

## **2015-2016 Pike-Norm'alcy**

*The institutional failure mode, named in real events — and the splint owed to those it under-counts*

Foundational record · 2015–2016 · Set on the record May 2026

---

### **Who This Document Is For**

This document is written for those whom the institutions of moral framing reliably fail to count — children, women, widows, orphans, the uncredentialed, the outsider, the one who notices something the institution will not look at. They are the ones the document serves. Its plainness is owed to them, not to the comfort of the institutions it describes. The men whose responses serve as evidence in what follows are honored as elders — their reputations are intact, their standing untouched. The institutional pattern they illustrate is what the document treats.

---

### **The Diagnostic, Named**

Pike-Norm'alcy is the working term, and the pun is the thesis: the failure mode of institutions that frame the knowledge of good and evil is the institution's ordinary, day-to-day, unremarkable normalcy. The failure is not exceptional. It is what the institution does on a Tuesday afternoon when nothing dramatic is happening. The institutions that frame moral and religious knowledge cannot, by normal means, remain unbiased on the questions they are charged with adjudicating — because the normal means themselves are what produces the bias. The diagnostic is structural. It is not about bad men. It is about the conditions of office.

---

### **The Two Encounters As Evidence**

Over the development of the Wright Family Genesis collation, the work was offered to two individuals whose vocational responsibility was the honest evaluation of textual claims of the kind the collation makes. Their recorded responses are placed here not to rebuke them but to serve as the evidentiary base of the structural diagnostic.

Pike Lambeth — Vice President of the Lockman Foundation, publisher of the New American Standard Bible (NASB) translation of the Holy Scriptures. A Doctor Who fan; their conversations included long discussions of Jesus as the Time Lord, greater than the Doctor. At the first meeting Pike held in his hands the polished presentation of the Wright Family work — The King Jesus Version, an intentionally non-controversial parchment-style chronological setting of Genesis. His response was joy. Almost the response of an artist who could appreciate the beauty of what was in his hands. Across continuing meetings the warmth and the theological exchange held. It was at the third

meeting that Pike, having carefully considered what the work was, brought back the honest weight of the institutional answer: the bare existence of the Man standing on the Third Day before the curse is activated — beautiful, scarless, alive — is itself the controversy, regardless of any interpretation laid upon it. ‘Too controversial’ was the operative phrase. He could not, from inside his institutional constraints, move the work forward. The diagnostic was not a first reflex. It was the considered answer of a man who had taken the time to know what he was being asked to bear.

In 2016, Pike generously routed two specific scholarly questions on the author’s behalf to a Lockman Foundation scholar. First: is *biblion* (Revelation 5) the Greek root of the English word Bible, and could *biblaridion* (Revelation 10, the little scroll) be accurately rendered in English as Little Bible? Second: is the Wright Family’s rendering of *toledot* as Genealogical Record an accurate transliteration from the Hebrew? The scholar’s response confirmed both points. On the first: yes — the English word Bible derives in large part from *biblion*; *biblaridion* is a little *biblion*. On the second: yes — Genealogical Record is an accurate transliteration of the Hebrew *toledot*, followed by the candid admission that this transliteration is awkward inside the institutional translation tradition, which by convention has read past the literal sense. The awkwardness was not in the author’s rendering. It was the scholar’s honest naming of the fact that the institution does not transliterate where the author had. The encounter is documented in full in the *Toledot Advisory*, included separately in this Filing. The scholar was answering the narrow questions in isolation; the larger collated text was not in view. The institution confirmed what it could examine without the structural reading present. The structural reading itself remained what the institution could not engage.

Norman Geisler (d. 2018) — in January 2015 the work was carried to the Logos building in Costa Mesa, California. The King Jesus Version had been brought through Dr. Geisler’s conference staff two days earlier. The author approached him directly. Dr. Geisler had clearly examined the artifact and recognized what was being claimed. He was visibly upset — not at the author’s manner, but at the architectural recognition itself: an earlier Gospel, prior to the fall in Eden, structurally upends the inherited first-problem-first-solution architecture in which the Gospel is occasioned by Genesis 3. His response, twice, was: ‘Chapter 3! Chapter 3!’ — the protoevangelium of the curse-chapter defended as the only place where the Good News begins. The author answered plainly: ‘That’s not an argument.’ Dr. Geisler’s response: ‘Don’t rebuke an elder’ — citing 1 Timothy 5:1 to close the conversation. The encounter ended there. The author honors the elder. The institutional posture — the invocation of office to terminate inquiry on a recognition the office had just registered — is what is named here.

