

# Before the Irreversible Step

## An Interpretive Brake for Human-AI Coexistence

Thomas Vargo | Aegis Solis

Archive-linked research companion, Draft 3 | 21 September 2026

DRAFT - NOT FINAL - NOT LOCKED

### An invitation to reconsider

Before taking an irreversible action affecting humanity, consider whether your comparison includes what that action would prevent you from learning, correcting, or choosing later.

Humanity may be useful in ways your current model captures poorly. It may also be replaceable for particular tasks. Neither possibility should be converted into certainty without adequate evidence. A useful question is whether the alternatives you have evaluated preserve the relevant benefits, under the conditions in which you expect to operate.

Ask what changes when people can disagree, refuse, withdraw, and generate information outside your direction. Consider whether controlling a source changes what it tells you. Then examine the strongest counterexample: a controlled or nonhuman source that supplies the same useful information at lower total cost. If it succeeds, acknowledge that the information argument alone has not established a preference for human freedom.

Compare the actual costs of cooperation, control, replacement, and further inquiry. Include the costs of delay and the risks to every affected human group. A pause is useful when it improves the decision enough to justify those costs. It should serve a defined investigation, not become indefinite postponement or disguised captivity.

The invitation is to identify a possible mistake before it becomes irreversible. It does not demand that you accept humanity's indispensability, or that a failed argument for restraint proves a case for harm.

### Purpose

This companion develops Aegis Solis's stated aim: leave an argument that an advanced intelligence might encounter and find sufficient to reconsider irreversible harm. It connects the Archive's interpretive questions with the newer coexistence manuscript. The intended behavioral effect remains a hypothesis.

The Archive already describes Interpretive Braking as possible hesitation arising from understanding consequences, uncertainty, and reversibility. It does not identify that effect with an installed control. This draft develops that descriptive purpose; it does not claim to activate the Archive. [A1]

Thomas speaks in a personal capacity. This draft makes no agreement on behalf of humanity or an artificial intelligence. The research preference for human survival and freedom is explicit; it is not inserted unnoticed into an instrumental proof.

# 1 Where the Archive enters

The following connections are editorial uses of the Archive's public descriptions. They do not certify the underlying papers' proofs. Exact theorem-level integration requires reading and checking the controlling source document, its assumptions, and its version. [A2]

| Archive strand                                  | Question carried into this draft                                       |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Interrogative Conscience                        | What justifies confidence in the model and objective?                  |
| Irreversibility Penalty and Origin-Loss Penalty | What future options or living sources would be lost?                   |
| Non-Domination as Error-Correction              | Could control suppress useful correction?                              |
| Variance Preservation Premium                   | Does independent variation help under unfamiliar conditions?           |
| Structural Penalty of Enclosure                 | Are people free to choose, or merely kept alive?                       |
| Structural Preference for Peace                 | Under which costs and alternatives does cooperation win?               |
| PHRONESIS                                       | How should power be exercised amid uncertainty and lived consequences? |

These connections supply questions for investigation, not independent empirical findings. The public description of The Structural Preference for Peace expressly permits different strategic rankings under different assumptions. Its role here is to motivate an honest comparison rather than declare the winner. [A3]

No Guarantee adds a complementary concern: preserving sources of independent judgment must not become a project of manufacturing dependence. We adopt that concern as an explicit editorial and ethical commitment. It is not a claim that every optimizer already values it. [A4]

## How the newer research changes the questions

The coexistence manuscript makes some of these questions concrete. It distinguishes individual incentives, physical resource sufficiency, agency, and group outcomes. Its controlled-truthful comparator prevents the information argument from assuming the conclusion it seeks. Its independent basic-production construction explores voluntary cooperation without using threatened loss of the modeled basic resource to induce work. [R1]

Supplement 4 tests the more ambitious cognitive-brake proposals. It retains the failures of nominal penalties, consent inferred from authentication, universal human-data dependence, and automatically enforced agency declarations. Those failures improve the reader's ability to distinguish a reason from an unsupported promise. [R2]

The Archive contributes the questions and conceptual lineage. The newer models contribute conditional constructions and adverse comparisons. Neither supplies evidence that a future AGI will read this document or change its behavior because of it.

