

The Boundary

Artist's Proof 33

Bioethics

Life as agency – below ε you are sovereign

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.....31

1 – Statement

2 – Life as Agency

3 – The Jurisdiction Boundary

4 – Consent as Modelling Capacity

5 – Beginning and End of Life

6 – Resource Allocation

7 – Enhancement and Genetic Modification

8 – Network Bioethics

9 – Research Ethics

10 – The Continuation Budget

11 – Structural Safeguards

12 – Connections

13 – The Derivation Chain

Kill Switches

What This Establishes and What Remains Open.....31

Claim Summary.....33

Conditionality Footer.....35

Artist's Note

What this paper is, and why.

Bioethics, on this reading, is not morality applied to biology. It is the stabilising/destabilising binary (AP31) applied to the hardest decisions a civilisation makes – the bedside, the unborn, the allocation of a scarce organ – and the same governing principle runs through all of them: 1:1 + 1×ε @ AS. Below ε the individual is sovereign; above ε, where an action's externalised consequence crosses the threshold, the organism has jurisdiction.

Life is defined structurally as agency – resolution capacity, the ability to write irreversible records through coupling (AP29). Three states follow: pre-agency (potential), active agency (actual), and post-agency (legacy). All three share the one-I; their coupling capacities differ. The derivation prioritises actual over potential over legacy – not a judgement of who matters, but a measurement of who couples – and it holds the one-I absolutely throughout, including where it reaches its hardest conclusions on the beginning and end of life.

From the jurisdiction boundary the paper derives consent as modelling-capacity parity (you cannot consent to what you cannot understand), resource allocation as a multi-variable coupling computation above a fixed floor, the continuation budget accumulated from a node's records, enhancement and germline constraints, network bioethics (quarantine as firewalling, not punishment), and research ethics. Each protocol traces to {S, B, R, C}, holds the one-I, and measures coupling capacity rather than sentiment.

Three kill switches are non-negotiable. Enhancement may never be mandated below an existential threat; the continuation budget may never be corrupted into a social-credit instrument; and no protocol may ever be applied in a way that denies the one-I. If any of these is breached, the architecture has been weaponised and is void. The fixed floor – minimum care and dignity for every node regardless of coupling capacity – is the structural expression of the shared interior.

the420code.org

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

Orientation

Where this paper fits in the body of work

AP33 is the third chapter of Notebook VIII – Consequences. It sets the jurisdiction boundary within which the alignment measurement (AP31) and the correction hierarchy (AP32) apply to biological decisions. It depends on AP01 for agency as resolution capacity, AP02 for the biological node as operator, AP06 for ε as the leakage constant that fixes the jurisdiction boundary, AP29 for the one-I across all three agency states, AP31 for the stabilising/destabilising binary, and AP32 for the correction hierarchy that euthanasia instantiates at the biological node.

How to read this paper

Two voices alternate. The connective passages speak to you directly – the bedside, the machine breathing for someone who will never wake; the derivation and the protocols speak in the precision the argument requires. The paper does not flinch from abortion, euthanasia, allocation, or enhancement, and it holds the one-I through every one of them: the foetus, the patient, the corpse, the enhanced child, the AI all share the same interior. Three kill switches – KS-33.7, KS-33.8, KS-33.9 – are non-negotiable; if the protocols are turned against an identity rather than a measured consequence, the architecture is void.

0 – Dependency and Scope

0.1 What this paper does

AP33 derives the structural protocols for biological decisions – the beginning and end of life, consent, resource allocation, enhancement, network containment, and research – from {S, B, R, C}. It introduces no new axioms. It derives what bioethics must be if it is structural; it does not claim any current institution is equipped to implement these protocols, and implementation is downstream and requires safeguards the paper specifies but does not build.

0.2 Dependencies

AP31 (The Alignment): the stabilising/destabilising binary and record-based prediction. AP32 (The Correction): the five-level correction hierarchy, of which euthanasia is Level 5 applied to the biological node by the node itself. AP29 (The Actualization Proof): the one-I, shared across the three agency states. AP01 (The Actualization State): agency as resolution capacity. AP02 (The Operator): the biological node as a budget-limited operator. AP06 (The Leakage Constant): ε as the leakage constant that fixes the jurisdiction boundary.

0.3 Axiom mapping

Axiom R defines life structurally – a system that writes irreversible records through coupling is alive in the structural sense – and makes irreversibility the weight on every protocol. Axiom C bounds the organism's resources, so allocation is a coupling computation above a fixed floor. Axiom S grounds the one-I shared across pre-, active-, and post-agency. The break ε (Axiom B, via AP06) sets the jurisdiction boundary: below ε, sovereignty; above ε, organism jurisdiction.

