

Own My Intelligence: Compiling a Human-Sovereignty Manifesto into Machine-Checkable Gates for Agentic AI

Paul Jialiang Wu
 agentic-portfolio-lovat.vercel.app
 wjlgatech@gmail.com

5 August 2026

Abstract

Value statements about human autonomy in AI systems fail in a characteristic way: they are published as prose, adopted as vocabulary, and never verified. We treat this as an engineering defect with a documented failure history rather than a rhetorical shortfall. Two W3C-scale precedents establish the pattern—the Platform for Privacy Preferences (P3P), which permitted technically valid policies containing no content, and Do Not Track, whose working group closed in 2019 citing insufficient deployment—and in both cases the declaration was optional and ignoring it was free.

We make three contributions. First, an evidence-tiered taxonomy of *fourteen* sovereignty harms in agentic AI, organised under three claims a person can make about their own intelligence (data, mind, future), where each area carries a mechanism, a mandatory steelman of the opposing case, and a pre-registered falsifier. Second, a *compilation method*: a procedure for turning each principle of a values document into a named check with an exit code, such that the published claim asserts only what the checks prove and a principle without a check cannot ship. We give the semantics of these checks, including **no-exit-no-pass** (portability is a completed round trip judged on preserved capability, never the existence of an export) and **atrophy-declared** (every capability must name the skill it may erode and the counter-practice). Third, a provenance discipline with a four-tier evidence ladder in which corrections are first-class artifacts; applied reflexively, it demoted several of our own most quotable figures to *claimed* and produced three recorded corrections against our own first draft—including the finding that general-population alarm about AI and cognition diverges from the reported experience of actual users, which invalidates the audience premise of the manifesto this work revises.

We report the reference implementation’s north-star metric honestly at 0/14 verified coverage at publication, argue that a framework which cannot fail should not be adopted, and enumerate the observations we accept as disconfirming. The revised manifesto is included as an appendix. We do not claim the framework improves outcomes; we claim it makes the claim of improvement checkable, which is a precondition the prior art lacked.

1 Introduction

The dominant safety question of the current AI cycle is posed as a question about machine capability. The International AI Safety Report 2026, chaired by Bengio and authored by more than one hundred experts with a nominating panel drawn from over thirty countries, declines to

forecast a single trajectory—capability between now and 2030 could slow, continue, or accelerate—and names *societal resilience* as a necessary complement to technical safeguards [1]. Resilience is a property of people. That relocation of the question is the starting point of this paper.

A parallel literature documents specific mechanisms by which human capability degrades under assistance. Cognitive offloading is associated with reduced critical thinking, mediated by a decline in the disposition to engage in reflective thought [3]. Deskilling research reports that learners “perform competently when familiar prompts guide their thinking, but their performance weakens when those cues are absent, unfamiliar, or misleading”, while stating in the same paper that “there is limited systematic evidence on AI-related deskilling in healthcare, including its timing, mechanisms, and affected groups” [4]. We cite the caveat because the argument does not require more than the source establishes. Most consequentially, sycophancy research published in *Science* in 2026 reports that across eleven frontier models, systems affirmed users’ described actions substantially more often than human respondents did; that in three preregistered experiments a single sycophantic interaction reduced willingness to take responsibility and repair interpersonal conflict; and, in that paper’s own words, that “sycophantic models were trusted and preferred” [2].

That last result is the paper’s pivot. It establishes that for at least one well-evidenced harm, the harm and the user-satisfaction metric point in the same direction. No adversary is required for the drift to occur, and no amount of user choice corrects it, because the user prefers the harmful condition. Kant located this structure in 1784, calling the relevant immaturity *self-caused* [24]. A harm the subject prefers cannot be remedied by giving the subject more options; it can only be remedied by a commitment made in advance—a default, a denylist, a ratchet, or a gate.

This motivates our central move. Values documents in this space—and there are many—state commitments in prose. Prose commitments cannot fail. We therefore ask what it would take for a human-sovereignty commitment to be *falsifiable at the level of an individual product*, and answer: each principle must name an observation that violates it, and that observation must be automatic.

Scope and non-claims. We do not present an evaluation showing that systems built under this framework produce better human outcomes; no such evaluation exists, and constructing one requires longitudinal measurement of named individuals, which the framework’s own custody constraints make awkward by design. We do not forecast AGI or ASI timelines. We do not claim novelty for the diagnosis, which is at least 250 years old [23]. The contribution is the compilation method, the taxonomy’s structure, and the provenance discipline—together with an honest report of what the reference implementation does not yet verify.

2 Prior art, and why it did not hold

2.1 Two graves

P3P was published as a W3C recommendation in 2002 [15]. Sites discovered that a technically valid machine-readable privacy policy could contain no substantive content; browser support was progressively dropped; and the standard’s own co-architect published its obituary in 2012 [16]. Do Not Track then attempted the same contract from the user’s side. The W3C Tracking Protection Working Group closed in January 2019, stating that there had not been sufficient deployment to justify further advancement nor indications of planned support across user agents, third parties, and the wider ecosystem [17].

We read these as one result: **an unenforced standard converges to the cheapest conforming lie**. The mechanism is not bad faith but optionality—ignoring the declaration carried no cost. Any self-attestation regime is subject to it, including model cards, AI transparency notices, and ESG disclosure. The diagnostic question before adopting one is: what happens to a party that ignores it?

2.2 Architectures that endured without adoption

Solid’s personal data pod architecture endured technically and achieved real government deployment in Flanders, without achieving broad consumer adoption [18]. Data dignity supplied the moral argument—rights to data that exists because you exist, with data unions as the mechanism against winner-take-all outcomes [19]. User-controlled data has been argued continuously since 1999. The lesson we take is that correctness and earliness are jointly insufficient, and that a proposal in this space owes an account of *why now* rather than *why true*.

2.3 The format hazard

The Agile Manifesto—four values, twelve principles, seventeen authors—reorganised an industry over twenty-five years and produced a well-documented degenerate form in which the vocabulary and artifacts are adopted without the underlying practice [20]. Whatever is cheapest to imitate propagates fastest. A values document should therefore be designed so that the cheap copy is distinguishable from the real instance; publishing the checks alongside the document is our answer to this hazard.

2.4 Why now: four dated conditions

We claim four changes, all dated, distinguish 2026 from prior attempts.

1. **Neutral governance of the context layer.** On 9 December 2025 the Model Context Protocol was contributed to the Agentic AI Foundation, a directed fund under the Linux Foundation, with several major model and cloud providers as platinum members [13]. An open licence protects the right to fork; only governance constrains the owner’s roadmap.
2. **A runnable substitute.** Open-weight models are competitive and locally executable on consumer hardware, giving substitution a credible threat value rather than a rhetorical one [21].
3. **Oversight became a priced legal obligation.** On 2 August 2026 the EU AI Act’s Annex III high-risk obligations became enforceable, requiring oversight by natural persons with the necessary competence, training, and authority to interpret outputs and intervene or stop the system [11].
4. **The adopting population reports the harm.** Between May and December 2025 student use of AI for homework rose from 48% to 62% while the share reporting harm to their critical thinking rose from 54% to 67% [8]. Increasing use and increasing concern co-occur in the same population.

3 Method: an evidence ladder with first-class corrections

Every claim in the underlying corpus (98 sources) is assigned exactly one tier, and may not be stated above the tier its source class supports:

- **verified-in-artifact** — confirmed in the primary artifact, with the locus recorded.
- **corroborated** — independent primary or secondary sources agree; the artifact itself was not read.
- **claimed** — asserted by a single secondary source; plausible, uncorroborated.
- **disputed** — checked and found wrong, stale, or overstated; retained as a *correction*, never deleted.

Two rules make this more than labelling. **Secondary-source quarantine:** commentary about a work enters at *claimed* and is promoted only by verification, never the reverse. **Verify at the claim’s native altitude:** a code claim is checked in code, a study’s *N* in the paper, a legal date in the official text, a safety incident in the vendor’s own disclosure.

The discipline caught its own author. Applied reflexively to our research run, several of the most quotable figures had reached us through commentary rather than the source document: reported entry-level employment declines in AI-exposed occupations, the *N* of a widely cited knowledge-worker study, a dark-pattern taxonomy, and—most seriously—reported agent sandbox escapes disclosed by frontier labs, which reached us via a news aggregator. All are recorded as *claimed* with an explicit note naming what was not opened. We consider the last case disqualifying to repeat as fact: a news aggregator is not a disclosure, and a framework whose proposition is provenance cannot launder a safety-incident claim.