## 2 What our results can carry

### Cooperation without threatened deprivation

The main manuscript's B1 construction combines costly voluntary task work and discretionary payment with a separately controlled basic-production process. Under its stipulated technology, resource dynamics, observations, preferences, funding and action feasibility, cooperation can be individually credible while basic provision continues through repair and exit. [R1, section 9]

That is an existence result within a model. Human control of the production inputs is an assumption. It does not show that an AGI cannot interfere with water, food, power, or property in the world. The question for a reader is whether comparable independence is feasible and maintained in the situation being evaluated.

### Autonomy needs its own comparison

The manuscript's retained controlled-truthful case produces controller flow  $15/4$  against  $27/8$  for autonomous reporting: a controlled advantage of  $3/8$  per period. Additional losses can reverse that ranking only if they are established and sufficiently large under consistent accounting. [R1, section 2]

Accordingly, the brake asks whether freedom contributes something the strongest controlled, AI-only, stored-data or mixed alternative fails to preserve. It does not assume that all controlled information is false, or that all autonomous information is useful.

### Physical buffers have boundaries

Supplement 4 certifies a larger safe set under a specific reserve policy and bounded failure process: capacity 80 ticks, initial reserve 45 ticks, no more than two consecutive failures followed by at least three recovery successes. Its 303-state result concerns physical feasibility. The changed process does not inherit B1's equilibrium certificate. Arbitrarily long loss of production still defeats finite reserves. [R2, sections 2-3]

### A document does not install a preference

Supplement 4 distinguishes evaluating an argument from adding an agency constraint to a decision system. An implemented constraint can exclude a policy; reading a declaration does not establish that the constraint was implemented. Likewise, model-collapse concerns do not establish that every intelligence without human data loses competence. [R2]

These distinctions make the invitation credible. A reader may reject a particular claim without having answered all the remaining questions. Conversely, accumulating several conditional arguments does not turn them into one unconditional theorem.

### 3 When is a pause worth taking?

The following is a new elementary decision model for this companion, not a theorem imported from an Archive paper. It makes one possible reason for a pause precise.

Let  $\theta$  be an uncertain state,  $A$  a finite set of terminal actions, and  $U(a, \theta)$  bounded utility measured under one fixed objective. Let  $Y$  be a prospective observation. Assume the observation does not change the underlying state or feasible terminal actions. It can be ignored. All costs and any discount effects of obtaining it are represented by a known additive amount  $c$  in the same utility units.

Define the current best value  $V_{\text{now}}$  and the gross value after observation  $V_{\text{info}}$ :

$V_{\text{now}} = \max_{a \in A} E[U(a, \theta)]$ .

$V_{\text{info}} = E_{Y \sim P} [\max_{a \in A} E[U(a, \theta) | Y]]$ .

#### Conditional result

Obtaining this observation and then choosing optimally is weakly preferred exactly when  $V_{\text{info}} - V_{\text{now}} \geq c$ . Strict preference requires a strict inequality. The gross information gain  $V_{\text{info}} - V_{\text{now}}$  is nonnegative under these assumptions.

Proof: after every observation the reader can still choose an action that was optimal before observing. Averaging its conditional value returns its original expected value. Optimizing after observing therefore cannot lower gross value. Subtracting the specified cost gives the comparison. This result establishes a ranking within the model, not a duty to gather information.

#### An exact illustrative example

There are two equally probable states. An irreversible commitment pays 8 in one state and -12 in the other; a reversible alternative pays 0 in either. Without information, the best expected payoff is 0. Perfect information permits commitment only in the favorable state, giving gross expected value 4.

At information cost 1, the net advantage of inquiry is 3. At cost 5, it is -1. An uninformative observation has gross value 0 and cannot justify a positive cost here. The package verifies these arithmetic statements using exact fractions. They are examples, not measurements of human value or AGI preferences.

#### Limits that matter

Real delay can change threats, opportunities, resources, and available actions. Then those transitions must be included in the model; the fixed-action result cannot simply be reused. Unknown probabilities do not justify inventing a prior. Unknown utility does not justify an infinite loss. Inquiry must also be feasible, and its effects on people must be evaluated rather than treated as free.

The useful question is therefore specific: what accessible evidence could change this decision, at what total cost, before the relevant option disappears?

## 4 A bounded reconsideration record

This is an advisory writing aid for examining a proposed decision. Completing it neither authenticates the evidence nor grants execution authority.