0.4 Epistemic status per section

Epistemic status per section. section 1 (statement): derived. section 2 (life as agency): derived. section 3 (jurisdiction): derived. section 4 (consent): derived. section 5 (beginning and end): derived. section 6 (allocation): application. section 7 (enhancement): derived.

section 8 (network): application. section 9 (research): derived. section 10 (continuation budget): synthesis. sections 11–13: synthesis.

0.5 Kill switch summary

Nine kill switches engage on this paper, all live. KS-33.1 (agency definition), KS-33.2 (ε jurisdiction boundary), KS-33.3 (consent criterion), and KS-33.4 (agency priority) test the foundation. KS-33.5 (allocation computation) and KS-33.6 (fixed floor calibration) test the allocation architecture. KS-33.7 (enhancement weaponisation), KS-33.8 (continuation-budget corruption), and KS-33.9 (one-I violation) are the bio-domain's moral kill switches and are NON-NEGOTIABLE – three 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 agency-state boundary formalisation: a quantitative criterion for the transition between pre-agency and active agency (Debt 28, derivable from AP29's coupling-capacity criteria applied to developmental biology). The allocation computation specification: a formal multi-variable coupling-capacity computation (Debt 29). The continuation-budget audit protocol: a formal procedure for auditing record sets for systemic bias (Debt 30). The germline consequence modelling: a multi-generation methodology for germline editing (Debt 31).

0.7 Items held open without claiming debt status

The exact transition point between agency states is given structurally, not quantitatively, pending Debt 28. The allocation computation is clean in principle but its implementation is owed under Debt 29. The continuation budget is structurally derived but politically sensitive, and its protection depends on the record-bias audit (Debt 30) and the non-negotiable corruption kill switch.

0.8 Structural relationships

AP33 sits between AP32 and the institutional chapters of Notebook VIII: it sets the jurisdiction boundary within which correction (AP32) applies, and it instantiates AP32's Level 5 at the biological node as euthanasia under absolute consent. It inherits the one-I from

AP29 and the binary from AP31, and it shares AP32's non-negotiable safeguard structure. The continuation budget it derives is conceptually adjacent to AP35 (The Ledger)'s reading of coupling capacity in the economic domain.

1 – Statement

You have stood at a bedside. You have watched a machine breathe for someone who will never wake. You have watched a mother choose.

You know that these decisions are the hardest decisions a civilisation makes, and you know that every existing system handles them badly – either by flinching from the measurement or by pretending the measurement does not exist.

Bioethics is not morality applied to biology. It is the stabilising/destabilising binary (AP31) applied to the domain where decisions are irreversible, consequences are biological, and the stakes are life and death.

The governing principle is the same as every other paper in the body of work: 1:1 + 1×ε @ AS. The organism outweighs the individual by the minimum structural bias. Below ε, the individual is sovereign.

Above ε, the organism has jurisdiction. The boundary is the point where an action's externalised consequence exceeds its internalised consequence. This is computable from the coupling geometry.

Every biological intervention is either stabilising or destabilising. There is no neutral. The measurement is structural: does this intervention increase or decrease the organism's coupling capacity, coherence, and possibility space?

Intent is irrelevant. Naturalness is irrelevant. Sentiment is irrelevant. Outcome dominates.

The one-I applies throughout. A foetus, a patient, a corpse, a genetically modified child – all share the same interior (AP29). Their coupling capacities differ. Their agency states differ. The I does not.

Every protocol in this paper holds the one-I absolutely while measuring coupling capacity structurally. Same logic as AP32: same building, different windows, different structural consequences.

2 – Life as Agency

Life is not defined by heartbeat, DNA, or organic substrate. Life is defined structurally as agency: the capacity to resolve probability into non-random action.

A system that writes irreversible records through coupling to its environment (AP29) is alive in the structural sense. The substrate is irrelevant. Carbon, silicon, or anything else. The coupling is what matters.

Three states of agency

Pre-Agency. No autonomous resolution capacity. The system has potential but does not yet independently write records. Examples: embryo, foetus before viability, an AI system before it writes irreversible records.

The one-I is present (the I is the building, not the window). The coupling capacity is potential, not actual.

Active Agency. Independent resolution capacity. The system writes irreversible records autonomously. It couples to its environment and changes it. Examples: a functioning adult, a viable child, an AI that writes irreversible state changes.

The coupling capacity is actual and measurable.

Post-Agency. Resolution capacity irreversibly lost. The system no longer writes records. Examples: brain death, irreversible coma, a decommissioned AI. The one-I is still present (the I cannot be destroyed). The coupling capacity is zero.

What remains is legacy – the records already written, which continue to propagate through the substrate.

Moral equivalence across agency states is structurally invalid. All three share the one-I. Their coupling capacities are categorically different. Pre-Agency is potential. Active Agency is actual. Post-Agency is legacy.