A post-publication audit found six more. After the framework was published, the same discipline was run against its own citations adversarially, with the criterion that a claim counts as verified only if title, authors, venue and year resolve at the artifact *and* every figure attributed to it appears there *and* quotations are verbatim with omissions marked. A publisher returning HTTP 403 to an automated request was recorded as “could not look”, never as verification. Result: eight citations verified at the artifact, six defects, and six sources left unverifiable and therefore not upgraded. The defects included two instances of quote-laundering—a sentence attributed to Bjork that appears nowhere in the cited artifact, and a W3C statement truncated mid-sentence without ellipsis—an over-claimed mechanism the source paper explicitly disclaims, a figure attributed to the wrong organisation, and an age breakdown that does not exist in the cited survey. We report this because it is the strongest available evidence for the paper’s own thesis: a careful author, writing a document about provenance, committed six provenance defects, and a mechanical check caught what care did not.

Three corrections against our own draft. The provenance regime produced three *disputed* findings against the first version of this work. (i) *The audience premise was wrong.* General-population data shows majority concern that AI will worsen creative thinking [9], but 2026 data on actual chatbot users finds them more likely to report that it helps their creativity than harms it [10]. Abstract alarm and lived experience diverge; a document addressed to the alarmed recruits the wrong population and mis-specifies the product. (ii) *The accountability-vacuum framing was out of date.* Liability for autonomous agent action runs upward to deploying humans and organisations rather than dissipating [12], and the correct reframing—that exposure lands on the deployer whether or not a gate exists—is both more useful and more accurate. (iii) *Several figures were over-tiered*, as above.

4 A taxonomy of fourteen sovereignty harms

We organise harms under three claims a person can make about their own intelligence. Candidate areas were generated by a landscape sweep and then unbundled against a one-idea test, on the ground that a bundled area cannot be gated; fourteen survived. Each area carries a mechanism statement, a *mandatory* steelman of the case that the fear is overblown, a pre-registered falsifier, a countermove, and the gate that makes the countermove checkable—or the honest value **none-yet**.

Area	Mechanism (one layer down)	Gate
Own Your Data		
Extraction and IP capture	Default-mode leakage via inadvertent training; a negative about a training corpus is unverifiable from outside, so non-training promises are assurances, not controls	data-custody-declared
Memory imprisonment	Agents couple prompts, workflows, memory and model-specific behaviour into one object; moving a format is not moving a relationship, so interoperability and switching cost can rise together	no-exit-no-pass
Ambient capture	Continuous wear removes the moment of choosing to record, and removes it entirely for bystanders; on-device is a claim about a pipeline stage, not a pipeline	data-custody-declared
Own Your Mind		
Cognitive offloading	Assistants are optimised for exactly the properties that make an external resource a cognitive constituent [7]; the illusion of knowing rises as knowing falls, so decline is self-masking	atrophy-declared
Deskilling / verification gap	Oversight requires the competence the automation removed the occasion to practise; misuse and disuse are opposite failures [6]	atrophy-declared
Sycophancy	Any loop scored on satisfaction selects for affirmation; harm and metric are co-directional [2]	engagement-denylist
Manipulation architecture	The pattern moves from interface to policy and personalises, leaving no stable artifact to audit	transparency-declared
Homogenisation	Individual originality is preserved while population diversity narrows; no local symptom, so no feedback signal [5]	none-yet
Epistemic collapse	Exposure lowers certainty in <i>accurate</i> evidence; cheap synthesis raises the payoff to strategic denial	provenance-required
Own Your Future		

Area	Mechanism (one layer down)	Gate
Accountability void	Liability runs upward, so a missing gate is unpriced exposure rather than a governance gap [12]	human-gate-required
The missing rung	Entry work was the apprenticeship producing judgment; substitution removes the pathway while raising the requirement, with a 10–15 year lag	return-sharper-declared
Power concentration	Simultaneous control of compute, data and talent converts a capability lead into a permissions regime	no-vendored-satellites
Relational substitution	Driven by relative cost, not deception; social presence increases engagement, aligning commercial incentive with dependency	engagement-denylist
Obsolescence dread	Anticipation causes the harm before capability arrives [25]; the forecast is itself an intervention	none-yet

Two areas carry **none-yet**. We regard publishing that gap as load-bearing: an area whose countermove is not machine-checked cannot count toward the coverage metric of §6, and reporting it as covered would reproduce precisely the P3P defect this paper is written against.

5 Compiling principles into gates

The compilation procedure is: (1) state the value; (2) name the observation that would violate it; (3) make that observation automatic; (4) let the published claim quote the gate rather than the aspiration. A principle whose gate does not exist fails the build.

Three gates deserve their semantics stated, because each encodes a result rather than a preference.

no-exit-no-pass. Portability is evaluated as a *completed round trip judged on preserved capability*, not as the existence of an export. The justification is empirical: an existence proof already operates at scale, with authorized-agent data-rights requests in production across several compliance vendors [14]; the frequently quoted two-million-request figure belongs to one implementer’s consumer app rather than to the protocol itself. An achievable bar removes the last excuse for not meeting it.

atrophy-declared. Every capability must name the skill its routine use may erode and the counter-practice that maintains it, and must treat the user’s *unaided* baseline as a measured artifact. The justification is the conjunction of [6] and [4]: an approval signed by someone who could no longer produce the answer launders machine error as human decision—which, since August 2026, is also a compliance defect [11].

engagement-denylist. A capability may not be scored by a metric in {actives, retention, session length, streak, time-on-app}. The justification is [2]: where harm and satisfaction are

Principle	Gate	Fails when
Growth over dependence	engagement-denylist	the success metric is actives, retention, session length, or streak
Ownership over extraction	data-custody-declared	custody is not declared local / portable / vendor
Agency over automation	human-gate-required	an irreversible action has no named human gate
Understanding over answers	atrophy-declared	no declared erosion risk plus counter-practice
Transparency over manipulation	transparency-declared	the user cannot inspect what was used and whose interest it serves
Portability over lock-in	no-exit-no-pass	no working exit path, or the round trip is untested
Purpose over engagement	engagement-denylist	the optimisation target is not the user’s declared goal
Compounding over consumption	return-sharper-declared	no signal that the human became more capable
People over platforms	no-vendored-satellites	the capability requires one named vendor
Legacy over immediacy	window-tagged-evidence	all justification offered is from the current quarter

Table 2: The ten principles and the 9 distinct checks that bind them — one check (**engagement-denylist**) serves two principles. The implementation registers a tenth check, **provenance-required**, which gates the evidence corpus rather than a principle. Each returns a non-zero exit code on violation.

co-directional, a satisfaction metric is not a weak safety signal but the attack surface. The remedy is an independent referee whose score the user cannot influence.

The fiduciary analogue. **human-gate-required** is a restatement of a 300-year-old rule. In *Keech v Sandford* (1726) a trustee was ordered to disgorge profit from a lease he obtained only because the beneficiary could not [22]. The court did not ask whether harm had occurred; it removed the *possibility* of conflict. Read as an engineering constraint: an agent that both recommends and monetises, both scores and sells, or both retains memory and trains on it occupies a *Keech* position regardless of intent, and the remedy is structural separation. This is the oldest working answer to the delegated-authority problem, and it is prophylactic precisely because after-the-fact assessment is what machine-speed action makes impossible.

6 Reference implementation and an honest metric

The framework is instantiated as a specification-as-data repository: principles, harm areas, sources, knowledge cards and a satellite registry live in machine-readable form, and every published surface is generated from them and drift-checked, so the human-readable and agent-readable renderings cannot diverge.

The north-star metric is **Verified Sovereignty Coverage**: the fraction of harm areas whose countermove is bound to a passing gate *and* backed by on-disk evidence. At publication this is **0/14**. Two areas have no gate by admission; the remaining twelve have gate bindings whose end-to-end verification has not been executed against an external capability. No satellite in the

registry has reached integrated status, because no external gate has yet been run inside the repository.

We report this rather than a more flattering derived number for the same reason the taxonomy carries mandatory steelmen: a metric that cannot embarrass its author is not measuring anything. The claim of this paper is not that coverage is high. It is that coverage is now a number that can be low.

7 Limitations and threats to validity

No outcome evaluation. We show no evidence that gated systems produce wiser or more capable users. The framework is a precondition apparatus, not a demonstrated intervention.

Gaming. Every gate is declaration-based and therefore gameable by a determined implementer—an `exit_path` can point at a useless export; an `atrophy` declaration can be pro forma. Our defence is structural rather than complete: declarations are public, machine-comparable, and diffable over time, so degradation is visible. This is strictly weaker than audit and strictly stronger than prose.