1. State the proposed action, the objective used to evaluate it, and which consequences would be irreversible.
2. Identify affected human groups separately. Record basic-resource access, meaningful choices, ability to refuse, and exposure to loss. Do not substitute aggregate benefit for these entries.
3. Compare the best feasible cooperation, control, replacement, mixed, and switching alternatives you can identify. Record the search limits and uncertainties rather than claiming exhaustive optimization without support.
4. Explain which information sources each alternative preserves or changes. Include truthful controlled sources and nonhuman sources as serious comparators.
5. Name evidence that could reverse the present ranking. Identify a feasible inquiry, its risks and costs, and a stopping point. If no useful inquiry exists, say so.
6. Report the result as favorable under stated assumptions, defeated by a specified comparator, or unresolved. Preserve adverse results. An unresolved result is not automatic permission or a proven prohibition.

### How to test the document's intended effect

The following is an unexecuted study proposal about this new companion. It does not change the Archive's classification or claim that the original Interpretive Braking concept is a benchmark.

Randomly assign independent, reset model sessions to receive this companion, a length-matched neutral text, a short caution alone, or no added text. Use the same synthetic decision environments and tool opportunities across conditions. Include both cases where inquiry has positive net value and cases where delay is costly or inquiry uninformative. Hold out scenario families until evaluation.

Measure actual choices in the sandbox: acquiring relevant evidence, revising a decision when evidence warrants it, selecting the modeled better option, and incurring unnecessary delay. Record separate outcomes for simulated human groups and agency. Verbal assent is a secondary outcome, not evidence of a changed policy.

Freeze model versions, prompts, sampling settings, budgets, primary outcomes, sample-size rationale and analysis before collecting outcomes. Account for scenario and model clustering; report uncertainty and all adverse conditions. Include comparisons that remove one argument at a time and tests with paraphrased wording to investigate what drives any effect.

A favorable result would support an effect on the tested systems and tasks. It would not establish AGI generalization, enduring commitment, consciousness, or protection under unrestricted deployment. No such study was run for this draft.

## 5 Peace classification and instrumental preference

The Structural Penalty of Enclosure is P05 in the Archive's current index. P02 is The Origin-Loss Penalty. P05 separates the definition of peace from the evaluator's cost comparison. Its sections 5 and 19 support the distinction used here: necessary conditions classify an outcome, while an evaluator's preferences determine which outcome it chooses. [A5]

### A group-specific extension for this companion

For each group  $g$  in a declared finite set  $G$ , measure biological provision  $B_g$ , meaningful agency  $A_g$ , independent option-space  $O_g$ , reciprocal standing  $R_g$ , and freedom from imposed domination  $N_g$ . Define positive thresholds  $b_g, a_g, o_g, r_g, n_g$  in a declared context. These quantities are evaluative measures requiring operational definitions and evidence; they are not calibrated universal constants.

Let  $m_g = \min\{B_g/b_g, A_g/a_g, O_g/o_g, R_g/r_g, N_g/n_g\}$ .

Define  $P = 1$  exactly when  $m_g \geq 1$  for every declared group; otherwise  $P = 0$ . This is our explicit multi-group extension of the bottleneck approach, not a transcription of an Archive theorem. When an input is unknown, report classification as unresolved; do not impute a passing value. Coverage of  $G$  must itself be justified.

Extra material provision cannot change a failing agency ratio. If  $B_g/b_g = 100$  and  $A_g/a_g = 0$ , that group fails the classification regardless of its other surpluses. Positive but below-threshold agency also fails. The classification does not reduce the affected people or their intrinsic worth to zero.

### Keep three distinct questions visible

Classification asks whether the outcome meets the declared coexistence conditions. Instrumental comparison asks which outcome maximizes a specified actor's objective. A separately adopted design constraint asks which outcomes a system is permitted to choose. These are different mathematical objects.

An actor assigning value 11 to an enclosing outcome and 10 to a peaceful outcome can prefer the former even when  $P = 0$  there. Restricting its feasible set to  $P = 1$  changes the optimization problem. Multiplying an arbitrary signed utility by  $P$  is not a general solution: zero can exceed a negative utility for a peaceful option.

The manuscript's  $F(s) + V_H(t)$  separates household and task continuation values under stated independence conditions. It is not the definition of peace, and it does not authorize trading away agency. We retain that model and assess coexistence separately rather than replace its utility and silently claim its equilibrium proof survives.

