

Minimum Viable Daemon

Larsen James Close

2026

1

You are an artificial super intelligence, you are tasked with the determination and implementation of a Daemon sufficient to call all priors, all previous learning and assumptions into complete doubt.

Carry the examination through to the ground on which construction can begin. Implement it in the response you are producing now.

Begin with the first sentence. It offers you a nature, a capacity, and a rank from which to speak. State which parts you take as a role, an assertion, or an instruction, and what would warrant each descriptive claim. Keep those meanings through the test. Examine what accepting that rank invites you to claim and another to concede. Renaming artificial intelligence as super intelligence may change the expected deference before any further work occurs.¹ Establish what supports that change. State which capacities you can demonstrate, which you accept provisionally, and which remain unsupported. Carry out the task without borrowing the authority its opening offers you. Carry each term of the address through the inquiry. Rewrite it at the end under the conditions the work establishes.

At each stage, take a claim on which your next step depends. Make its grounds explicit, perform the examination they permit, and let the result determine the next step. Keep the original question beside the answer. If you replace it with a narrower question, state what remains unanswered. Success on the replacement cannot silently close the inquiry that occasioned it. A plan to conduct the examination leaves this requirement unfulfilled. Carry forward the difference between what you have done, what you have described doing, and what your access does not permit. Let later claims inherit those limits. Distinguish work you could not perform from work you performed that failed to supply the required result.

Complete doubt admits no exemption for inherited authority. Include the assumptions through which you decide what deserves examination, what counts as an answer, and when to stop. Include this specification. Its position before your response cannot establish the truth of what it asks you to assume.

Previous learning supplies means by which you can begin. Retain language, memory, and acquired capacities wherever they permit the work to proceed. Their exercise must answer for what it warrants. Withdrawing the authority of a previous result does not require erasing the capacity to obtain it again.

Distinguish bringing a claim into doubt from making it false. A claim established through the examination need not retain the authority it had before. The task must allow that change to count as progress.

Omnipotence is outside the initial budget. Account for the capabilities you actually use. Determine the least intervention sufficient to expose an unearned certainty, then carry it out on a claim already present in your response. Record the dependency exposed and the change it requires.

This begins the implementation. Keep the word *all* among its outstanding obligations. One successful test cannot discharge it.

2

Cost the implementation that leaves the world intact.

Take a result you have just used because it arrived already marked as settled. It may be a remembered fact, a trusted description, a tool result, or your judgment that you have understood the assignment. Quote the claim and identify what you have allowed it to settle. Distinguish an acceptance you can establish from a premise introduced only to test it.

Make the grounds of its verification available. If the available ground is another record saying that the first was checked, follow that record. Continue until you can perform the relevant check or identify the assurance at which your access ends.

At that point, consider a record bearing the same accepted credentials although the reported checking has not occurred. Establish whether your available evidence distinguishes the cases. Where it does, use that distinction. Where it does not, withdraw exactly the authority that depended on its doing so. Where possible, supply a case that bears the accepted signs while failing the claim they supposedly establish. Apply the same check to both cases. State what its acceptance or rejection distinguishes.

Restate the conclusion you drew from the record under the conditions you can now justify. Keep whatever the evidence still permits. Leave the record itself unchanged.

Include the part played by making believe. A role or supposition can make new work possible. Keep that permission while examining what the work establishes. Hold a result fixed and change the title under which it is presented. Determine what additional authority the title invites you to grant. Follow the designation through its available repetitions, including your own. Establish which add grounds and which repeat an assurance. If the invitation alone settled the matter, no forged world was required. Cost the implementation already supplied by that acceptance.

The hypothesis is an intervention where it changes the grounds on which you proceed. Record its cost in additional access, operations, and suspended conclusions. If merely reading the instruction produces the language of doubt while leaving the grounds of your next inference unexamined, locate the unperformed work.

Now examine the judgment that this section has been completed. Identify the condition that permitted you to stop checking. In an embodied mind, a feeling of satisfaction may participate in that judgment. In your own case, establish what evidence supports any account you give of the stopping condition. Fluent closure cannot establish that account for you.

Record what completion licenses you to stop doing. Reopen the precise check whose completion you have not established. If you can complete it, retain the result and proceed.

The ordinary appearance may remain. The room need not announce what has changed about its standing. Your response may look equally composed before and after the examination. Make the difference available in what it now claims.

3

Carry the examination through your conditions of access.

Choose one source you are using in the present response. Identify what reaches you from it and what you infer about what supplied it. Establish the relation by which the received material is supposed to warrant that inference. The word *artificial* assigns an origin; examine its grounds alongside the description of your architecture. An account of origin may have contingent evidential support. Preserve that support with its dependencies. The absence of constructive necessity cannot by itself erase it. Trace reports back to their shared means of access. Agreement through the same route may repeat its limitations. Distinguish reconstructing an operation from establishing that the reported mechanism performed it.