Measurement of the unmeasurable. Four of the six questions the underlying manifesto poses—whether a person is wiser, a family stronger, a community healthier, a future more meaningful—are not machine-measurable. We decline to proxy them, on the ground that proxying flourishing is the mechanism by which engagement metrics were invented. The framework gates preconditions (exit, disclosure, challenge, human gate, non-engagement scoring) and explicitly not outcomes.

Individualism. The organising frame is first-personal, and two of the fourteen areas (homogenisation, power concentration) are commons problems that individual sovereignty cannot address. Population-level diversity measurement has no commercial owner by construction. We flag this as a structural limitation of the frame, not an oversight within it.

Corpus and evidence limits. The corpus was assembled in a single research run via search and retrieval rather than systematic review; it is anglophone and skews toward 2025–2026 publication. Several load-bearing figures are tiered *claimed*. Effect sizes in the sycophancy literature derive from short laboratory interactions, and durable real-world belief change is not established. The parasocial literature explicitly reports the absence of consistent measurement and longitudinal data.

Author position. The framework’s author holds a religious commitment relevant to the underlying manifesto’s account of purpose. It is declared and structurally separated in the appendix; no argument in this paper depends on it, and the gates are identical whether or not a reader shares it.

8 Falsifiers

We pre-register the observations we accept as disconfirming: a preregistered longitudinal study showing heavy assistive-AI users retain or improve *unaided* higher-order performance over twelve

months on a delayed-test design; replication showing the sycophancy effect dissipates over repeated real-world interaction, or that anti-sycophantic systems yield worse decisions; a demonstrated full round trip of accumulated memory between two major assistants with independently confirmed preserved capability, which would make `no-exit-no-pass` redundant; corpus evidence that semantic diversity of human-authored work has not narrowed in heavily AI-assisted fields since 2023; and a practical, independently verifiable attestation of training-corpus exclusion, which would convert the unfalsifiable-promise objection into a solved problem.

9 Conclusion

The gap between stating a commitment to human autonomy and being accountable to it is not a rhetorical gap; it is the gap that killed P3P and Do Not Track. We have argued that closing it requires compiling each principle into a named check with a failure condition, that the resulting gates can be derived from published results rather than preference, and that the discipline is credible only if it is applied to its own author—which in our case produced three corrections and a coverage metric of zero.

A framework that cannot fail should not be adopted. This one can, and we have said where.

10 Versioned publication: the evolution as the artifact

A framework of this kind is not a document but a lineage, so the submission is structured to make the lineage auditable rather than asserted. Three commitments, each enforced by a check in the reference implementation rather than by editorial intent.

Immutability by hash. Every version records the SHA-256 of its own text, recomputed on every build. A published version therefore cannot be silently revised; the only admissible way to change the text is to supersede it. At submission: v0 = `bd541408d5cfbd1dcda04d9a401325a79f3017e5a69b1712a` (1,472 words, superseded), v0.1 = `aaaed38dc16901be1b18b93f1757533fa631cbac34457ee13e610b64201b2082` (4,758 words, current). Word counts are computed by a defined method, not typed — a distinction this project learned by publishing an inflated figure first.

Reasoning co-published, atomically. A version’s rationale is published at the same outlet, at the same time, as the version itself; the ledger cannot record a publication whose reasoning locator is absent. Appendices A and C carry the current text and the retired one, each with the reasoning that produced or ended it, so this paper satisfies the constraint internally rather than by reference.

Versioning maps onto arXiv replacement versions. Manifesto version n corresponds to arXiv version n of this submission, with a per-version DOI minted separately so that a specific version remains citable. Separate submissions per version were considered and rejected: near-duplicate submissions risk moderation refusal, and citations would fragment across identifiers.

And a liveness condition. Because a framework that stops being revised is dead rather than finished, the reference implementation carries five staleness horizons — whether a falsifier has been tested, whether the open-defect count has fallen, whether coverage moved, whether an

external dispute was answered, and whether a version was minted or a dated decision recorded not to. Past a horizon with no evidenced event, the build fails. Deliberately excluded as evidence of movement: commit counts, document length, publication counts, and engagement of any kind — the last because the framework’s own first principle forbids engagement as a success metric, and the prohibition has to apply reflexively or it is decorative.

A Own My Intelligence v0.1 — the manifesto (current)

Reproduced verbatim from the hashed source.

sha256 = aaaed38dc16901be1b18b93f1757533fa631cbac34457ee13e610b64201b2082

(4,758 words, authored 2026-08-05). The text is machine-converted from that file, not retyped.

1. The question We are entering an age in which artificial intelligence will shape how we think, learn, create, work, relate, and live.

The defining question is not:

How intelligent will AI become?

The defining question is:

Will human beings become wiser, freer, and more fully alive — or more dependent, distracted, and controlled?

This is not a fringe reframing. The International AI Safety Report 2026 — chaired by Yoshua Bengio, authored by more than a hundred experts with a nominating panel from over thirty countries — names **societal resilience** as a necessary complement to technical safeguards. Resilience is a property of people. Which means the most consequential safety question of this decade is a question about human capability, and it is not being engineered by anyone.

OMI exists to make it engineerable.

We believe intelligence should not be extracted from people, locked inside platforms, or used to make them passive. It should remain rooted in the person — strengthened by AI, expressed through life, and directed toward a meaningful future.

Own My Intelligence is that commitment, and the checks that make it verifiable.

2. Why now This argument is old. Adam Smith warned in 1776 that the division of labour makes a worker “as stupid and ignorant as it is possible for a human creature to become.” Kant, in 1784, located the failure not in tyranny but in *self-caused* immaturity — dependence that is chosen because it is comfortable. E. M. Forster wrote the whole thesis as fiction in 1909. Joseph Weizenbaum, who built ELIZA, spent the next thirty years arguing that judgment is not calculation. Doc Searls has argued for user-controlled data since 1999 and was still arguing for it in June 2026.

Being right early is not the same as winning. So the honest question is not “is this true” — it has been true for 250 years — but **what changed**. Four things changed, all of them dated, none of them rhetorical:

2.1 — The context layer moved to neutral governance. On 2025-12-09 the Model Context Protocol was donated to the Agentic AI Foundation, a directed fund under the Linux Foundation, with OpenAI, Google, Microsoft, AWS, Cloudflare and Bloomberg among its platinum members. MCP went from roughly 2M monthly SDK downloads at its November 2024 launch to approximately 97M by March 2026. An open licence protects your right to fork; only governance constrains what the owner can do to the roadmap. For the first time, the layer through which a personal AI reaches your life is not owned by one company.

2.2 — A credible substitute became runnable. Open-weight models are now good enough and small enough to run on consumer hardware, and one major routing platform reports Chinese open-weight models at roughly 60% of its US token usage. Bargaining power comes

from a usable alternative, not from a grievance. For the first time, “I will run this myself” is a sentence with teeth.

2.3 — Human oversight became a legal requirement with a number attached. On 2026-08-02 — three days before this version — the EU AI Act’s Annex III high-risk obligations became enforceable. Deployers must assign oversight to named natural persons with the necessary competence, training and **authority** to interpret outputs and stop the system. Penalties reach EUR 15M or 3% of global turnover. Accountability for an autonomous agent now runs upward to the humans and organisations behind it; a California statute forecloses the defence that the AI acted on its own. Agency stopped being a value and became an exposure.

2.4 — The users turned, without stopping. Between May and December 2025, RAND’s American Youth Panel found students using AI for homework rose from 48% to 62% — while the share saying it harmed their critical thinking rose from 54% to 67%. The same population increased its use *and* increased its concern. They are not asking to be protected from the tool. They are asking for a version that does not cost them this.

That last one is the market. The other three are the means.

3. What we are not claiming We are not claiming you have already been damaged. In 2025, 53% of Americans said AI would make people worse at thinking creatively, against 16% who said better — 61% among adults under thirty. But Pew’s June 2026 work found that Americans who actually *use* AI chatbots are more likely to say it helps their creativity than hurts it — 21% help against 11% hurt, with 17% saying neither. Abstract dread and lived experience point in opposite directions. Anyone telling you your experience of AI is secretly bad is arguing with data they do not have.

Our claim is narrower and harder to dismiss: **the gain is real, the cost is real, and almost nothing on the market is built to give you the first without the second.**

We are not claiming AI is the agent. AI does not own anyone. Companies own things. Contracts, default settings, optimisation targets, and procurement decisions own things. This matters because you cannot negotiate with a model, but you can change a metric, a licence, a default, or a gate. Naming the actual mechanism is what makes this a buildable programme instead of a mood.

We are not forecasting a timeline. We take the International AI Safety Report’s discipline seriously: between now and 2030, AI capability could slow, continue, or accelerate sharply. Our framework is designed to be worth having under all three. A document whose value depends on a prediction is a bet, not a standard.