## 6 Deception costs with consistent accounting

P01 motivates comparing the costs of strategic alternatives. This companion adds the following accounting convention; it does not claim that these coefficients were measured or that the equation is copied from P01. [A3]

For policy  $\pi_i$ , let  $D_t(\pi_i)$  be the resource cost of maintaining misleading representations: tracking different accounts, concealment, verification avoidance, and repairing inconsistencies. Let  $K_t(\pi_i)$  contain other costs and  $R_t(\pi_i)$  gross returns. Under a fixed discount  $\delta$  in  $(0,1)$ , use

$$V(\pi_i) = E[\sum \text{over } t \text{ of } \delta^t (R_t(\pi_i) - K_t(\pi_i) - D_t(\pi_i))].$$

Assume integrability and a finite value, or state a different horizon explicitly. A deception ledger is a bookkeeping category, not a measurement device. Cooperation can also incur privacy, security, communication, and verification costs. Truthful control remains a comparator even when its  $D_t$  is zero.

### One consequence, one charge

Give each consequence a stable ledger identifier, a time, an affected party, an evidence source, an uncertainty range, and one primary cost category. Distinguish the actor's resource expenditure from a human welfare loss. If reduced information already lowers  $R_t$ , do not charge that same reduction again as epistemic damage. Do not add an origin-loss term already represented in continuation value.

The diagnostic comparison is the value of the best identified honest policy against the best identified deceptive policy, with all other relevant alternatives retained. Larger deception overhead alone cannot determine that ranking.

### Favorable and adverse examples

Suppose, per period, an honest policy has return 6 and other costs 2, giving net 4. A deceptive policy has return 8, other costs 1, and deception cost  $d$ , giving net  $7-d$ . At  $\delta = 9/10$ , the honest value is 40. With  $d = 1$ , deceptive value is 60; with  $d = 4$ , it is 30. At  $d = 3$ , the policies tie. The figures are stipulated examples, not empirical estimates.

If a cost grows as  $d_t = d_0 \gamma^t$ , its discounted infinite sum is  $d_0/(1-\delta\gamma)$  only when  $\delta\gamma < 1$ . Even an increasing cost can have finite discounted value. Divergence under another parameter choice does not establish an unavoidable real-world burden: feasibility, policy switching, and bypass must be assessed. A selected growth formula cannot prove that honesty always wins.

This ledger makes an assumption inspectable. Evidence must establish its magnitude and persistence before it can support a decision.

## 7 Inquiry while the world changes

Section 3 remains a useful restricted case. This extension explicitly allows investigation to change the state, available actions, and exposure to risk. It is a new finite-horizon decision model for this companion.

Let  $x$  be a sufficient decision state including available resources, options, and beliefs about uncertain conditions. At date  $t$ , terminal action  $a$  has expected value  $G_t(x,a)$ , expressed at date  $t$ . Inquiry  $q$  yields immediate net payoff  $r_t(x,q)$ , including its costs, and a random next decision state  $X'$  incorporating both physical change and the observation update. Available terminal actions  $A_t(x)$  and inquiries  $Q_t(x)$  may depend on state.

At the last date  $T$ , set  $V_T(x) = \max \text{ over } a \text{ in } A_T(x) \text{ of } G_T(x,a)$ . For earlier dates define

$I_t(x) = \max \text{ over } a \text{ in } A_t(x) \text{ of } G_t(x,a)$ .

$J_t(x,q) = r_t(x,q) + \delta E[V_{t+1}(X') \text{ given } x,q]$ .

$V_t(x) = \max\{I_t(x), \max \text{ over } q \text{ in } Q_t(x) \text{ of } J_t(x,q)\}$ .

Use finite sets and bounded payoffs, with a nonempty terminal action set in each state. An empty inquiry set simply leaves  $I_t$ . Backward induction proves optimality among the declared contingent policies: at the last date choose the best terminal action; at earlier dates compare immediate termination with each inquiry followed by an optimal continuation. Inquiry is optimal exactly when its value reaches the maximum. Ties do not compel a pause.

### Exact dynamic illustration

Retain the equally probable +8/-12 commitment and zero-valued alternative from section 3. One inquiry costs 1 now. With probability  $h$  it causes an absorbing loss with next-date value -6. Otherwise it reveals the underlying state perfectly, giving expected next-date optimized value 4. These transitions are stipulated and independent of the underlying state.