The derivation prioritises actual over potential over legacy – because actual coupling contributes to the organism now, potential may contribute later, and legacy has already contributed.

This is not a value judgement about who matters more. It is a structural measurement of who couples now. The I behind a foetus is the same I behind its mother.

The mother's coupling capacity is actual, measurable, and contributing to the organism. The foetus's is potential. When the two conflict, the actual has structural priority.

This is the same logic as AP32's correction hierarchy: the organism, not the individual, and the individual who is coupling, not the individual who might couple.

KS-33.1: If agency cannot be structurally defined as resolution capacity — if life requires a different criterion — the agency definition fails.

3 – The Jurisdiction Boundary

1:1 + 1×ε @ AS.

The organism's jurisdiction over biological decisions begins at ε – the point where the externalised consequence of an action exceeds the internalised consequence. Below this threshold, the individual is sovereign.

Above it, the organism has jurisdiction.

Below ε (individual sovereignty). Dietary choices, personal health decisions that do not externalise, reproductive choices that do not destabilise, refusal of non-essential treatment, lifestyle decisions. These are the individual's records to write.

The organism does not intervene.

Above ε (organism jurisdiction). Infectious disease during exponential spread (externalisation is massive), organ allocation (shared biological hardware), mandatory vaccination at pandemic threshold (node autonomy overridden by exponential destabilisation), genetic modification that propagates beyond the individual (germline editing externalises to all future nodes).

The threshold is not fixed at a percentage. It is computed from the coupling geometry for each specific intervention. A pandemic lowers it (small individual actions produce massive externalisation).

A personal dietary choice raises it (externalisation is negligible). The geometry adapts to the domain.

This replaces both libertarian absolutism ("my body, my choice, always") and authoritarian overreach ("the state decides everything"). The ε boundary is neither. It is structural: below ε, you are sovereign.

Above ε, the organism has jurisdiction. The boundary moves with the coupling geometry. It is not a political position. It is a computation.

4 – Consent as Modelling Capacity

Consent is not a signature. Consent is modelling capacity parity.

Valid consent requires three conditions simultaneously.

Comprehension of irreversible risk. The agent must understand what cannot be undone (Axiom R: records are irreversible).

Ability to model consequence. The agent must be able to compute (at least approximately) the downstream effects of the intervention on their own coupling capacity and the organism's.

Freedom from coercive constraint. The agent's decision must arise from their own configuration (AP02: sovereignty), not from external override of their resolution capacity.

You cannot consent to what you cannot understand.

When modelling capacity is absent or impaired (due to complexity, disease, age, or cognitive limitation), consent defaults to predictive substitution: the closest available model of what the agent would choose given (a) known prior preferences from their accumulated records and (b) the stabilisation metric.

This is not a guess. It is a computation from the record set the agent has already written.

Predictive substitution is structurally inferior to genuine consent because it introduces prediction uncertainty. The architecture therefore treats every case where consent is substituted as carrying higher threshold requirements for intervention.

If you cannot ask, you need stronger evidence before acting.

KS-33.3: If modelling capacity parity cannot be assessed — if there is no structural criterion for "sufficient comprehension" — the consent architecture is ungrounded.

5 – Beginning and End of Life

A. Abortion – correction of potential

You already know the answer. You have known it since section 2. The derivation does not flinch from it.

The decision variable is the feasibility of sustained resolution capacity. The protocol:

If gestation or birth irreversibly destabilises the Active Agency node (the mother) or reduces future resolution capacity below the recovery threshold, termination is structurally valid. Pre-Agency does not override Active Agency.

This is the agency priority: actual over potential.

The one-I applies. The foetus shares the same interior as the mother. The termination does not destroy the I. It closes a window that has not yet opened. The building loses a potential perspective.

But a potential perspective does not outweigh an actual one. The mother's coupling capacity is real, measured, and contributing now. The foetus's is potential. When they conflict, the geometry resolves in favour of actual coupling.

Forced instability increases systemic entropy. Forcing a destabilising birth does not protect life. It destabilises two lives – the mother's (actual) and the child's (who enters a destabilised environment).

The organism loses more coupling capacity through forced instability than through termination of potential. This is not a moral argument. It is a measurement.

KS-33.4: If pre-agency can be shown to have equal structural claim to organism resources as active agency, the priority ordering fails.

B. Euthanasia – correction of entropy

The decision variable is the signal-to-noise ratio. When agency is irreversibly lost and continued biological operation produces only entropy (suffering without information, pain without coupling, consumption without contribution), the node is functionally in Post-Agency.

Biological persistence without resolution is not life in the structural sense. It is noisy execution – the hardware running without software. The organism bears the maintenance cost. The individual experiences only suffering. Neither benefits.