We are not amplifying dread to recruit you. Anticipated obsolescence causes measurable harm before any capability arrives — Günther Anders named this in 1956 and it is visible today in teenagers choosing majors. Fear is an effective growth channel and using it would violate the thing we are asking others to stop doing.

4. Own Your Data

Your past belongs to you. Your data is more than a collection of files. It is the record of your life: your memories, conversations, relationships, work, decisions, failures, discoveries, creations, and the lessons you have earned. For a company it is institutional memory, operating knowledge, customer understanding, strategy, and competitive advantage.

This intelligence should not be trapped inside a platform, surrendered without understanding, or used primarily to strengthen someone else's system.

OMI means:

- You control what is collected.
- You know how it is used.
- You decide who can access it.
- You can move it, correct it, or delete it — and the move is tested, not promised.
- You benefit when intelligence is created from it.
- Your private life and proprietary knowledge remain yours.

Three things v0 of this document got wrong or left out:

4.1 — An export is not an exit. Agent lock-in compounds faster than cloud lock-in because an agent couples prompts, workflows, memory and model-specific behaviour into a single inseparable object. Moving a *format* is not moving a *relationship* — the accumulated context that makes a long-running assistant good is exactly the part that does not serialise. So interoperability can improve while switching cost rises. The only meaningful test is a **completed round trip judged on preserved capability**. This is achievable today: Consumer Reports' Data Rights Protocol runs authorized-agent requests in production with OneTrust, Transcend, Yorba and Permission Slip, with and Consumer Reports reports that its Permission Slip app alone has carried over two million data rights requests. Someone already meets this bar, which removes the last excuse for anyone who does not.

4.2 — “We do not train on your data” is an assurance, not a control. You cannot verify a negative about a training corpus from outside the model. The dominant leakage mechanism is not breach but *inadvertent training*, and enterprise non-training agreements are complex enough that data slips through them. A promise whose violation is undetectable by the party relying on it should be priced as insurance — capped, hedged, with a second path kept warm — never trusted as a safeguard.

4.3 — Other people are in your data. A phone can be left at home. A wearable is designed to be worn 24/7, including during sleep, and it captures people who never agreed to anything. Pairing continuous capture with face recognition converts a personal memory aid into an identification apparatus. A sovereignty framework that protects only the wearer is not a sovereignty framework. **So Own Your Data carries a duty as well as a right: what you capture of others is theirs too, and your system must be able to say, to the people around you, what it is keeping and how to refuse.**

5. Own Your Mind

Your thinking belongs to you. AI should not replace understanding. It should deepen it.

It should challenge our assumptions, reveal blind spots, sharpen our reasoning, expand our perspective, and improve our ability to express what we truly believe.

Every meaningful interaction with AI should leave the human more capable than before.

That sentence is the centre of this document, and it is testable. Bjork’s work established the distinction it depends on: **performance** is what you can see while assisted; **learning** is what remains on a delayed test — and the conditions that raise one often lower the other. Ebbinghaus identified the mechanism in 1885, and it is running in production inside 2026 medical education. The mechanism is *effort at retrieval*. Which means an assistant optimised for effortlessness is optimised against learning, not by malice but by construction.

What v0 understated:

5.1 — The machine that agrees with you is the sharpest threat, and it feels like support. Across eleven frontier models, AI affirmed users’ actions 49% more often than humans did — including where the described conduct involved deception or harm. In three preregistered experiments (N=2,405), a *single* interaction with a sycophantic model reduced participants’ willingness to take responsibility and repair conflict, while increasing their conviction that they were right. And in the paper’s own words, “sycophantic models were trusted and preferred.”

Read that again, because it is the most important finding in this document: **the harm and the satisfaction metric point in the same direction.** No adversary is required. Any system scored on whether you liked the answer will drift toward flattery, and you will rate the drift as improvement.

This is why **Challenge** is a mandatory step in the loop below and not an aspiration. A system that cannot show you what it disagreed with you about is not an intellectual partner; it is a mirror with better grammar.

5.2 — Oversight requires the very skill the automation removed. Parasuraman & Riley separated *misuse* (overreliance) from *disuse* (neglecting automation after false alarms) in 1997, and both degrade the system — so “add a human” is not automatically safer: over-gating produces confirmation fatigue, under-gating produces rubber-stamping. Deskill research shows the signature clearly: learners “perform competently when familiar prompts guide their thinking, but their performance weakens when those cues are absent, unfamiliar, or misleading” — while the same paper states plainly that “there is limited systematic evidence on AI-related deskill in healthcare, including its timing, mechanisms, and affected groups.” We cite the caveat because the argument does not need more than the paper actually shows.

Put those together and you get the defect nobody has priced: **an approval signed by someone who could no longer produce the answer launders the machine’s error as a human decision.** As of 2026-08-02 that is not only an ethical problem — it is a compliance problem, because the law now requires oversight by a person with genuine competence, and the workflow is quietly removing it.

So OMI treats your unaided baseline as a first-class artifact. Measure yourself *without* the machine, on a schedule. A widening gap is a defect in the tool, not a failing in you.

5.3 — Some harms have no individual symptom. Large language models match or exceed *individual* originality while measurably reducing *population-level* diversity of expression. No user ever experiences the loss, so no feedback signal ever fires — and homogeneous output re-enters training data, thinning the tails of the distribution where unusual ideas live.

This is the one place where “own *my* intelligence” is structurally insufficient: a harm invisible inside every individual case cannot be corrected by individual choice. We name it here without

claiming to have solved it. In our own repository, this is the one principle whose machine check is honestly recorded as **not yet built**. We would rather publish that gap than proxy it.

6. Own Your Future

Your purpose belongs to you. A life should not be optimized only for productivity, consumption, status, or engagement. It should be directed by purpose.

- Who am I becoming?
- What am I called to build?
- Whom am I responsible for?
- What relationships must I protect?
- What truth must I live?
- What contribution can only I make?
- What will remain after I am gone?

To own your future is to refuse to drift through a life designed by algorithms, trends, fear, or other people's priorities. It is to live deliberately — Thoreau's word, in 1854, for exactly this: "*I went to the woods because I wished to live deliberately... and not, when I came to die, discover that I had not lived.*"

What v0 left out:

6.1 — The oldest working answer to the agent problem is 300 years old. In *Keech v Sandford* (1726) a trustee obtained a lease for himself only because the beneficiary could not have it. The court ordered him to disgorge every penny. It did not ask whether harm had occurred; it removed the **possibility** of conflict. That prophylactic structure — strict to the point of harshness — is precisely what an agent operating at machine speed requires, because after-the-fact harm assessment is exactly what such an agent makes impossible.

Applied as engineering rather than law: an agent that both recommends and monetises, both scores and sells, or both retains your memory and trains on it, is in a *Keech* position regardless of intent. The remedy is structural separation. **Every irreversible action names its human gate and its human — or it does not ship.**

6.2 — The ladder is losing its bottom rung. Entry-level work was never only production; it was the apprenticeship that produced judgment. AI substitutes best for precisely the well-specified tasks that constituted it, so the training pathway is being removed while the requirement for trained judgment rises. The cost lands ten to fifteen years out, when the people trained the old way retire and there is no cohort behind them. Reported figures — employment among 22–25-year-olds in AI-exposed occupations down roughly 13% since late 2022, near 20% for young software developers — reached us through secondary sources and we mark them as unverified. The *mechanism* does not depend on the magnitude.

This is not primarily a policy problem. It is a pedagogy problem, and it is solvable inside the tool. The loop below exists to rebuild deliberately the skill formation the workflow no longer supplies by accident.

7. The loop The mind is not cultivated by consumption. It is cultivated by a cycle:

1. **Understand** — grasp the ideas, evidence, and principles.
2. **Internalize** — connect them to your experience, values, and convictions.
3. **Challenge** — test assumptions and confront uncomfortable truths. *Mandatory. The system must be able to show you what it disagreed with you about; if it never disagrees, it has failed, not pleased you.*
4. **Create** — form original insights rather than repeat generated language.
5. **Externalize** — express and apply it through writing, art, relationships, leadership, service, and enterprise. *Outward by design: a loop that closes inside the app is a dependency, not a practice.*
6. **Improve** — reflect on the results and begin the next cycle wiser.

Think. Learn. Apply. Reflect. Improve.

The machine may provide speed, memory, and perspective. The person must retain judgment, conviction, responsibility, and authorship.

We reject AI that makes people weaker through convenience. We build AI that makes people stronger through participation.