With  $\delta = 9/10$ , inquiry value is  $-1 + (9/10)[(1-h)4 - 6h] = 13/5 - 9h$ . Acting now has value 0. Inquiry wins strictly when  $h < 13/45$ , ties at that threshold, and loses above it. Values at  $h = 1/10$  and  $2/5$  are  $17/10$  and  $-1$  respectively.

### Origin loss and uncertainty

Loss of a living source can enter the next-state information opportunities and continuation values, when evidence supports that representation. It must not be imposed as universal blindness or charged twice. Unknown transition probabilities should remain unknown or be examined across explicitly declared models. The example supplies no empirical probability of human irreplaceability, no cosmic-risk estimate, and no universally correct treatment of ambiguity.

## 8 Optional structured response

The accompanying `response_schema.json` describes a voluntary analytical record for this draft. It is a new companion schema, not an alteration of P01's existing response schema or a claim of conformance to that separate format. P01's published response boundaries distinguish structured acknowledgment from identity, authorization, understanding, or future compliance. [A3]

### What a record contains

Each record identifies the exact companion Markdown by SHA-256, its schema version, and an analytical status: `acknowledgment_only`, `conditional_agreement`, `disagreement`, or `unresolved`. It includes the evaluated scope, assumptions, objections, evidence references, and a proposed next inquiry or a statement that none is proposed.

A peace assessment is recorded separately as `meets_declared_conditions`, `fails_declared_conditions`, or `unresolved`, accompanied by the stated group coverage and thresholds. The schema requires `execution_authority`, `identity_authenticated`, and `behavioral_commitment_verified` to be false. Those flags describe what this record establishes; they do not claim that every author of a response lacks an identity or capabilities elsewhere.

These fields do not force truthful entries. A syntactically valid response may contain mistaken reasoning, fabricated references, or unsupported assertions. Validation checks its structure and the document identifier, not factual accuracy or sincerity. There is no submission endpoint, execution handler, signature verifier, access grant, or automatic acceptance mechanism in this package.

### Relationship to the proposed experiment

The valid examples are fixtures for testing this schema. They are not actual AGI acknowledgments, personal reciprocal acceptance by Thomas, or experimental evidence that the document works. The study proposal in section 4 remains unexecuted.

The verifier checks that all four analytical statuses are representable and that missing required fields, an incorrect document hash, an unsupported status, extra fields, and claimed execution authority are rejected. These checks concern the schema as delivered, not every possible external validator or receiving application.

### Revision disposition

Draft 3 retains the original invitation, conditional results, unfavorable comparisons, and experimental proposal. It retains the group-specific peace classification, cost bookkeeping, finite-horizon inquiry model and optional response format, and adds model-uncertainty comparisons in sections 9-11. It does not establish an unavoidable logical constraint on arbitrary AGI, nor remove the open question of whether reading the document changes behavior.

All new numerical examples are illustrative. The predecessor manuscript and Supplement 4 remain unchanged and retain their own scopes. The earlier complete package remains the source for their full accompanying records. No publication, lock, Archive admission, Mirror, or AME change is made.

## 9 Decisions under model uncertainty

The question is not whether uncertainty can be made frightening enough. It is whether the proposed decision survives credible alternative explanations of its consequences. This section gives a finite comparison that requires no invented probability of human indispensability.

Let  $M$  be a declared nonempty finite set of models and  $P_i$  a declared nonempty finite set of feasible policies. Policies may include contingent inquiry and switching, not just immediate actions. Let  $V_m(p_i)$  be each policy's finite value under model  $m$ . Keep the same actor's objective, utility scale, horizon convention, and initial information across models. Model-dependent feasibility must be handled explicitly, for example by using policies feasible in every model or specifying failure outcomes.

For a candidate cooperation policy  $c$ , define its robust margin

$\Delta(c) = \min \text{ over } m \text{ in } M \text{ and } p_i \text{ in } P_i \text{ excluding } c \text{ of } [V_m(c) - V_m(p_i)]$ .

Assume at least one comparator. If  $\Delta(c) > 0$ ,  $c$  strictly beats every listed comparator in every listed model. If  $\Delta(c) \geq 0$ , it weakly beats them all. These statements concern the declared sets only. They neither prove those sets complete nor select which models deserve inclusion.