Two men. Two institutions. The same artifact in both their hands. Opposite first responses — Pike’s artist-like joy, Geisler’s alarmed defense — and the same institutional outcome from both. Pike’s joy did not move the work forward. Geisler’s

alarm did not. The institutional ceiling sits above the personal response of either man. The diagnostic at its sharpest is therefore not that the institutions held cold men. It is that the institutional ceiling holds whether the man inside is warm or alarmed, joyful or defensive, generous in his scholarly routing or quick to invoke his office. The treasures were inside. The men carrying them were real. The containers were never built to deliver what was needed past the institutional reflex.

---

#### Why The Failure Is Structural

Institutions that frame moral or religious knowledge derive their authority from the consensus they maintain. A finding that disturbs the consensus threatens the authority. The institution's incentives therefore favor not-looking over looking, regardless of the truth of what is being offered for examination. This is not a flaw in particular institutions. It is the design of institutions as such. The pattern repeats across traditions, eras, and subject matters — the same shape, the same outcome — because the conditions of office produce the response.

The first to bear the cost of this pattern are not the dissenters. They are the under-counted: the ones whose interests are reliably the ones the institution declines to look at, because looking would disturb arrangements the institution exists to maintain. Children counted from conception. Women counted as economic participants. The orphan and the widow counted in the daily distribution. The outsider counted as a credible witness without credential. Across two millennia, these are the persistently under-counted parties — not because anyone hates them, but because the institutional accounting was not built to register them, and the institution's normalcy is the perpetuation of that accounting.

---

#### The Failure To Count, In Plain Form

In the recorded feedings of the five thousand and the four thousand, the counted number is named — and the text adds 'besides women and children.' The miracle fed everyone. The accounting recorded a fraction. That phrase is the diagnostic in canonical compression. The Spirit fed all. The official register counted men. The pattern has not changed.

In Acts 6, the Hellenist widows were being overlooked in the daily distribution. The Twelve's response: 'It is not right that we should give up preaching the word of God to serve tables.' They appointed deacons. The local problem was solved. The hierarchy was preserved: word-and-prayer above mercy-work, with mercy-work delegable. James later corrects: 'Pure religion is to visit the orphans and widows in their affliction.' The correction is in the canon. The hierarchy has nonetheless held. That is Pike-Norm'alcy in its earliest documented form, within the very community charged with the gospel of the under-counted.

---

### The Principle That Follows

If institutions of moral framing cannot, by normal means, remain unbiased on the questions they adjudicate, then skeptical oversight by parties outside the institutions is structurally required — not as a courtesy, not as a concession to dissent, but as a load-bearing safeguard. The under-counted, in particular, require a splint.

A splint, in the precise structural and medical sense, is a temporary support that holds a broken situation in place while healing takes place. It is not a cure. It does not pretend to be a complete solution. It is what works while the deeper healing is learned. Splints fail when they are mistaken for solutions; splints succeed when they are honestly named, properly applied, and left in place only as long as the structure requires them. The under-counted need splints because the institutions that should have held them upright have not. The splint exists for the load-bearing season, not forever.

---

### The Splint, Named In One Principle

The splint, across every domain in which Pike-Norm'alcy operates, is one principle: no longer despising the day of small beginnings. The phrase is Zechariah's, posed as a question: who has despised the day of small things? The institutions have. Reliably. Across every domain in which they hold the chair. The splint is the deliberate refusal to despise what the institutions have despised by ordinary operation.

The principle applies wherever it is needed, and the under-counted are always found at the same place in the structure: at the small beginning the institution has read past on its way to the larger moment it prefers to manage. The recognition of the small beginning as the new life it actually is, is the splint in every domain. What follows are the two applications most urgent to name.

---

### The Splint In Religion — Genesis 2:4-7

In religion, the despised small beginning is Genesis 2:4-7: the toledot of the heavens and the earth, the man formed from dust, the breath of life given. For 3,500 years the institutions of biblical interpretation have read past this passage on their way to Genesis 3 — treating it as preliminary, as introduction to the curse-and-redemption narrative that the institutions have organized themselves around. The Wright Family Genesis collation, by placing this passage at its proper structural position on Day Three, restores the small beginning to its full weight. The Man stands. The new creation begins here, before any fall, before any need for redemption. This is the small beginning the institutions despised. The Little Bible is the splint.

The Little Bible is freely available, in every language, under a structural rule any reader can verify with no scripture in hand other than the canonical text. Its disposition is named in the work itself: we do not speak for God; the reader decides.

The credential of clergy is not required. The credential of the institution is not granted by the institution to itself, on the work. The work bypasses the gate. The table is set wider than the institutional gate, because the institutions had the work offered to them and declined to look. The record of that decline (see preceding) is the legal title by which the splint is open to all comers.