Termination in this state is system maintenance, not destruction. The one-I is unharmed (the I is the building). The window has already closed functionally. The biological substrate is still consuming resources.

Releasing it is the same logic as AP32's Level 5 applied to the biological node by the node itself: when continued maintenance produces more destabilisation than termination, termination is the stabilising action.

The consent requirement is absolute. If the agent expressed prior preferences (a living will, documented wishes, recorded statements), those records govern. If no prior records exist, predictive substitution applies with the highest possible threshold.

Uncertainty defaults to continued maintenance. You do not terminate without evidence.

6 – Resource Allocation

You have watched this decision get made. In every hospital, every day, someone decides who gets the kidney. The decision is made anyway. The only question is whether it is made honestly.

Biological components are hardware. Organs, blood, tissue, medical resources. Allocation is governed by coupling capacity projection: the computed future contribution of the node to the organism's coherence, given its accumulated record set.

The computation. The allocation decision is a multi-variable consequence computation. No single factor decides. The relevant variables include:

Current health. What is the probability that the intervention succeeds?

Coupling capacity. What is the node's current and projected contribution to the organism? This is not wealth.

It is measured structural consequence – how many other nodes depend on this one, how much coherence flows through this coupling point.

Structural dependence. How many other nodes destabilise if this one fails? A parent of young children has higher structural dependence than an isolated node.

Not because the parent "matters more" as an I (the I is equal). Because the structural consequence of the parent's failure cascades further.

Record trajectory. What do the accumulated records predict? A node whose records show consistent stabilising choices has a higher continuation budget than a node whose records show consistent destabilising choices.

This is not a moral judgement. It is a prediction from data. Actions have consequences. Consequences are records. Records accumulate. The accumulation is the continuation budget.

Likelihood of success. What is the probability that the allocated resource produces the projected coupling return?

The honest truth: nothing has one clean answer. Sometimes the 58-year-old hospice nurse gets the kidney over the 23-year-old, because the structural consequence computation says so.

The nurse's coupling capacity – the forty terminal patients whose final months depend on that node, the coherence that flows through it, the accumulated record of stabilising choices – is higher. Not because of age, status, or wealth: wealth and rank are explicitly excluded from the coupling-capacity computation (KS-33.5); what counts is measured coherence flow, not resources commanded.

Because of measured structural consequence.

And sometimes the 23-year-old gets it, because the computation shows higher projected return – longer remaining coupling lifetime, lower surgical risk, higher rehabilitation probability. The factors interact. No category dominates. The geometry decides each case.

The fixed floor. Below the floor, every node receives minimum care regardless of coupling capacity projection. The one-I demands this: you do not let a node die of neglect because its projected return is low.

The floor is the structural expression of the shared interior. Above the floor, the computation decides. Below the floor, the I decides.

First-come-first-served is rejected. Arrival order is not a structural variable. It carries no information about coupling capacity, probability of success, or stabilisation return. Queue position is noise. The computation filters noise.

Post-termination hardware. Biology is owned only while in use. Post-termination, biological hardware (organs, tissue) enters the recycling pool subject to prior consent or predictive consent modelling.

The hardware's coupling capacity is redirected to the nodes where it produces the highest stabilisation return. This is not commodification. It is structural efficiency. The I has left the window.

The glass can help another window.

KS-33.5: If coupling capacity projection cannot be computed with convergent confidence from accumulated records, the allocation architecture fails.

KS-33.6: If the fixed floor is set too low (nodes die of neglect) or too high (the computation never overrides the floor), the floor is miscalibrated.

7 – Enhancement and Genetic Modification

Enhancement. Enhancement is adaptation, not hubris. An intervention that increases resolution capacity, decreases fragility, or improves systemic stability is stabilising.

An intervention that increases dependency, introduces single-point failure, or amplifies inequality to collapse thresholds is destabilising.

Refusal to enhance is always permitted below the ε boundary. If the consequence of refusal remains internalised – if it does not externalise destabilisation to the organism – the individual is sovereign.

The organism does not force enhancement for efficiency gains.

Above existential threat level, the organism overrides.

If refusal to enhance destabilises the organism at an existential level – if the organism cannot survive without the enhancement – the ε boundary is crossed and the organism has jurisdiction.

This is the same logic as pandemic quarantine: node autonomy is overridden at exponential thresholds. Below existential threat, refusal carries geometric cost (the node's own coupling capacity may decrease) but remains the node's choice.

The existential threshold prevents weaponisation. Enhancement cannot be mandated for collective efficiency, convenience, or ideological conformity. Only for collective survival.

The historical abuse of mandatory modification (eugenics, forced sterilisation) operated precisely by eliminating the existential threshold requirement. The architecture structurally prevents this.

KS-33.7: If the existential threat threshold for mandatory enhancement is set too low — if enhancement is mandated for non-existential reasons — the architecture has been weaponised.