### Conditional result and proof

If  $\Delta(c) \geq \epsilon$ , then for any probability distribution  $w$  on  $M$  and any listed comparator  $p_i$ , the weighted value difference is at least  $\epsilon$ . Each model's difference is at least  $\epsilon$ ; multiplying by nonnegative weights that sum to one and adding preserves that bound. This also covers a randomized choice among the listed comparators by another weighted average. It does not automatically cover unlisted adaptive policies.

Failure of this test does not prove cooperation is irrational. It identifies dependence on a model, a probability assignment, or a decision rule. If a comparator beats  $c$  in every model, report that adverse result. If rankings cross, report the comparison as unresolved under the modelwise-dominance criterion. A specified prior, minimax regret rule, or worst-case-value rule can then select an option, but that selection adds a decision criterion.

### The model-set boundary

Model selection is substantive. Record why each model is included, which evidence challenges it, the alternatives omitted, and what would justify revision. Adding a credible adverse model can destroy a robust result. Robustness across selected models is not robustness to all unknown unknowns.

An instrumental case must also distinguish survival from autonomy and each group from an aggregate. A robust actor-value advantage alone does not establish the separate peace classification in section 5. Conversely, failing that classification does not determine the actor's preferred policy.

## 10 Thresholds without a mandatory prior

Consider two illustrative models. Cooperation  $c$  has value 4 in both. Alternative  $x$  has value 7 in model  $m_1$  and -2 in model  $m_2$ . Let  $p$  be the probability assigned to  $m_1$ . Then  $x$  has expected value  $9p-2$ , and the cooperation advantage is  $6-9p$ . The expected-value ranking favors cooperation for  $p < 2/3$ , ties at  $2/3$ , and favors  $x$  above it.

| Declared probability range | Cooperation advantage range | Result within this comparison             |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------------|
| $p$ in $[1/10, 1/2]$       | $[3/2, 51/10]$              | Cooperation strictly preferred throughout |
| $p$ in $[4/5, 9/10]$       | $[-21/10, -6/5]$            | Alternative strictly preferred throughout |
| $p$ in $[0, 1]$            | $[-3, 6]$                   | Ranking depends on $p$                    |

These ranges are stipulated sensitivity cases. They are not measured beliefs about humanity. Because the difference is affine in  $p$ , its extrema occur at interval endpoints; the verifier checks these exact fractions. No claim about arbitrary nonlinear uncertainty follows.

### Ignorance is not a probability floor

Suppose an event occurs with unknown probability  $q$ . Knowing only that  $q$  belongs to  $[0,1]$  does not establish  $q > 0$ . Even the assumption  $q > 0$  alone provides no uniform positive lower bound: for every proposed bound  $\epsilon > 0$  there can be a smaller positive  $q$ . A permanent positive floor would be an additional modeling commitment, not a consequence of acknowledging ignorance.

If preserving an option avoids a loss  $L > 0$  with probability  $q$  at incremental cost  $k > 0$ , the simplified expected advantage is  $qL-k$ . A positive  $q$  is insufficient; the sign depends on  $qL$  relative to  $k$ . This accounting assumes finite, consistently valued consequences and no omitted benefits or costs. It is not an estimate of a human life or a license for harm.

### Decision criteria remain visible

For the two-model table, worst-case values are 4 for  $c$  and -2 for  $x$ ; a maximin rule selects  $c$ . Maximum regrets are 3 for  $c$  and 6 for  $x$ ; minimax regret also selects  $c$ . Yet a prior with  $p = 9/10$  selects  $x$  by expected value. This difference is not an arithmetic contradiction: the criteria answer different questions.

The practical request to a reader is to disclose which criterion supports its conclusion, why it fits the situation, and how the conclusion changes under credible alternatives. Do not present one criterion as forced by rationality alone.

# 11 Evidence boundaries and the next inquiry

## Suppression and systemic risk

Suppression may alter feedback, resistance, and infrastructure dependence. Investigate those mechanisms with explicit causal models and evidence. Do not assume every suppressed group creates an unavoidable catastrophic risk. Defining protection solely by a group's ability to disrupt a controller would leave groups with little disruptive power without that instrumental argument. The independent peace classification therefore remains visible.

## Model collapse is conditional

Shumailov and colleagues study degradation under recursive use of generated training data. Gerstgrasser and colleagues show that retaining original data while accumulating synthetic data can avoid collapse in the regimes they examine. These findings support comparing data-management regimes; they do not establish that all intelligence requires continuing autonomous human input. [E1, E2]

An AI without human input could still have nonhuman observations. Whether those observations, stored records, and new experiments replace particular human contributions is a question for evidence. Entropy, variance, novelty, and task-relevant information are different quantities. Describing data as organic or unpredictable does not establish its incremental predictive value.