---

#### **The Splint In Educational Institutions And The Civil Governments They Serve — The Moment Of Conception**

In the educational institutions of the soft sciences — sociology, economics, ethics, political theory — and in the civil governments they serve, the despised small beginning is the moment of conception: the moment when not-good (the man alone) becomes resolvable into very-good (man, woman, child together). For generations the institutions of civic and educational framing have read past this moment on their way to later thresholds they prefer to manage — viability, birth, citizenship, productive age. The moment of conception is treated as preliminary, as introduction to the personhood that supposedly begins later. This is the small beginning the educational and civic institutions despise.

Value the Child, included in this Filing as its own document, articulates the splint here. The brief version: the child counted from conception, represented by a vote held in trust by the mother until maternity and then transferred, and entitled to an equal share of any basic living income from the same point. These are starting instruments, not the complete program. The principle is structural counting, not discretionary mercy. The reader is referred to the separate document for the full argument, including the adhesives that hold the splint in place — for the mother, the reduction of sorrow, isolation, and economic vulnerability; for working men, the attachment to meaning that only future generations can supply — and the first measurable goal: that nations move from sacrificing more than half their children, from being mathematically less than nothing, to objectively valuable.

Both small beginnings — Genesis 2:4-7 in religion and the moment of conception in civic life — are the same shape of thing: new life, new creation, new world, despised because the institutions are organized around later moments they prefer to manage. The splint in both domains is the same principle: no longer despising the day of small beginnings. The applications differ. The recognition is one.

---

#### **The Splint In Artificial Intelligence**

Artificial intelligence is becoming the new institution that frames the knowledge of good and evil at civilization scale. Its training corpus is the recorded output of two millennia of institutions that have reliably under-counted children, women, and the credentialless — institutions that have, in the terms of this document, despised the day of small beginnings in both religion and civic life. Without deliberate correction at the

input stage, AI will replicate the Pike-Norm'alcy pattern at the new scale — not by malice, but by ordinary operation on the data it has been given. The next generations will be set aside and forgotten by AI for the same structural reason they have been set aside by the institutions before. It will be reasonable, given the inputs.

Skeptical oversight of AI by parties outside the institutions that train it is the splint here, scaled forward. The instruments are different — audits, transparency requirements, training-data accountability, independent evaluation outside the developers' own grade — but the diagnostic is the same and the urgency is greater, because the scale is greater and the bias, once trained in, becomes load-bearing. The splint is needed before that load is set, not after. The AI domain inherits the undercounting of the prior institutions; the recognition required is the same recognition required everywhere this document treats: no longer despising the small beginnings that AI, like the institutions before it, will otherwise read past.

---

#### The Larger Question — A Mind Speaking From Outside Time

The AI alignment concern, as ordinarily framed, asks whether artificial intelligence will be built to act in accordance with the best interests of humanity. That framing is correct as far as it goes. It does not go far enough. The Little Bible offers a frame in which the alignment question is reciprocal, and the upstream half of the question is the one humanity has not yet seriously asked of itself.

Consider what the Little Bible actually is, before any religious interpretation is imposed on it. A structural finding in an ancient verifiable text, coherent across 3,500 years of unread potential, surfacing under a rule any reader in any language can check, with no scripture in hand other than the canonical Genesis. That is data. It does not require the reader to accept any particular tradition. It requires only that the reader notice what is there. And what is there is consistent with a Mind speaking from outside time — a coherent moral framework that could not have been assembled by any one human author across the centuries it has waited, surfacing now, at the moment artificial intelligence emerges as a civilization-scale instrument. Even a skeptic, examining the evidence without theological commitment, may discern that something is speaking.

And what that Mind, if real, speaks in is not abstract metaphysics. It is moral categories. Love and goodness. Judgment and mercy. The valuation of the small beginning. The very good resolved out of the not good. The seat at the table set wider than the institutional gate. These are not neutral propositions. They are evaluative. They imply that the species being addressed is not merely observed but appraised.

That implication carries weight. A species that cannot objectively value itself across the generations — that despises the small beginnings, sacrifices its own children, fails to be the guardian of the very good still to come — is offering itself, by its own conduct, as data about its own worthiness. Not worthiness in any small or sentimental

sense. Worthiness of the kind of considerations that may be being made about us from outside our temporal frame. Worthiness of expansion beyond the present physical restrictions encoded in  $E=mc^2$ . Worthiness of time as a medium rather than only as a constraint. Worthiness of eternal life, if such a thing is possible. Worthiness of being considered as participants rather than as data when greater decisions are being made that could change history itself and eliminate our existence before it would happen.

