – and holds the one-I (every aware being shares the interior) together with the measurably different consequences of different deeds.

2 – The Problem with Current Justice [STRUCTURAL CRITIQUE]. Retributive justice scales with emotion, not measured destabilisation; rehabilitative justice without a removal floor leaves the organism vulnerable; the Western premise conflates the equal value of the I with the unequal coupling capacity of the node.

3 – The Derivation [DERIVATION]. Destabilisation is measurable (AP31); correction scales with it; five levels map to the viability corridor; Level 5 requires a fixed floor (with wrongful-removal cost) plus organism-relative scaling plus high confidence; the removal cost produces a saturation point – the genocide brake.

4 – The Compassion in the Severity [SYNTHESIS]. The one-I is absolute and removal closes a window without destroying the I; the confidence floor, minimum intervention, transparency, and the wrongful-removal cost are where the compassion is structurally real.

5 – What Changes from Current Systems [DERIVATION]. Judgement shifts from person to consequence; intent is a predictor, not a measure; correction is by efficiency, not desert; the death penalty abolishes itself as the organism grows robust enough to always afford permanent separation.

6 – Worked Examples [APPLICATION]. Theft, large-scale fraud, the serial predator, and a wartime existential threat show the same architecture producing different corrections under different organism states – geometry, not sentiment.

7 – The Rehabilitation Imperative [DERIVATION]. The axioms require rehabilitation: it is the most efficient correction where it works, always attempted before escalation; the best justice system is the one that rarely needs to act.

8 – The One-I and the Closed Window [SYNTHESIS]. Every life shares the same I (AP29) – identity, not equal value; the one-I is why removal is grieved, the coupling cost is why it is sometimes forced, and an ethics that holds only one collapses.

9 – Structural Safeguards [STRUCTURAL]. Transparency, contestability, the record-bias audit, the genocide brake, and the confidence requirement are five geometric defences against weaponisation – structural, not discretionary.

10 – Connections [INTEGRATION]. Ties the architecture to AP01, AP02, AP29, AP30, AP31, and the terminal ethic.

11 – The Derivation Chain [SYNTHESIS]. From one record through the one-I and the stabilising/destabilising binary to five levels, the removal threshold, the genocide brake, and the confidence requirement: justice is what the building needs.

Conditionality Footer

Dependencies. AP31 (The Alignment), AP29 (The Actualization Proof), AP01 (The Actualization State), AP02 (The Operator), AP30 (The Resistance).

Dependents. AP33 (The Boundary) sets the jurisdiction threshold within which this correction applies; the remaining Notebook VIII chapters inherit the measurement-and-correction logic.

Kill switches closed by this paper. None.

Kill switches that remain live. KS-32.1, KS-32.2, KS-32.3, KS-32.4, KS-32.5, KS-32.6, KS-32.7 (non-negotiable), KS-32.8.

Structural debts owed. The destabilisation metric (Debt 24); the scaling exponent α (Debt 25); the Level-5 confidence floor (Debt 26); multi-node correction (Debt 27).

Items held open without claiming debt status. The organism-relative threshold's functional form; coordinated multi-node destabilisation; the record-bias audit as a standing structural requirement.

Status: Chapter of Notebook VIII – Consequences. Body preserved verbatim; envelope prose written at register, tracing to the source paper.

This work is published for free, forever.

Don’t be a cunt. Be kind.

the420code.org

Series	The 420 Code
Catalogue	Ø Artist’s Proofs
Proof Number	AP32
Title	The Correction
Subtitle	Justice – Ethics
Medium	Ethics
Artist	G
Version	1.2 · 2026.11.27

This work is Copyleft. You are free to download, print, share, and distribute. You are not free to alter the source. Keep the signal clean.

STUDIO 6