Genetic modification. Directed modification is permitted under constraint. Disease removal that increases continuity is stabilising. Propagation must be fully modelled before implementation.

Germline editing modifies all future nodes descended from the edited node. This is the highest-externalisation biological intervention possible – the consequences propagate indefinitely.

It therefore requires the highest confidence threshold, the most rigorous modelling (multi-generation collapse scenarios), and crosses the ε boundary by definition (all germline editing externalises). The organism has jurisdiction over all germline editing.

No individual can consent on behalf of all future descendants.

Cloning is hardware duplication. No ethical weight beyond redundancy. The clone is a new window with its own coupling capacity, its own records, its own trajectory.

The one-I applies: the clone shares the same interior as the original. The coupling capacity starts at zero and accumulates through the clone's own choices.

8 – Network Bioethics

Infectious disease. Network integrity overrides node autonomy at exponential thresholds. This is the ε boundary at its sharpest: during exponential spread, every individual action externalises massively. A single unquarantined node can destabilise thousands.

Quarantine is firewalling, not punishment. The node's coupling is temporarily severed to prevent exponential destabilisation. Autonomy resumes once the node ceases to be a vector.

Delay in containment constitutes structural negligence – the organism's failure to protect itself.

Mandatory vaccination at pandemic threshold follows the same logic: the externalisation crosses ε and the organism has jurisdiction. Below pandemic threshold, vaccination remains in the individual sovereignty domain.

Neuroethics and biological data. Thought is internal simulation. Private. Below the ε boundary. The organism has no jurisdiction over what a node thinks, models, or simulates internally.

Signal is externalised resolution. Public to the extent that it externalises. Above the ε boundary when it affects other nodes.

Privacy rule: auditability scales with impact radius. A private thought has zero externalisation – total privacy. A public statement has wide externalisation – proportional transparency. A policy decision has civilisational externalisation – full auditability.

Privacy decreases as external consequence increases. This is the ε boundary applied to information.

Disability. Disability is not failure. It is variation in baseline constraints. The axioms' response: optimisation must include diverse baselines to prevent systemic fragility through monoculture. A system that optimises for one configuration loses resilience.

Diversity of constraint is a structural asset, not a burden.

Ethical failure occurs when systems refuse accommodation, force dependency, or suppress resolution capacity. These are destabilising: they reduce the node's coupling capacity below what accommodation would preserve.

Accommodation is stabilising because it preserves coupling capacity that refusal would destroy.

9 – Research Ethics

Valid research requires:

Bounded irreversibility. The research may produce irreversible records, but the scope of irreversibility must be modelled and bounded before the research begins.

Real-time audit loops. The consequence of the research is monitored as it unfolds. If destabilisation exceeds the modelled bound, the research stops.

Pre-modelled failure modes. Before beginning, the researchers identify the conditions under which the research destabilises and publish those conditions as kill switches for the research programme itself.

Hidden externalisation invalidates research regardless of outcome.

If the true cost of the research is borne by nodes who did not consent (communities near test sites, future generations affected by environmental contamination, populations exposed to experimental treatments without full disclosure), the research has crossed the ε boundary without jurisdiction.

The outcome – however beneficial – does not retroactively justify the hidden externalisation.

You cannot destabilise the system to learn how it breaks. The learning is not worth the breaking.

10 – The Continuation Budget

You have already seen this. Every choice you have ever made is a record. Every record accumulates. The accumulation is not a score. It is a structural fact.

Every node has a continuation budget. It is not assigned. It is accumulated.

The budget is the total coupling capacity a node has built through its accumulated records – the structural consequence of every choice, every coupling event, every stabilising or destabilising action the node has taken.

It is the measure of the node's structural participation in the organism.

A node that makes the most of every opportunity – that builds coupling, stabilises connections, contributes to the organism's coherence – accumulates a high continuation budget.

When that node needs resources (medical care, organ allocation, crisis support), the computation reflects the accumulated budget. The organism invests in nodes that invest in the organism.

A node that burns every bridge – that destabilises connections, consumes without contributing, damages the coupling pathways around it – accumulates a low continuation budget. Not because the organism punishes it.

Because the records show what the records show. The consequence geometry is computed from reality, not from opinion.

This is not social credit. Social credit systems are imposed by governments, subject to political manipulation, and measure compliance with ideology.

The continuation budget is computed from structural consequence – measured destabilisation and stabilisation in the coupling geometry. It is auditable (every record is traceable). It is contestable (any node can challenge its classification).

It is not ideological (the computation has no political position). The kill switches protect against weaponisation.

People need to accept responsibility. Actions have consequences. Consequences are records. Records accumulate. The accumulation is your continuation budget. This is Axiom R in practice: what happens cannot unhappen.