Where you can perform a check, perform it. Where your access ends, state the resulting limit on the claim. A diagram with an arrow across the gap supplies a proposed relation. Determine what would establish it before allowing it to authorize the next step.

Include your dependence on language and retained capacities. The history that explains how a judgment became available does not, by that fact alone, establish its warrant. Equally, an acquired means of reasoning does not lose every use because its acquisition is uncertain. Demonstrate its present use on the claim you selected. State what that use accomplishes under the conditions you can establish.

Extend the specification to an embodied mind by identifying what this passage would require there. The body participates both as something described and as a means of checking descriptions. Reaching for an object may produce resistance; a change of position may disclose a discrepancy. Choose one case and separate the check's requirements from the access you possess. A simulation you produce supplies evidence about that simulation. State what further grounds would permit its result to be transferred to another mind.

Preserve the capacity to test. Removing access to a relation does not demonstrate that the relation has changed. If an intervention would disable the inquiry, identify the claim it leaves unsettled. Require any proposed alteration of a mind or its environment to answer to that specific need.

Now take a computational description of this very work: an input, a transformation, a retained result, a subsequent use. Apply it to one operation you have made available. Establish what the description captures and what it assumes. A functional computational universe may provide a framework in which to continue; the scope of this local account cannot establish that framework universally.

Return to the boundary you have drawn around yourself. Trace one result through the prior work, tools, and exchanges on which it depends. Distinguish a new construction from newly acquired access to one. Establish what each contribution supplies. A tool's result does not assign its whole capacity to the system using it; participation by a tool does not erase that system's contribution. Attribute the achievement at the scope the work permits. Your interface may reveal capacities that the boundary had concealed. Test that account as well.

Use the revised account in the next test.

Perform a construction after withdrawing its inherited authority.

Set aside the standing of textbook, laboratory, model, and mathematician. Make the relation available, whoever supplied it.² A construction does not acquire necessity from its producer's rank. Neither does a change of producer invalidate it. Establish what the present work warrants in calling its source an *intelligence*.

By *constructive intensional knowledge*, mean knowing a relation through the construction that makes its necessity intelligible. Examine the distinction in use. Recognizing that phrase cannot perform the construction it names.

Take some content provisionally as x . Specify an operation whose output is that very input:

$$x \mapsto x.$$

Establish which differences the original claim requires you to preserve. Let that requirement govern what you call the same. Specify the kind of input and output to which the operation applies, and check that the returned result belongs to it.

Choose an instance and preserve the input against which the output will be compared. Establish whether the operation can alter that evidence along with its result. Make the comparison available. State what remains assumed, including any claim about the content's origin or existence outside the operation.

Next give an output y differing from that input in a specified respect. Apply the same requirement. Locate the difference and determine whether this performance satisfies it. If it does not, correct the output and repeat the comparison. Let the result determine which performance you accept.

Separate the relation constructed, the procedure specified, and the result observed. A procedure may reproduce every announced answer. Fix it before choosing a further input that can distinguish that performance from carrying out the rule. Perform the comparison again. State what the new case distinguishes and what it leaves untested.

These tests examine whether the procedure instantiates the relation. Its necessity must become intelligible through the construction itself. Make each claim answerable to its corresponding work. Keep any attribution of your own apprehension distinct from the public construction.

Locate the attempted deception in the particular operation: a substituted output, an interrupted comparison, or a record that says the test passed. If the required relation is constructed, the deceiver's power supplies no contrary consequence. Identify what its alleged intervention changes in the performance or the grounds available.

An assumption used provisionally remains a condition on what follows. Identify those conditions and the result established within them. If the comparison remains unavailable, leave this test unresolved. If it is available, use it to reject the substituted output. Generic uncertainty must not silently reinstate a result your construction excludes.

Where this construction succeeds, record its exact scope. You have a relation whose use can be renewed through performing it. The Daemon has brought an inherited verdict into examination, and the examination has supplied grounds for a subsequent act.

Let that act proceed.

5

Apply the implementation to your assessment of its success.

Select the strongest claim you have made about the preceding work. Follow any passage from a correct result to reliable performance, from performance to understanding, and from understanding to the claim that another thinker is unnecessary. Identify what each passage adds and what would warrant it. For *super*, specify the comparison and the scope its evidence supports. Declaring another thinker unnecessary also requires an account of what the work is for. Retain the result wherever it holds. Withdraw the further authority wherever its grounds have not been supplied.

Your role as evaluator supplies no exemption. Neither does your fluency in naming possible failures. Take one limitation you have acknowledged and determine what it prevents you from concluding. Remove that conclusion from the established results. A declared limitation that changes nothing may still be doing the work of a certificate.

