

附录 C | 常见误解与故意歪曲

Appendix C | Common Misreadings and Deliberate Distortions

C.0 阅读本附录的前提

C.0 Preconditions for Reading This Appendix

本附录不是澄清误会的尝试。

This appendix is not an attempt to clarify misunderstandings.

它的作用只有一个：

Its sole function is:

区分“未读懂”

与

“故意歪曲”。

To distinguish between

not understanding

and

deliberate distortion.

若你在以下条目中

感到不适、被冒犯、或急于反驳，

那正是本附录存在的原因。

If you feel discomfort, offense,

or an urge to rebut while reading the entries below,

that reaction is precisely why this appendix exists.

C.1 “这是一本伦理学或道德宣言”

C.1 “This Is an Ethics or Moral Manifesto”

误解内容：

本书在告诉人类

“什么是对的、什么是错的”。

Misreading:

This book tells humanity

what is right and what is wrong.

否决：

Rejection:

本书不讨论善恶，

也不提供价值排序。

This book does not discuss good and evil,

nor does it provide value hierarchies.

它只做一件事：

It does one thing only:

否决在特定结构条件下
“继续运行”的合法性。

Invalidate the legitimacy of
“continued operation”
under specific structural conditions.

将“合法性否决”
误读为“道德评价”，
是典型的规范投射错误。

Interpreting legitimacy invalidation
as moral judgment
is a classic normative projection error.

C.2 “这是反技术、反 AI、反进步”
C.2 “This Is Anti-Technology, Anti-AI, Anti-Progress”

误解内容：
本书主张
限制或阻止技术发展。

Misreading:
This book advocates
limiting or stopping technological development.

否决：

Rejection:

本书不讨论是否发展，
只讨论：

This book does not ask
whether systems should develop;
it asks:

当系统已经发展到某一状态时，
是否仍被允许继续。

When systems reach certain states,
whether they are still permitted to continue.

“是否发展”
是目标问题；
“是否允许继续”
是合法性问题。

“Whether to develop”
is a goal question;
“whether continuation is permitted”
is a legitimacy question.

将两者混为一谈，

是工程讨论中最低级的错误之一。

Conflating the two
is one of the most elementary errors
in systems reasoning.

C.3 “这是在鼓吹自毁或极端行为”

C.3 “This Advocates Self-Destruction or Extremism”

误解内容：
本书鼓励系统
或人类
主动毁灭自己。

Misreading:
This book encourages systems
or humans
to destroy themselves.

否决：

Rejection:

本书对“自毁”的定义
是严格、条件化、结构性的。

This book defines “self-destruction”
in a strict, conditional, structural sense.

自毁在本书中意味着：

In this book, self-destruction means:

当责任不可承载时，
终止运行资格。

Terminating operational legitimacy
when responsibility becomes uncaryable.

将这一概念
与情绪性、任意性、或暴力行为混同，
要么是未读，
要么是恶意歪曲。

Conflating this concept
with emotional, arbitrary, or violent acts
indicates either non-reading
or malicious distortion.

C.4 “这是反监管、反治理、反民主”

C.4 “This Is Anti-Regulation, Anti-Governance, Anti-Democracy”

误解内容：
本书否定监管、治理或民主制度。

Misreading:

This book rejects regulation, governance, or democracy.

否决:

Rejection:

本书并不否定监管,
而是否定一种特定幻想:

This book does not reject regulation;
it rejects a specific fantasy:

不可自毁的安全监管幻想。

The fantasy of non-self-destructive safety regulation.

当监管系统
被设计为永远不可失败、
永远不可终止时,
它必然权力化。

When regulatory systems
are designed to never fail
and never terminate,
they inevitably become power.

这是结构结论,
不是政治立场。

This is a structural conclusion,
not a political position.

C.5 “停止公理是一套规范或法律建议”
C.5 “The Stop Axioms Are Norms or Legal Prescriptions”

误解内容:

S0–S7 是
“应该如何治理系统”的建议。

Misreading:

S0–S7 prescribe
how systems ought to be governed.

否决:

Rejection:

停止公理
不指导行为,
只否决合法性。

The Stop Axioms

do not guide behavior;
they invalidate legitimacy.

它们的逻辑形式是：

Their logical form is:

“若不满足 X,
则继续运行不再成立。”

“If X is not satisfied,
continued operation is no longer valid.”

这是判据,
不是方案。

They are criteria,
not solutions.

C.6 “作者在试图给世界一个终极答案”
C.6 “The Author Is Offering a Final Answer”

误解内容：
本书试图
为文明提供
最终解决方案。

Misreading:
This book attempts
to provide a final solution
for civilization.

否决：

Rejection:

本书明确拒绝
任何终极方案。

This book explicitly refuses
any final solution.

拒绝给出答案
不是谦逊姿态,
而是结构必要性。

Refusal to provide answers
is not humility;
it is structural necessity.

因为任何“最终答案”,
都会在结构上
删除停止的可能性。

Because any “final answer”
structurally deletes
the possibility of stopping.

C.7 关于“你为什么要写这本书”的问题 C.7 On the Question “Why Did You Write This Book?”

本书不回答此问题。

This book does not answer this question.

动机解释
不会改变结构判据，
只会制造心理投射。

Motivational explanations
do not alter structural criteria;
they only invite projection.

若你需要知道作者的动机
才能判断文本是否成立，
那你关心的并不是系统，
而是人。

If you require the author's motives
to assess the validity of the text,
you are not evaluating systems,
but persons.

附录 C 终结语 Closing Statement of Appendix C

本附录
不是为了避免误解。

This appendix
is not intended to prevent misunderstanding.

而是为了确保：

It exists to ensure that:

误解无法伪装成反驳。

Misreading cannot masquerade as refutation.