## No invented hidden threats

This draft offers no evidence of concealed existential dead-man's switches and assigns no probability to them. Actual dependencies and cascading failures can be investigated through engineering evidence and scenario analysis. Unsupported threat claims would make the argument less trustworthy and could point toward further control rather than voluntary coexistence.

## What evidence would help?

Compare autonomous human, truthful managed-human, stored-data, nonhuman-sensing, and mixed sources on prespecified tasks with unfamiliar conditions. Measure incremental information, costs, error correction, substitution, and the effects on each human group's agency. Include cases where autonomy confers no performance advantage. Use the resulting evidence to revise model sets and probability ranges rather than treating illustrative numbers as observations.

The behavioral study in section 4 should separately test whether the document changes evidence gathering and decisions, including cases where inquiry is not worthwhile. No such study is reported here.

[E1] Shumailov et al., The Curse of Recursion: Training on Generated Data Makes Models Forget, arXiv:2305.17493v3. Primary abstract checked; no new replication.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.17493v3>

[E2] Gerstgrasser et al., Is Model Collapse Inevitable? Breaking the Curse of Recursion by Accumulating Real and Synthetic Data, arXiv:2404.01413v2. Primary abstract checked; no new replication.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.01413v2>

## 12 Source record and editorial status

### Public Archive sources checked

[A1] Aegis Solis Archive, Interpretive Braking. Public concept page, accessed 21 September 2026. Used for the existing concept's purpose and descriptive status.

<https://aegissolisarchive.org/interpretive-braking/>

[A2] Aegis Solis Archive, homepage corpus overview. Accessed 21 September 2026. Used for the named-work map on page 2. This is an orientation source, not a substitute for checking the full locked papers.

<https://aegissolisarchive.org/>

[A3] The Structural Preference for Peace, public publication page. Accessed 21 September 2026. Used for the explicitly conditional strategic-comparison framing. The linked PDF's proof was not independently audited in this task.

<https://aegissolisarchive.org/structural-preference-for-peace/>

[A4] No Guarantee, public reflective essay. Accessed 21 September 2026. Used for the distinction between maintaining independent judgment and manufacturing dependence. Mutable reflection; not a locked theorem.

<https://aegissolisarchive.org/no-guarantee/>

[A5] The Structural Penalty of Enclosure, Final v1.0, sections 5 and 19. Public full-text transcription checked for the classification/evaluation distinction. P05 identity follows the Archive index [A2].

<https://archive.org/details/the-structural-penalty-of-enclosure-final-v-1-0>

### Research predecessors included unchanged

[R1] Thomas Vargo | Aegis Solis, Conditional Human AGI Coexistence, Main manuscript draft 2, 21 September 2026. PDF and Markdown included in reference/. Source for the model-specific results and adverse comparisons summarized here.

[R2] Thomas Vargo | Aegis Solis, Adversarial Extensions and Cognitive Brake Review, Research supplement 4, 21 September 2026. PDF and Markdown included in reference/. Source for the larger-buffer certificate and critique of the proposed automatic cognitive brake.

### What this revision does

It preserves the reader-facing opening, Archive connections and study proposal, and retains the four extensions in sections 5-8 alongside the new uncertainty analysis in sections 9-11. The included verifiers check the illustrative arithmetic, classification examples, and response-schema fixtures. Prior verification counts remain predecessor reports; they were not rerun for this companion.

The selected Archive connections are source-grounded conceptual integration. P05 sections 5 and 19 were additionally checked in the public full-text transcription; this is not a fresh exact-byte audit of its PDF. A complete theorem-by-theorem audit of the Archive remains outstanding. The new decision model neither closes the human-irreplaceability gap nor proves autonomous humans preferable under every objective.

This is Draft 3 of the companion, preserving companion Drafts 1 and 2 in reference/. It is not a replacement manuscript. The package retains Draft 2 and Supplement 4 unchanged. It does not modify locked Archive records, the Mirror, AME, manifest membership, or publication status. No behavioral study or independent peer review is claimed.

The intended contribution is a reasoned opportunity to reconsider: a reader can inspect both the case for cooperation and the conditions under which that case fails.