Appendix A — AGI Narrative Posture

Purpose

This appendix clarifies our posture toward the term **"AGI"** to prevent misinterpretation, narrative drift, and reputational risk.

Our Position (Plainly Stated)

We do **not** pursue AGI as commonly defined.
We do **not** claim to build a mind, an oracle, or an autonomous general agent.

We are building **conditions under which intelligence does not collapse under scale**.

What We Reject

We explicitly reject narratives that equate intelligence with:

- autonomy without constraint
- authority derived from capability
- inevitability driven by scale
- singular agents replacing human judgment
- probabilistic fluency as truth

These narratives incentivize urgency, spectacle, and governance bypass.

What We Affirm

We affirm a different target:

- **Epistemic integrity at scale**
- **Explicit assumptions and inspectable derivations**
- **Preserved uncertainty and surfaced contradiction**
- **Action gated by proof, not pressure**
- **Coordination via contextualisation, not control**

Relationship to Language-Native Models

Parametric language models are powerful tools for:

- translation
- hypothesis generation
- exploration of possibility space

They are **not** authorities for truth, decision, or execution.

In our architecture:

- models propose
- entailment decides
- execution is gated

This removes the role that makes models dangerous at scale.

The Responsible Answer to "Is This AGI?"

- If AGI means *a general autonomous mind*: **No**
- If AGI means *a trustworthy intelligence substrate that preserves meaning under scale*: the term is inadequate and misleading

Our claim is narrower and stronger:
We make intelligence governable by structure.

Commitment

We will:

- avoid AGI mythologising
- refuse claims of inevitability
- speak carefully about capability
- protect explicit framing
- absorb pressure without distortion