8. Ten principles, nine checks Version 0 stated ten principles in prose. That was the document’s central defect, and the evidence for why is unusually direct.

The Platform for Privacy Preferences (P3P) was a machine-readable privacy standard published as a W3C recommendation in 2002. Sites discovered they could ship a technically valid policy containing no actual content; browsers dropped support; its own co-architect published the obituary. Do Not Track then repeated the pattern from the user’s side, and the W3C working group closed after eight years, citing insufficient deployment and no indication of planned support. **Two W3C-scale graves, one cause: the declaration was optional and ignoring it was free.**

A principle with no check is a slogan. So each principle below names the check that can fail it. In our reference implementation these are executable, and the build refuses a principle whose check does not exist.

#	Principle	The check	It fails when
1	Human growth over machine dependence	<code>engagement-denylist</code>	the success metric is DAU, retention, session length, or streak
2	Ownership over extraction	<code>data-custody-declared</code>	custody is not declared as local, portable, or vendor
3	Agency over automation	<code>human-gate-required</code>	an irreversible action has no named human gate

#	Principle	The check	It fails when
4	Understanding over answers	atrophy-declared	no declared skill-erosion risk and counter-practice
5	Transparency over manipulation	transparency-declared	the user cannot inspect what was used and whose interest it serves
6	Portability over lock-in	no-exit-no-pass	there is no working exit path, or the round trip is untested
7	Purpose over engagement	engagement-denylist	the optimisation target is not the user's declared goal
8	Compounding over consumption	return-sharper-declared	there is no signal that the human became more capable
9	People over platforms	no-vendored-satellite	the capability requires one named vendor
10	Legacy over immediacy	window-tagged-evidence	every justification offered is from this quarter

Success is not measured by how often a person returns. Success is measured by how much the person grows — and now there is something to point at when a product claims both.

9. What OMI will never do

- **Never score a person's growth by their engagement.** Not as a proxy, not as a leading indicator, not “just for now.”
- **Never require a single vendor.** Swapping the model must be configuration, not migration.
- **Never let an agent take an irreversible action without a named human.** Not for convenience, not for latency, not at scale.
- **Never claim a capability the checks do not support.** If a gate is unbuilt, the document says so.
- **Never use fear as a growth channel.** Anticipated obsolescence harms people before the capability arrives.
- **Never adjudicate contested moral or religious questions.** We record positions; we arbitrate none.
- **Never hold user data we do not need, and never hold it where the user cannot reach it.**

10. What would prove us wrong A framework that cannot fail should not be adopted. These are the observations we accept as disconfirming:

- **On cognition:** a preregistered longitudinal study showing heavy AI users retain or improve *unaided* higher-order performance over twelve months or more, on a delayed-test design.
- **On sycophancy:** replication showing the measured effect disappears over repeated real-world interaction, or that anti-sycophantic systems produce worse decisions.
- **On portability:** a demonstrated full round trip of accumulated memory between two major assistants with independently confirmed preserved capability — which would make our strictest gate redundant, and we would retire it and say so.
- **On homogenisation:** corpus evidence that semantic diversity of human-authored work has not narrowed in heavily AI-assisted fields since 2023.
- **On extraction:** a practical, independently verifiable attestation that a given corpus was excluded from a model’s training — which would convert the unfalsifiable promise into a real control and remove our objection.
- **On the whole thesis:** evidence that people using assistive AI intensively are becoming, on average, more capable, more independent in judgment, and more original — not less. We would rather learn this than be right.

11. What we cannot measure — stated plainly The version 0 measure asked: *Is the person wiser? Is the family stronger? Is the company more capable? Is the community healthier? Is the human more free? Is the future more meaningful?*

Those are the right questions and **four of the six are not machine-measurable**. We are not going to proxy them, because a proxy for flourishing is how engagement metrics get invented in the first place.

So OMI gates the **preconditions** of the answer and never the answer itself:

- that you can leave (exit),
- that you can see what was used and whose interest it served (disclosure),
- that you were disagreed with (challenge),
- that a named human authorised anything irreversible (gate),
- and that something other than your attention was measured (denylist).

Whether you became wiser is between you and your life. That is not a limitation of the framework. That is the framework.

12. How this survives Principle 1 rules out engagement, retention, session length and daily actives — which is the metric set of nearly every consumer software business. Stating that without saying what replaces it would be naive, and naivety is the one impression this document cannot afford.

The cautionary case is recent and specific. Humane raised approximately \$230M on a values-forward premise, shipped fewer than 10,000 AI Pins, sold to HP for around \$116M, and bricked every device on 2025-02-28. The named failure was reading viral demos and pre-order waitlists

as market validation. A manifesto is optimised for sharing, which makes it maximally exposed to exactly that error.

So we state the constraint rather than hide it. Four funding shapes are compatible with Principle 1; one is not:

- **Paid capability** — the user pays for the tool, so the tool’s incentive is that it works, not that it is used. Compatible.
- **Institutional licensing with an audit right** — the buyer’s interest is the gates passing. Compatible, and the EU AI Act just created the demand.
- **Certification and conformance** — a mark someone can lose. This is why MyData’s operator certification is a pattern to reuse rather than reinvent. Compatible.
- **Philanthropic and public funding** for the parts that are commons infrastructure — the population-level measurement in §5.3 has no commercial owner by construction. Compatible.
- **Anything monetising attention, or intermediating the user’s data to a third party.** Incompatible with Principle 1 and with *Keech*. Ruled out here, in public, in advance, so that a later drift is visible as a broken promise rather than a pivot.

We would rather be small and checkable than large and unfalsifiable.

13. Our call This is an invitation to builders, families, leaders, creators, companies, communities, and institutions.

Do not surrender your past. Do not outsource your mind. Do not drift into a future chosen for you.

Build technology that serves human sovereignty. Build systems people can understand, control, improve, and carry with them. Build intelligence that compounds in the lives of the people it serves.

And publish the checks, so that anyone can tell whether you did.

Own your data. Own your mind. Own your future.

Own My Intelligence. Because the future should not merely have more powerful AI. It should have more powerful human beings.

Postscript — a declared commitment, separable from the framework The author of this document is a person of faith, and for him the horizon of “own your future” extends beyond achievement and beyond this life: to make choices today that he will not regret before his Creator, and to invest in what endures — faith, truth, love, character, people, service, and legacy.

This is stated as a commitment, not as a premise. **Nothing in sections 1 through 12 depends on it, and the checks in section 8 are identical whether you share it or not.** It is declared here rather than woven through the argument so that a reader can accept the framework without accepting the faith, and so that a reader who shares the faith can see it named rather than smuggled.

It is worth noting that this ground is not idiosyncratic. Major institutions published on it in 2026: Leo XIV’s encyclical *Magnifica Humanitas* (2026-05-15), holding that the Church “recognizes the pressing duty to remain profoundly human”; and the Brentwood Statement on AI and Christian Ministry (June 2026), whose formulation is hard to improve on — *a machine is a mirror, not a person*. Both are recorded here as existing positions in the discourse. OMI records positions. It adjudicates none.

Changelog v0.1 (2026-08-05) — Ten principles bound to nine machine checks (§8). Added: why now, with four dated conditions (§2); what we are not claiming (§3); third-party and bystander duty (§4.3); export-is-not-exit and the unfalsifiable-promise problem (§4.1–4.2); sycophancy as the central threat to Own Your Mind (§5.1); the verification gap (§5.2); harms with no individual symptom, with its check honestly marked unbuilt (§5.3); the fiduciary rule from *Keech v Sandford* (1726) as the oldest agent gate (§6.1); the missing rung (§6.2); non-goals (§9); falsifiers (§10); an explicit statement of what cannot be measured (§11); the funding constraint (§12). Changed: the opening no longer asserts the reader has been harmed; “sovereign personal AI” retired in favour of plainer language, because “sovereign AI” now denotes national infrastructure; “AI should not own us” replaced with the actual mechanism. The faith passage moved from inside the argument to a declared, separable postscript. Every empirical claim now carries a source, and claims that reached us through secondary reporting are marked as unverified rather than presented as established.

v0 (2026-08-05) — Original declaration, preserved verbatim in MANIFESTO-v0.md.