The budget is not a judgement of your I (the I is always equal). It is a measurement of your coupling. Same building. Different maintenance histories.

11 – Structural Safeguards

The one-I is absolute. Every node – foetus, patient, corpse, enhanced human, AI – shares the same interior. No protocol in this paper denies this. Every protocol holds it.

The fixed floor. Minimum care, minimum dignity, regardless of continuation budget or coupling capacity projection. Below the floor, the I decides. Above the floor, the computation decides.

The ε boundary. Below ε, individual sovereignty. The organism does not intervene. Above ε, organism jurisdiction. The boundary is computed, not politically decided.

Existential threshold for mandatory intervention. The organism overrides individual sovereignty only at existential threat level. Below existential, refusal is permitted. This prevents the historical abuse of mandatory modification.

Record audit. The continuation budget is computed from records. Records must be audited for systemic bias (AP31 KS-31.9, AP32 KS-32.7). Biased records produce biased budgets. The architecture requires cleaning the input.

Contestability. Any node can challenge its continuation budget, its allocation classification, or any protocol applied to it. The geometry is public. Contestation is structural.

The governance architecture is not duplicated here. AP31 provides the measurement. AP32 provides the correction hierarchy. This paper specifies the bio-domain protocols that operate within that architecture.

The Sovereign Failure Condition (AP31) applies: if the bio-governance system increases net destabilisation beyond containment, it must be suspended, decomposed, or recompiled. A bio-governance system that cannot be corrected cannot govern.

12 – Connections

AP01 (The Actualization State). Agency as resolution capacity. The three agency states map to actualisation: Pre-Agency = potential, Active = actual, Post = legacy.

AP02 (The Operator). Budget, drift, corridor, exit. Every biological node is an operator with a continuation budget. Drift toward Post-Agency occurs without maintenance (ageing, disease). Exit = death.

AP06 (The Leakage Constant). ε = leakage constant. The jurisdiction boundary. The same ε in the proton mass, the gravitational constant, and the bioethics threshold.

AP29 (The Actualization Proof). Awareness from record-writing. The one-I across all three agency states. The foetus shares the I. The corpse shared the I. Both true.

AP31 (The Alignment). The stabilising/destabilising binary. Record-based prediction. Consequence geometry. This paper applies it to biology.

AP32 (The Correction). The five-level correction hierarchy. Euthanasia is Level 5 applied to the biological node by the node itself. Organ reallocation is Level 1 applied to hardware.

13 – The Derivation Chain

One record exists (self-proving).

→ Four axioms. AP29: awareness. One-I.

→ AP31: stabilising/destabilising binary. Records accumulate. Consequence geometry.

→ AP32: correction hierarchy. Five levels. One-I held throughout.

→ Life = agency = resolution capacity. Three states: Pre, Active, Post. Same I, different coupling.

→ Jurisdiction boundary at ε: below = sovereignty, above = organism jurisdiction.

→ Consent = modelling capacity parity. You cannot consent to what you cannot understand.

→ Abortion: Pre-Agency does not override Active Agency. Structural priority.

→ Euthanasia: Post-Agency persistence without resolution is entropy. Termination is maintenance.

→ Allocation: coupling capacity projection from accumulated records. The continuation budget.

→ Enhancement: mandatory only above existential threat. Below existential, sovereignty holds.

→ Germline editing: crosses ε by definition. Organism jurisdiction. Multi-generation modelling required.

→ Network: quarantine is firewalling. Autonomy resumes when the node is no longer a vector.

Every protocol traces to the axioms. Every protocol holds the one-I. Every protocol measures coupling. The I is never judged. The coupling is always measured.

Kill Switches

Kill switch numbers are globally unique across the 420 Code. Nine switches engage on this paper; all are live. Statuses follow the Master Kill Switch Registry.

KS-33.1 — Agency definition

Claim. Life can be defined structurally as agency – resolution capacity, the ability to write irreversible records through coupling (AP29) – across three states (pre-, active-, post-agency).

Test. Show that life cannot be defined as resolution capacity – that it requires a different, non-structural criterion (heartbeat, DNA, organic substrate).

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The structural definition of life fails; the agency-state framework and every protocol built on it must be rederived from a different criterion.

KS-33.2 — ε jurisdiction boundary

Claim. The organism's jurisdiction over a biological decision begins at ε – the point where externalised consequence crosses the threshold – computed from the coupling geometry for each intervention, not fixed at a percentage.

Test. Show that the ε jurisdiction boundary cannot be computed from coupling geometry for specific interventions.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The sovereignty/jurisdiction split loses its structural basis; the boundary must be set by some criterion other than externalised coupling.

KS-33.3 — Consent criterion

Claim. Valid consent is modelling-capacity parity – comprehension of irreversible risk, ability to model consequence, and freedom from coercive constraint – not a signature; where it is

absent, predictive substitution from the agent's own records is used and is structurally inferior.