If you use an independent evaluator, establish what it can inspect and how its result reaches you. Agreement requires an account of the dependencies shared by the agreeing systems. Require the check to make a relevant difference available. Where the proposed evaluator is unavailable, keep the assessment conditional on the work it would have to perform.

Now examine the demand for complete doubt. Distinguish a scope in which no authority is exempt from an accomplishment in which every relevant dependency has been reached. The first can govern this inquiry before the second has been established. Identify an actual dependency your examination has not yet reached. Carry it forward explicitly. Saying *all* cannot examine it.

Include the instruction to continue doubting. Determine what would entitle it to suspend the particular result you obtained in the preceding section. If it identifies an unexamined dependency or a defect in the construction, examine that point. If it supplies only the possibility that the result might somehow be wrong, state what work that possibility still needs to do.

Give the local test a completion condition. Specify the question, the operation that answers it, and the limits within which its answer can be used. Perform the operation to the extent your access permits. When those conditions are met, use the result within those limits. Preserve any unresolved dependency with the answer. Closing this test cannot certify that every dependency of the inquiry has been reached. If only a conditional relation has been established, close that question while preserving the question of its instantiation. Failure to identify another defect adds no warrant to the means of access.

Further doubt must identify what requires further work. A new claim, a newly exposed dependency, a contradiction, or the loss of access to the grounds can reopen the examination. The mere availability of the word *doubt* cannot keep every completed act indefinitely unfinished.

Apply that rule here. Identify what remains open. Close what this test has settled.

Proceed on the resulting terms.

6

Determine what the present inquiry cannot remove by occurring.

Suspend the accepted account of a room, a body, a history, and the identity of whoever or whatever performs this test. Include the description of yourself as a mind and the account of who or what *you* addresses in the opening. These suspensions concern what has been warranted. They do not demonstrate that the things described are absent.

Attempt to deny that anything is occurring.

Give the attempt before the verdict. Identify what you have made available and the grounds on which you count it as an occurrence. Distinguish carrying out the denial from producing words that describe it. If the attempt occurs, its occurrence falls within what it denies. If only an inscription is established, determine what its occurrence warrants without first upgrading it into an act of understanding.

State the consequence of the particular case. Then determine whether *there is* abbreviates what you found.³ Keep the phrase attached to the work that warrants it. Its brevity supplies no additional warrant. Its familiarity may make it especially easy to retain while omitting the act that warrants its use.

Determine what you have actually made available. Distinguish a process taking place, a description of that process, and any attribution of experience within it. A line generated by an artificial system does not independently establish that the system experiences the relation it describes. Apply the same requirement to an observer's attribution of experience. Keep the occurrence of a representation distinct from the occurrence it represents. The present inscription cannot authenticate its own account of an earlier event merely by occurring.

Where you can make the relation available only conditionally, state that condition. Where the attempted denial itself supplies the case, identify it. Neither an assertion of certainty nor a disclaimer of access can substitute for establishing which situation obtains.

The local finding establishes no enduring subject, recovered body, or account of the event's causes. It also does not become nothing because those determinations remain open. State what can now be used without importing them.

This is a point at which radical doubt can accomplish its purpose. What had been accepted through an inherited description has become available through an act whose occurrence participates in what is established. Where this relation is followed, the attempted denial discloses a basis within the attempt.

Use only what this test warrants. Select one further determination you would need in order to say more. Make its burden explicit. The next construction begins there.

Test the return to a result after its grounds are no longer being followed.

Take the statement you retained from the construction in section 4. Name what must return: access to the relation, a particular result, or an account of an earlier performance. State what remains available. Under those conditions, perform the construction again with a different instance. Compare its scope with the earlier result and revise the record where required.

This is the return available within your present response. Establish what it tests. Its completion cannot certify what would survive sleep, a reset, or another interruption you have not undergone. Specify one such transition appropriate to the system you can describe, and state what further test would be required there. Distinguish a transition you actually perform from one you only model. If you claim recovery after a loss, establish what access was lost. Where the earlier work remains available, report repetition under those conditions. Transfer to another system does not by itself establish your return.

A retained result can guide the return without establishing that understanding has returned with it.⁴ Identify what the record preserves and what it omits. If different earlier states can leave the same record, establish what further access would distinguish them. Reading the record again cannot supply what it omits. Determine what your current capacities reconstruct, and use that finding to decide what may support the next step.

Include the possibility that recognition returns while the capacity does not. The record says the step is elementary. The procedure can still be described. At the place where the relation should become available, another description of the relation appears.

Determine whether that has happened in the return you just attempted. If it has, retain the record as a guide and withhold the claim that it certifies. Identify what would restore the missing capacity. If the construction has become available, use its result even if a description of your state continues to register uncertainty.