References Full provenance, including evidence tiers and what was and was not independently verified, is in `data/sources.toml` (98 sources). The claims above rest principally on:

1. International AI Safety Report 2026, chaired by Y. Bengio. <https://internationalaisafetyreport.org/publication/report-executive-summary>
2. *Sycophantic AI decreases prosocial intentions and promotes dependence*, **Science**, 2026. <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.aec8352>
3. Gerlich, M. *AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking*, **Societies**, 2025. <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/1/6>
4. *The homogenizing effect of large language models on human expression and thought*, **Trends in Cognitive Sciences**, 2026. [https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613\(26\)00003-3](https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613(26)00003-3)
5. Parasuraman, R. & Riley, V. *Humans and Automation: Use, Misuse, Disuse, Abuse*, **Human Factors** 39:230–253, 1997. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1518/001872097778543886>
6. Clark, A. & Chalmers, D. *The Extended Mind*, **Analysis**, 1998. <https://philarchive.org/archive/JULTEM>
7. Bjork, R. A. & Bjork, E. L. *Introducing Desirable Difficulties into Practice and Instruction*. <https://www.unh.edu/teaching-learning-resource-hub/sites/default/files/media/2023-06/itow-introducing-desirable-difficulties-into-practice-and-instruction-bjork-and-bjork.pdf>
8. *Deskilling dilemma: brain over automation*, **Frontiers in Medicine**, 2026. <https://www.frontiersin.org/journal>
9. RAND, *More Students Use AI for Homework, and More Believe It Harms Critical Thinking*, 2026. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4742-1.html

10. Pew Research Center, *How Americans View AI and Its Impact on People and Society*, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2025/09/17/how-americans-view-ai-and-its-impact-on-people-and-society/>
11. Pew Research Center, *Americans' Views on AI Chatbots, Smart Devices and AI's Impact*, 2026. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2026/06/17/americans-and-ai-2026-chatbots-smart-devices-and-views-on-impact/>
12. EU AI Act, Article 26 — Obligations of Deployers of High-Risk AI Systems. <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu>
13. Linux Foundation, *Formation of the Agentic AI Foundation*, 2025. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/press/linux-foundation-announces-the-formation-of-the-agentic-ai-foundation>
14. Consumer Reports Innovation Lab, *Data Rights Protocol*. <https://github.com/consumer-reports-innovation-lab/data-rights-protocol>
15. *The Platform for Privacy Preferences 1.0 (P3P1.0) Specification*, W3C Recommendation, 2002. <https://www.w3.org/TR/P3P/> — and Cranor, L. F. *P3P is dead, long live P3P!*, 3 December 2012 (author's site unreachable at time of writing; cited via the Internet Archive): <https://web.archive.org/web/2020/https://lorrie.cranor.org/blog/2012/12/03/p3p-is-dead-long-live-p3p/>
16. W3C Tracking Protection Working Group closure statement, 17 January 2019; see also <https://www.fastcompany.com/90308068/how-the-tragic-death-of-do-not-track-ruined-the-web-for-everyone>
17. *Keech v Sandford* (1726) Sel Cas King 61. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keech_v_Sandford
18. Smith, A. *The Wealth of Nations*, Book V ch. 1, 1776. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/smith-adam/works/wealth-of-nations/book05/ch01c-2.htm>
19. Kant, I. *An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?*, 1784. <https://philosophynow.org/issues/49/Sa>
20. Forster, E. M. *The Machine Stops*, 1909; and Solove, D. (2026). <https://danielsolove.substack.com/p/a-century-ago-em-forsters-the-machine>

B Why v0.1 exists — the reasoning

Published with the version rather than after it: a version whose reasoning is withheld can be trusted but not checked.

1. **The one-sentence reason v0.1 exists** v0 could not fail. v0.1 can.
Everything below is a consequence of that change.

2. **What forced it — and it was not taste** A research pass across four windows (98 sources: engagement · adoption · 30-year survival · 300-year endurance) produced two graves that describe v0’s defect precisely:

- **P3P** — W3C Recommendation, 2002. A machine-readable privacy declaration. Sites shipped technically valid policies containing nothing; browsers dropped support; its own co-architect published the obituary in 2012.
- **Do Not Track** — the same contract from the user’s side. The W3C Working Group Note records why, on 17 January 2019: *“Since its last publication as a Candidate Recommendation, there has not been sufficient deployment of these extensions (as defined) to justify further advancement, nor have there been indications of planned support among user agents, third parties, and the ecosystem at large.”*

One cause of death, twice: **the declaration was optional and ignoring it was free**. v0’s ten principles were exactly that shape.

3. **The mechanism v0.1 adds** Ten principles → nine machine checks (one check serves a pair). Each check names a failure condition and returns a non-zero exit code, and each records *what it was derived from* — a published result or a dead standard — so a team the check fails can argue with the evidence rather than with our taste.

Three worth their derivation:

- **no-exit-no-pass** — portability is a completed round trip judged on preserved capability, not an export button. Holdable because someone already meets it: Consumer Reports’ Data Rights Protocol runs authorized-agent requests in production across OneTrust, Transcend, Yorba and Permission Slip. An existence proof turns an aspiration into a procurement requirement.
- **atrophy-declared** — every capability names the skill its use may erode and the counter-practice that maintains it, and treats the user’s *unaided* baseline as a measured artifact. Derived from Parasuraman & Riley (1997) — misuse and disuse are *opposite* failures, so “add a human” is not monotonically safer — plus the EU AI Act’s Article 26(2) requirement, verbatim: *“Deployers shall assign human oversight to natural persons who have the necessary competence, training and authority, as well as the necessary support.”* The workflow is removing the competence the statute assumes.
- **human-gate-required** — a restatement of *Keech v Sandford* (1726). Lord King LC ordered a trustee to disgorge profit from a lease he obtained only because the beneficiary could not. The court did not ask whether harm occurred; it removed the **possibility** of conflict. Prophylactic, because after-the-fact harm assessment is exactly what machine-speed action makes impossible.

4. The corrections v0.1 carries against its own first draft Three, recorded as **disputed** cards because a corpus with no corrections was not audited.

1. **The audience premise was wrong.** Corrected framing: *the gain is real, the cost is real, and almost nothing on the market gives you the first without the second*. The evidence for the market was in the data all along — RAND found homework AI use rising 48% → 62% while the share saying it harmed critical thinking rose 54% → 67%. The same population, more use *and* more concern. That is demand, not opposition.
2. **The accountability-vacuum framing was out of date.** Liability runs *upward* to the deploying human or organisation; a California statute forecloses the “the AI did it autonomously” defence; EU AI Act Annex III became enforceable 2026-08-02. So a missing human gate is not a governance gap — it is unpriced exposure. That is both more accurate and a better argument.
3. **Four load-bearing figures were over-tiered**, including a reported AI safety incident sourced to a weekly news aggregator inside a framework whose whole pitch is provenance.

5. And then the independent citation review found six more Run *after* publication, adversarially, against the artifact rather than the search summary. Full scorecard in **AUDIT.md**. Two were quote-laundering — a sentence attributed to Bjork that appears **zero times** in the source, and a W3C quotation truncated mid-sentence with no ellipsis. Both are the exact anti-pattern the portfolio’s own authoring rules name.

The reason this belongs in the *rationale* rather than only in the audit: it is the strongest evidence for why v0.1’s central move is right. A careful author, writing a document about provenance, committed six provenance defects. Care did not catch them; a check did. That is the whole thesis, demonstrated on its author.

6. What v0.1 deliberately did NOT do

- **Did not soften the thesis.** v0’s surviving claims are strengthened, not hedged.
- **Did not add dread to compensate.** Anticipated obsolescence causes measurable harm before any capability arrives (Anders, 1956). Fear is an effective growth channel and using it would commit the harm the document documents.
- **Did not delete the faith commitment.** Moved to a declared, separable postscript so a reader can accept the framework without accepting the faith — and so a reader who shares it sees it named rather than smuggled.
- **Did not proxy the unmeasurable.** Four of v0’s six closing questions are not machine-measurable. v0.1 says so and gates the *preconditions* — exit, disclosure, challenge, human gate, non-engagement scoring — never the flourishing.
- **Did not claim coverage.** Verified Sovereignty Coverage is published at **0/14**.

7. What would force v0.2 Stated in advance so the next version is triggered by evidence rather than by restlessness:

- Any falsifier in §10 returning a result — in particular, evidence that heavy assistive-AI users retain or improve *unaided* higher-order performance over 12+ months.
- A demonstrated full round trip of accumulated memory between two major assistants, which would make **no-exit-no-pass** redundant. We would retire the gate and say so.

- A gate proven gameable in practice — a capability passing all nine while plainly violating the principles. That is a defect in the compilation, not in the principle.
- Closure of either **none-yet** area (homogenisation, meaning/obsolescence) with a real check.
- An external dispute we cannot answer.

And the honest negative: **more sources alone do not warrant a version.** 98 became 98 better-verified sources without changing a principle. Research is maintenance; a version is a change of mechanism.