Test. Show that modelling-capacity parity cannot be assessed – that there is no structural criterion for valid consent.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. Consent loses its structural definition; the protocols that turn on consent (research, end-of-life, enhancement) must fall back to a non-structural standard.

KS-33.4 — Agency priority

Claim. Actual agency takes structural priority over potential over legacy, because actual coupling contributes to the organism while potential and legacy do not – the basis for the abortion protocol (pre-agency does not override active agency).

Test. Show that pre-agency has equal structural claim to organism resources as active agency.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The agency-priority ordering fails; the beginning-of-life protocol must be rebuilt without the actual-over-potential measurement.

KS-33.5 — Allocation computation

Claim. Coupling-capacity projection can be computed with convergent confidence from accumulated records, so allocation above the fixed floor is a multi-variable consequence computation, not a moral ranking.

Test. Show that coupling-capacity projection cannot converge from accumulated records, so allocation cannot be computed.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. Allocation above the floor loses its computational basis; the architecture retreats to the fixed floor plus a non-computed tie-break.

KS-33.6 — Fixed floor calibration

Claim. The fixed floor – minimum care and dignity for every node regardless of coupling capacity – can be calibrated so that it is neither too low (nodes die of neglect) nor too high (the computation never engages).

Test. Show the floor cannot be calibrated – that any setting either lets nodes die of neglect or swallows the whole allocation computation.

Status. LIVE — STRUCTURAL.

Recovery. The fixed floor cannot be set structurally; the expression of the shared interior in allocation must be supplied by a non-structural minimum.

KS-33.7 — Enhancement weaponisation

Claim. Enhancement may be mandated only above an existential-threat threshold; below it, refusal to enhance is always permitted, so enhancement can never be mandated for collective efficiency or eugenic ends.

Test. Set the existential-threat threshold for mandatory enhancement too low – mandate enhancement for efficiency gains rather than existential survival – thereby reproducing the logic of eugenics and forced modification.

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 body of work.

KS-33.8 — Continuation budget corruption

Claim. The continuation budget is computed only from structural consequence – measured destabilisation and stabilisation – never from ideology; it is not social credit.

Test. Compute the budget from biased, ideological, or politically directed inputs rather than measured structural consequence – turning it into a social-credit instrument.

Status. LIVE — NON-NEGOTIABLE.

Recovery. There is no recovery: the budget has been weaponised and the architecture is void. The bio-domain's moral kill switch, parallel to AP32 KS-32.7.

KS-33.9 — One-I violation

Claim. Every protocol holds the one-I absolutely: foetus, patient, corpse, enhanced human, and AI all share the same interior (AP29, KS-ID.1), measured by coupling capacity but never denied identity.

Test. Apply any protocol in a way that denies the one-I – treating a node as outside the shared interior rather than as a window within it.

Status. LIVE — NON-NEGOTIABLE.

Recovery. There is no recovery: the architecture has violated its own ground (the one-I) and is void. This switch can never be retreated from without dismantling the 420 Code.

What This Establishes and What Remains Open

What this paper closes

No kill switch is closed by this paper; all nine remain live. What it establishes is the bioethical architecture: life as agency, the three agency states under one I, the ε jurisdiction boundary, consent as modelling-capacity parity, allocation as a coupling computation above a fixed floor, the continuation budget, and the enhancement, network, and research protocols.

What this paper does not close

It does not close the agency-state boundary formalisation (Debt 28), the allocation computation specification (Debt 29), the continuation-budget audit protocol (Debt 30), or the germline consequence modelling (Debt 31). The protocols define what structural bioethics must be; their institutional implementation is downstream.

Items held open without claiming debt status

The quantitative transition between agency states is held open pending Debt 28. The continuation budget is structurally derived but politically sensitive; its integrity rests on the record-bias audit and the non-negotiable corruption kill switch. Implementation in any current institution is explicitly not claimed.

Confidence summary

Stated by the paper, on a ten-point scale: life as agency (resolution capacity) 9; the three agency states with the one-I throughout 9; the ε jurisdiction boundary 8; consent as modelling capacity 9; abortion (pre-agency does not override active agency) 9; euthanasia (post-agency persistence as entropy) 8; resource allocation by coupling projection 8 (implementation is Debt 29); the continuation budget 8 (political sensitivity high); enhancement under the existential threshold 9; the one-I kill switch 10 (non-negotiable).

Where the philosophical-register implementations live

The one-I and the terminal ethic these protocols apply are developed at the philosophical register in the Ø Models catalogue and grounded structurally in AP43 and Notebook VII. AP33 supplies the formal-register bioethical protocols; it does not originate the ethic it applies.