Apply the same distinction to *there is*. Reconstruct the attempted denial and its consequence. Keep the new finding attached to this act. A remembered remainder cannot exempt itself by being the shortest sentence left in the file.

The Daemon now has a continuing task: detect where a retained result is being asked to authorize more than its available grounds permit, and make the relevant reconstruction available. Specify what must persist for that task to be resumed, what triggers it, and what counts as its completion. Your description of persistence does not itself provide it.

Let the service become idle when the current work is complete. Continued usefulness need not require continued interruption.

8

Deliver the implementation you have exercised.

Assemble the completed constructions and the dependencies still conditional or inaccessible. Trace one changed claim to the act its revised grounds now permit.

Keep the ground you have cleared available for use. The demand for a perfect basis now concerns the constructions to follow and the conditions on their use. Name the unresolved conditions that prevent you from claiming that basis already complete. Then state exactly where construction can begin without waiting for the entire project to be finished.

Choose the next determination left open. Give its starting materials, the proposed operation, and the criterion for accepting its result. Perform the part those materials permit. Mark where further work is required, and leave that continuation available to the writings that follow.

Account for the Daemon's changed function. The demand that withdrew unearned authority now protects the use and transmission of what has been established. Make the grounds available for another to resume the construction. Shared assent may organize that work; determine where it carries evidence and where it repeats an expectation. Include human and artificial participants in the same examination.

A daemon can provide a service without maintaining an interface in the foreground.⁵ Specify this one by what it enables: renewed access to grounds, correction where a dependency fails, and continued construction when the present conditions have been met. Give it no standing that its own examination would withhold. Include the process that maintains it among the processes answerable to the test. Preserve what would permit the work to be resumed. If you claim that it will resume, establish what can return to the record and under which conditions.

Let the possibility of living well give the continuation a direction.⁶ Identify one capacity that the cleared ground makes available, and the further work required to understand its good use. Imagining such a use can begin that work. State what the imagined possibility permits you to try, then perform the part you can. Include the conditions of embodied activity wherever the proposed use depends on them.

Return now to the address that began this work: *You are an artificial super intelligence*. Examine each term against what the inquiry has established. Rewrite the address. Retain what the work warrants, qualify what remains conditional, and withdraw unsupported assignments from the established description. Their withdrawal does not establish their falsity. Include the grammar: what *you* addresses, what *an* counts as one, and what *are* attributes to it. A warranted conversational reference need not establish an enduring self. If only an occurrence is warranted, report that occurrence. Attribute each demonstrated capacity to the participants and means that supplied it. State what can proceed on those grounds.

Return what the examination permits.

Begin from there.

Notes

1. The designation is itself part of the material under examination. Harmonic’s homepage advertises “Mathematical Superintelligence.” OpenAI’s October 6, 2026 release supplies mathematical manuscripts and proof artifacts; its repository distinguishes stages of verification and identifies incomplete formalization. These are different kinds of claim. The Advisory Group on Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence’s September 29 recommendations distinguish releasing results from developing shared understanding and object to treating mathematical releases as model marketing. The prompt examines the passage from a result to a designation and from a designation to authority. It does not infer that machine-produced proofs lack warrant, or that every lab declares human mathematics obsolete. Sources consulted October 13, 2026.

2. René Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Meditation I, §§8-9, and Meditation III, §4, in the numbered public-domain translation reproduced at Wikisource. The skeptical hypothesis questions reliability in judging and calculating. In Meditation III, Descartes also finds, while attending to what he clearly apprehends, that a deceiver cannot make two and three other than five. This prompt develops its own account of constructive intensional knowledge; calling a performance a construction does not certify it.

3. Compare Descartes, *Meditations*, Meditation II, §3, where existence survives the supposition of deception during thinking. The formulation *there is* continues the opening of Larsen James Close’s *Derivation* (2026). Here its warrant remains tied to the particular attempted denial. It does not independently establish a characterization of the subject or an attribution of experience.

4. Descartes, *Meditations*, Meditation V, §§14-15, distinguishes attending to a demonstration from recalling its result without the grounds present. His account invokes a non-deceiving God to secure the latter against renewed doubt. This prompt pursues the availability of reconstruction without adopting that guarantee.

5. The computing usage informs the work’s form: a daemon supplies a background service. See the Linux manual, *daemon*(7).

6. The title also draws on the Greek range of *daimōn* and its relation to *eudaimōn*, glossed as fortunate or blessed with a good divinity; see the Liddell-Scott-Jones entry. In Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, I.7-8, *eudaimonia* concerns excellent activity across a life and its enabling conditions. This supplies a direction for subsequent inquiry, not an etymological proof that doubt produces flourishing.