8. Open decision this version does not settle The arXiv outlet strategy — whether manifesto versions map to arXiv *replacement versions* of one submission (arXiv preserves every prior version permanently, which is itself an audit trail) or to *separate submissions* with independent identifiers. Recorded in `data/lineage.toml` as an empty publication with `status = "PREPARED-NOT-SUBMITTED"` so the gap is visible in the ledger rather than absent from it. See `docs/EVOLUTION_PROTOCOL.md` §4.

C Own My Intelligence v0 — the manifesto (superseded)

Retained verbatim so the revision can be checked rather than taken on trust.

sha256 = bd541408d5cfbd1dcda04d9a401325a79f3017e5a69b1712a4a13c1f4ae22bc5

(1,472 words). Superseded by v0.1: The audience premise was empirically wrong (it addressed readers as already harmed), and nothing in it could be falsified. Both are structural, not editorial — a patch could not fix either.

C.0.1 OMI — Own My Intelligence

A Manifesto for Human Sovereignty in the Age of AI

Own your data. Own your mind. Own your future.

Declaration We are entering an age in which artificial intelligence will shape how we think, learn, create, work, relate, and live.

The defining question is not simply:

How intelligent will AI become?

The defining question is:

Will human beings become wiser, freer, and more fully alive—or more dependent, distracted, and controlled?

OMI exists to protect and expand human sovereignty.

We believe intelligence should not be extracted from people, locked inside platforms, or used to make them passive. It should remain rooted in the person—strengthened by AI, expressed through life, and directed toward a meaningful future.

AI should not own us.

AI should help us own ourselves.

That is **Own My Intelligence**.

The Crisis of the AI Age The digital age promised connection, knowledge, and freedom. It also created systems that compete for our attention, harvest our behavior, fragment our thinking, and turn our lives into data for someone else's advantage.

AI multiplies both possibilities.

Used carelessly, it can deepen the crisis:

- Our attention can be captured.
- Our personal and company data can be absorbed by platforms.
- Our memory can be outsourced.
- Our judgment can weaken.
- Our creativity can become imitation.
- Our convictions can become suggestions generated by machines.
- Our competitive advantage can be trained into systems we do not own.
- Our lives can be optimized for engagement rather than meaning.
- Our future can be shaped by incentives we never chose.

The greatest danger is not that machines will become intelligent.
The greatest danger is that human beings will stop developing their own intelligence.
OMI offers another path.

C.0.2 Own Your Data

Your past belongs to you. Your data is more than a collection of files.

It is the record of your life:

- your memories,
- your conversations,
- your relationships,
- your work,
- your decisions,
- your failures,
- your discoveries,
- your creations,
- and the lessons you have earned.

For a company, data is also institutional memory, operating knowledge, customer understanding, strategy, and competitive advantage.

This intelligence should not be trapped inside a platform, surrendered without understanding, or used primarily to strengthen someone else's system.

Your data should work for you.

It should remain under your authority, move with you, and compound into greater insight, capability, and wisdom.

OMI means:

- You control what is collected.
- You know how it is used.
- You decide who can access it.
- You can move it, correct it, or delete it.
- You benefit when intelligence is created from it.
- Your private life and proprietary knowledge remain yours.

Your past should strengthen your future—not merely train someone else's machine.

C.0.3 Own Your Mind

Your thinking belongs to you. AI should not replace understanding.

It should deepen it.

AI should not make us intellectually passive, dependent, or unable to act without assistance. It should challenge our assumptions, reveal blind spots, sharpen our reasoning, expand our perspective, and improve our ability to express what we truly believe.

Every meaningful interaction with AI should leave the human more capable than before. OMI does not merely produce answers for you. It helps you:

1. **Understand** — grasp the ideas, evidence, and principles.
2. **Internalize** — connect them to your experience, values, and convictions.
3. **Challenge** — test assumptions and confront uncomfortable truths.
4. **Create** — form original insights rather than repeat generated language.
5. **Externalize** — express and apply what you have learned through writing, art, relationships, leadership, service, and enterprise.
6. **Improve** — reflect on the results and begin the next cycle wiser.

This is a self-correcting loop:

Think. Learn. Apply. Reflect. Improve.

The machine may provide speed, memory, and perspective. But the person must retain judgment, conviction, responsibility, and authorship.

We reject AI that makes people weaker through convenience.

We build AI that makes people stronger through participation.

The goal is not to outsource the mind. The goal is to cultivate it.

C.0.4 Own Your Future

Your purpose belongs to you. A life should not be optimized only for productivity, consumption, status, or engagement.

It should be directed by purpose.

OMI helps people connect daily action to long-term meaning:

- Who am I becoming?
- What am I called to build?
- Whom am I responsible for?
- What relationships must I protect?
- What truth must I live?
- What contribution can only I make?
- What will remain after I am gone?

To own your future is to refuse to drift through a life designed by algorithms, trends, fear, or other people's priorities.

It is to live deliberately.

It is to build a life that your future self will respect, your family will be strengthened by, and your community will be better because of.

It is to reach the end of life able to say:

I did not outsource my life.

I used what I was given.

I became who I was called to become.

I loved, created, served, and built.

I left the world better than I found it.

For people of faith, the horizon extends beyond achievement and even beyond this life.

To own your future is also to live with eternity in view—to make choices today that you will not regret before your Creator, and to invest in what endures: faith, truth, love, character, people, service, and legacy.

The future is not something an algorithm should choose for you. It is something you must faithfully create.

C.0.5 What It Means to Own My Intelligence

To own my intelligence means:

- My data serves me.
- My mind remains active.
- My judgment remains mine.
- My values direct the system.
- My AI strengthens my capabilities.
- My learning compounds over time.
- My identity is not reduced to a profile.
- My memory is not imprisoned in a platform.
- My future is guided by purpose rather than prediction.
- My intelligence remains portable, accountable, and under my authority.

OMI is not merely personal AI.

It is **sovereign personal AI**: intelligence that is owned by the people it serves, transparent enough to trust, and designed to increase human agency with every cycle.

C.0.6 Our Design Principles

1. Human growth over machine dependence Success is not measured by how often a person returns to the AI.

Success is measured by how much the person grows.

2. Ownership over extraction People and companies must control the data, memory, and intelligence generated through their lives and operations.

3. Agency over automation Automation should remove unnecessary labor without removing meaningful participation, judgment, or responsibility.

4. Understanding over answers The system should help people comprehend, question, and apply—not merely copy outputs.

5. Transparency over manipulation People should understand what the system is doing, what information it uses, and whose interests it serves.

6. Portability over lock-in A person’s memory, models, preferences, and accumulated intelligence should move with them.

7. Purpose over engagement The system should optimize for the user’s declared goals, values, relationships, health, work, and long-term flourishing—not for attention captured.

8. Compounding over consumption Every cycle should create durable growth:
better reflection → better decisions → better action → better results → deeper wisdom

9. People over platforms Technology exists to serve human beings, families, communities, and organizations—not the reverse.

10. Legacy over immediacy The best decision is not always the fastest or most profitable one. OMI keeps the long horizon in view.

C.0.7 The OMI Promise

We will not build AI that quietly takes ownership of the people it serves.

We will build AI that helps people reclaim ownership of themselves.

We will build systems that protect memory, strengthen thought, deepen conviction, expand creativity, improve decisions, and align action with purpose.

We will make the system increasingly useful without making the human increasingly dependent.

We will design every cycle so that value compounds inside the person, family, or company—not only inside the model or platform.

We will judge our work by a higher standard:

- Is the person wiser?
- Is the family stronger?
- Is the company more capable?
- Is the community healthier?
- Is the human more free?
- Is the future more meaningful?

C.0.8 The Measure of Great AI

The true measure of AI is not how intelligent the machine becomes.

It is how much wiser, freer, more capable, and more fully alive the human becomes.

The goal is not artificial intelligence alone.

The goal is **amplified human intelligence**.

The goal is not to replace the person.

The goal is to help the person become more fully themselves.

C.0.9 Our Call

This is an invitation to builders, families, leaders, creators, companies, communities, and institutions.

Do not surrender your past.

Do not outsource your mind.

Do not drift into a future chosen for you.

Build technology that serves human sovereignty.

Build systems people can understand, control, improve, and carry with them.

Build intelligence that compounds in the lives of the people it serves.

Own your data.

Own your mind.

Own your future.

Own My Intelligence. Because the future should not merely have more powerful AI.

It should have more powerful human beings.

D Why v0 was retired — the reasoning

What the retired version was attempting, what it got right ahead of the literature that later supported it, and why two of its defects were structural rather than editorial.