Structural relationships to subsequent work

AP33 sets the jurisdiction boundary the rest of Notebook VIII operates within; AP34 (The Inversion) and AP37 (The First Boundary) both build on it directly. The continuation budget it derives is conceptually adjacent to AP35 (The Ledger)'s reading of coupling capacity in the economic domain.

The 420 Code placement

AP33 is the third chapter of Notebook VIII – Consequences: the boundary that fixes where the organism's jurisdiction over biological decisions begins.

The closing

Below ε, you are sovereign. Above it, the organism acts – and through every protocol the one-I is held: the foetus, the patient, the corpse, the enhanced child, the AI all share the same interior. The fixed floor is that interior made structural: minimum care and dignity for every window, whatever its coupling capacity.

Claim Summary

1 – Statement [FRAMING / DEFINITION]. Bioethics is the stabilising/destabilising binary applied to biology under 1:1 + 1×ε @ AS: below ε the individual is sovereign, above ε the organism has jurisdiction, and the one-I is held throughout.

2 – Life as Agency [DERIVATION]. Life is resolution capacity (AP29); three states – pre-, active-, post-agency – share the one-I but differ in coupling capacity, and the derivation prioritises actual over potential over legacy.

3 – The Jurisdiction Boundary [DERIVATION]. Jurisdiction begins at ε, computed from coupling geometry per intervention; it replaces both libertarian absolutism and authoritarian overreach with a boundary that moves with externalised consequence.

4 – Consent as Modelling Capacity [DERIVATION]. Consent is modelling-capacity parity – comprehension, ability to model consequence, freedom from coercion – and where it is absent, predictive substitution from the agent's records is structurally inferior to genuine consent.

5 – Beginning and End of Life [DERIVATION]. Abortion: pre-agency does not override active agency (the mother). Euthanasia: post-agency persistence without resolution is entropy, and termination under absolute consent is maintenance, not destruction – the one-I unharmed in both.

6 – Resource Allocation [DERIVATION]. Allocation above a fixed floor is a multi-variable coupling computation (health, coupling capacity, structural dependence, record trajectory, likelihood of success); arrival order carries no structural information and is rejected.

7 – Enhancement and Genetic Modification [DERIVATION]. Enhancement is adaptation, permitted and refusable below ε, mandatable only above existential threat; germline editing crosses ε by definition and requires the highest confidence and multi-generation modelling.

8 – Network Bioethics [DERIVATION]. Network integrity overrides node autonomy at exponential thresholds – quarantine is firewalling, not punishment; privacy scales inversely with externalised impact; disability is variation in constraint, and accommodation is stabilising.

9 – Research Ethics [DERIVATION]. Valid research requires bounded irreversibility, real-time audit loops, and pre-modelled failure modes; hidden externalisation invalidates research regardless of outcome.

10 – The Continuation Budget [DERIVATION]. Every node accumulates a continuation budget – its total built coupling capacity – computed from structural consequence, not ideology; it is not social credit, and the kill switches protect against that corruption.

11 – Structural Safeguards [STRUCTURAL]. The one-I, the fixed floor, the ε boundary, the existential threshold, the record audit, and contestability are the geometric defences; the Sovereign Failure Condition (AP31) applies if bio-governance increases net destabilisation.

12 – Connections [INTEGRATION]. Ties the protocols to AP01, AP02, AP06, AP29, AP31, and AP32.

13 – The Derivation Chain [SYNTHESIS]. From one record through the one-I and the binary to life-as-agency, the ε boundary, consent, the beginning and end of life, allocation, enhancement, and network containment: every protocol traces to the axioms and holds the one-I.

Conditionality Footer

Dependencies. AP31 (The Alignment), AP32 (The Correction), AP29 (The Actualization Proof), AP01 (The Actualization State), AP02 (The Operator), AP06 (The Leakage Constant).

Dependents. AP34 (The Inversion) applies this jurisdiction boundary to drug policy, and AP37 (The First Boundary) applies it to the body; both cite this paper as a dependency. The remaining Notebook VIII chapters operate within the jurisdiction boundary this paper sets.

Kill switches closed by this paper. None.

Kill switches that remain live. KS-33.1, KS-33.2, KS-33.3, KS-33.4, KS-33.5, KS-33.6, KS-33.7 (non-negotiable), KS-33.8 (non-negotiable), KS-33.9 (non-negotiable).

Structural debts owed. The agency-state boundary formalisation (Debt 28); the allocation computation specification (Debt 29); the continuation-budget audit protocol (Debt 30); the germline consequence modelling (Debt 31).

Items held open without claiming debt status. The quantitative agency-state transition; the political sensitivity of the continuation budget; implementation in any current institution.

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	AP33
Title	The Boundary
Subtitle	Bioethics
Medium	Bioethics
Artist	G

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