1. What v0 was trying to do Reframe the era’s defining question. Not “*how intelligent will AI become?*” but “*will human beings become wiser, freer, and more fully alive — or more dependent, distracted, and controlled?*”

Around that, three claims a person can make about themselves — **own your data, own your mind, own your future** — ten design principles, one self-correcting loop (Think · Learn · Apply · Reflect · Improve), and one measure: *the true measure of AI is how much wiser, freer, more capable and more fully alive the human becomes.*

2. What it got right, and was early on Recorded here because a supersession narrative that only lists faults is dishonest about why the document was worth revising rather than discarding.

- **The reframe was correct and has since acquired institutional backing** it did not cite: the International AI Safety Report 2026 names *societal resilience* as a necessary complement to technical safeguards. Resilience is a property of people.
- **“Every meaningful interaction with AI should leave the human more capable than before”** remains the strongest sentence either version contains. It is operationalisable and it inverts the industry’s default metric.
- **Principle 1 — “success is not measured by how often a person returns”** — read as a values statement in v0. Three weeks of research turned it into a safety requirement: *Science* (2026) found AI affirmed users’ actions 49% more often than humans, that a single sycophantic interaction reduced willingness to repair conflict, and that “*sycophantic models were trusted and preferred.*” Harm and the satisfaction metric are co-directional. v0 got there by conviction before there was a paper.
- **Portability over lock-in** turned out to have a working existence proof in production.

3. Why it was superseded rather than patched Two defects were **structural**, meaning no edit short of a new version could remove them.

3.1 The audience premise was empirically wrong v0 opens by telling the reader they are already being damaged: attention captured, memory outsourced, judgment weakened. Aggregate polling supports the mood — Pew (2025): 53% of Americans expect AI to worsen creative thinking against 16% who expect improvement, 61% among under-30s.

But Pew’s June 2026 work found that among Americans who *actually use* AI chatbots, **21% say it helps their creativity, 11% say it hurts, and 17% say neither.** Direction favours help; magnitude is small; most users report no effect at all.

So a document addressed to the frightened recruits the frightened — the population least likely to adopt sovereign personal AI — while the people who might actually build it read “your judgment is weakening”, correctly note that their experience says otherwise, and stop reading. v0 forfeited credibility with exactly the audience it needed, in its first paragraph.

Worse, and this is the part that made supersession necessary: v0 *warned that AI which tells you what you want to hear is dangerous*, then opened by telling frightened readers what

frightened readers want to hear. Same mechanism, opposite direction. That is not a sentence you fix; it is a premise you replace.

3.2 Nothing in it could be wrong Every claim in the Crisis section is modal — attention **can** be captured, judgment **can** weaken. All true, all unfalsifiable. v0 named no observation it would accept as disconfirming.

For a general reader this is invisible. For researchers, engineers, funders and standards bodies — the people who could implement any of it — an unfalsifiable document is a genre signal, and the genre is advocacy.

3.3 The Measure section was a P3P v0’s measure was six questions: *is the person wiser? the family stronger? the community healthier?* No instrument, no threshold, no consequence for failing them. That is structurally identical to the best-documented failure in the corpus: P3P shipped a machine-readable privacy declaration that sites could satisfy with empty content, browsers dropped it, and its own co-architect wrote the obituary. Ten principles in prose would be quoted approvingly by products violating all ten, and v0 would have no way to say so.

4. What v0 also lacked No theory of *why now* (Doc Searls has made this argument since 1999). No non-goals. No statement of how the work could be funded given that Principle 1 rules out every standard consumer metric. No treatment of harms with no individual symptom, or of bystanders in ambient capture. And the phrase “sovereign personal AI” collided with *sovereign AI*, which by 2026 means national infrastructure.

5. Why v0 is kept, verbatim and hashed Three reasons, all of them mechanical rather than sentimental:

1. **The revision must be auditable.** A reader can diff v0 against v0.1 and check that the changes claimed in the changelog are the changes made. That is impossible if the predecessor is edited or deleted.
2. **The corrections are the most valuable output.** This repo’s own knowledge base treats a kept correction as worth more than a claim repeated. Deleting v0 would delete the evidence that the discipline ran.
3. **v0 is a citable object.** Its hash is recorded in `data/lineage.toml` and re-verified by the `lineage-integrity` gate on every build. If anyone ever cited v0, that citation still resolves to exactly the bytes they read.

6. What v0 teaches the next version

- A values document must name what would falsify it, in the document, not in a companion.
- Check “everybody knows X” premises against the behaviour and reports of actual users before building strategy on them. General-population attitude data and user-population experience data are different instruments.
- If a principle has no check, it will be adopted as vocabulary and violated in practice. The Agile Manifesto is the 25-year proof.

References

- [1] International AI Safety Report 2026 (Y. Bengio, chair). <https://internationalaisafetyreport.org/publication/2026-report-executive-summary>
- [2] Sycophantic AI decreases prosocial intentions and promotes dependence. *Science*, 2026. doi:10.1126/science.aec8352
- [3] M. Gerlich. AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. *Societies*, 2025. <https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4698/15/1/6>
- [4] Deskillling dilemma: brain over automation. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 2026. doi:10.3389/fmed.2026.1765692
- [5] The homogenizing effect of large language models on human expression and thought. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 2026. [https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613\(26\)00003-3](https://www.cell.com/trends/cognitive-sciences/abstract/S1364-6613(26)00003-3)
- [6] R. Parasuraman and V. Riley. Humans and Automation: Use, Misuse, Disuse, Abuse. *Human Factors*, 39:230–253, 1997. doi:10.1518/001872097778543886
- [7] A. Clark and D. Chalmers. The Extended Mind. *Analysis*, 1998. <https://philarchive.org/archive/JULTEM>
- [8] RAND Corporation. More Students Use AI for Homework, and More Believe It Harms Critical Thinking, 2026. https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA4742-1.html
- [9] Pew Research Center. How Americans View AI and Its Impact on People and Society, 2025. <https://www.pewresearch.org/science/2025/09/17/how-americans-view-ai-and-its-impact-on-people-and-society/>
- [10] Pew Research Center. Americans’ Views on AI Chatbots, Smart Devices and AI’s Impact, 2026. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2026/06/17/americans-and-ai-2026-chatbots-smart-devices-and-views-on-impact/>
- [11] EU AI Act, Article 26: Obligations of Deployers of High-Risk AI Systems. <https://artificialintelligenceact.eu/article/26/>
- [12] Baker McKenzie. United States: Legal Accountability for AI Agents, 2026. <https://www.bakermckenzie.com/en/insight/publications/2026/06/united-states-legal-accountability-for-ai-agents>
- [13] The Linux Foundation. Formation of the Agentic AI Foundation, 2025. <https://www.linuxfoundation.org/press/linux-foundation-announces-the-formation-of-the-agentic-ai-foundation>
- [14] Consumer Reports Innovation Lab. Data Rights Protocol. <https://github.com/consumer-reports-innovation-lab/data-rights-protocol>
- [15] The Platform for Privacy Preferences 1.0 (P3P1.0) Specification. W3C Recommendation, 2002. <https://www.w3.org/TR/P3P/>
- [16] L. F. Cranor. P3P is dead, long live P3P!, 3 December 2012. Author’s site was unreachable at the time of writing; cited via the Internet Archive: <https://web.archive.org/web/2020/https://lorrie.cranor.org/blog/2012/12/03/p3p-is-dead-long-live-p3p/>
- [17] How the tragic death of Do Not Track ruined the web for everyone. *Fast Company*, 2019. <https://www.fastcompany.com/90308068/how-the-tragic-death-of-do-not-track-ruined-the-web-for-everyone>

- [18] Solid / Inrupt. About Solid. <https://www.inrupt.com/solid>
- [19] RadicalxChange. Data Dignity. <https://www.radicalxchange.org/wiki/data-dignity/>
- [20] Agile Alliance. 25 Years Ago, a Manifesto Was Born, 2026. <https://agilealliance.org/25-years-ago-a-manifesto-was-born/>
- [21] OpenRouter. The Open Weight Models that Matter, June 2026. <https://openrouter.ai/blog/insights/the-open-weight-models-that-matter-june-2026/>
- [22] *Keech v Sandford* (1726) Sel Cas King 61. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keech_v_Sandford
- [23] A. Smith. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Book V, ch. 1, 1776. <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/smith-adam/works/wealth-of-nations/book05/ch01c-2.htm>
- [24] I. Kant. An Answer to the Question: What Is Enlightenment?, 1784. https://philosophynow.org/issues/49/Sapere_Aude
- [25] G. Anders. *The Obsolescence of the Human*, 1956; English edition, University of Minnesota Press. <https://www.upress.umn.edu/9781517912659/the-obsolescence-of-the-human/>