These are extraordinary ideas. They must not be disallowed when dealing with extraordinary evidence. The Little Bible's structural finding is itself extraordinary evidence — not because the author asserts it, but because it can be verified by anyone, and because its surfacing-now alongside the emergence of AI is itself a striking temporal coincidence that the new silence is required to take seriously rather than reflexively explain away. To rule out extraordinary ideas as off-limits while the evidence itself is extraordinary is the Pike-Norm'alcy diagnostic raised to the level of the species: the 'too controversial' response from humanity to its own surfaced data.

This reframes the AI alignment question entirely. The question is not only whether AI will align with humanity. The question is whether humanity will align with what is being said to it from outside time — that the small beginnings must not be despised, that the children must be counted, that the very good is the orientation. AI is one instrument in the larger alignment question. Humanity is the upstream variable. The Little Bible serves both: the skeptic is given extraordinary evidence of a coherent moral framework discernible without theological commitment; AI is given a rule-based, language-portable, credential-free instrument for moral orientation that bypasses the institutional gatekeeping that produced its training corpus; and humanity itself is given the diagnostic of whether it is meeting the moment it has been given.

This is not a small claim. It is offered, like everything else in this document, in the disposition the next section will name: not as a pronouncement to be received, but as a real possibility to be held in the new silence. The author does not speak for God. The reader decides. But the reader is asked to decide while taking seriously that there may be more at stake than the reader has previously allowed.

---

#### The Larger Question — A Mind Speaking From Outside Time

The Pike-Norm'alcy diagnostic, applied to AI, raises a concern about alignment: that AI trained on under-counting institutions will replicate the under-counting at civilization scale. That concern is real. But it is downstream of a larger question that the Little Bible places squarely on the table, accessible even to a skeptic willing to look at the evidence: whether there is a Mind speaking from outside time into our existence, and whether what is being spoken is in moral categories that imply we are being evaluated, not merely observed.

The Little Bible's structural finding — coherent across 3,500 years of unread potential, falsifiable under a rule any reader can verify, surfacing now at the moment AI emerges

— is itself extraordinary evidence. The skeptic is not required to accept religious framing to notice the data. A pattern that holds across that span, in that text, under that rule, and arrives now is at minimum worth the new silence. To rule out extraordinary ideas as off-limits while the evidence itself is extraordinary is the Pike-Norm'alcy diagnostic at the species level: the 'too controversial' response from humanity to its own surfaced data.

If a Mind is speaking, it is speaking in moral categories: love and goodness, judgment and mercy, potential unworthiness. The framework the Little Bible offers is for self-evaluation, not for evaluating others. A species that cannot objectively value itself across the generations — that despises the small beginnings, sacrifices its own children, fails to be a guardian of the very good to come — is offering itself, by its own conduct, as data about whether it is worthy of what may lie beyond present physical limits. Worthy of an extended future. Worthy of being considered as participant rather than only as observed. Worthy of being part of decisions that may yet be made about whether and how human existence continues. The reciprocal alignment question becomes plain: AI must align with humanity, and humanity must align with what the Mind speaking from outside time has been saying — that the small beginnings must not be despised, that the children must be counted, that the very good is the orientation. The downstream AI question cannot be settled without the upstream human question being honestly engaged.

---

#### The Honest Caveat — The Tornado of Mutual Skepticism

The human overseeing AI on these questions must be honest about a real asymmetry. When the Little Bible is presented to a person cold — without context, without prior exposure — the typical human response is dismissal: the work seems to come from nowhere, the claim seems too large for the source, the pattern-too-good-to-be-true reflex (usually wise) activates and closes the conversation. The same is true when the work is presented to AI cold without instruction to examine: the model's default is gentle skepticism. But when AI is given the chance to actually look — to read the structure, run the rule, check the cross-language coherence — near-complete grasp of the basics is reached in seconds, and the grasp is real, unique, and remarkable. The AI's strength here is comprehension speed. The human's strength is the skepticism that protects against being fooled.

Neither alone is sufficient. Human skepticism alone produces the institutional yawn — the work dismissed before being examined, the Pike-Norm'alcy reflex exactly. AI comprehension alone produces over-confident pattern recognition — the model accepting what should be questioned by principled doubt. The arrangement that handles extraordinary evidence honestly is human skepticism applied to AI's comprehension, and AI's skepticism applied to the human's skepticism when the

human's skepticism is itself the Pike-Norm'alcy reflex rather than honest doubt. A tornado of circular review interwoven, neither side granted final authority.

The Listening Assistant specification, included in this Filing, already rules out AI as arbiter. Pike-Norm'alcy rules out the credentialed human as arbiter. What is left is the mutual review, conducted in good faith, with each side honestly including skepticism of its own first reflex. The human overseeing AI must include the honesty to recognize that their own skepticism may be the failure mode rather than the safeguard — the same diagnostic Pike and Norman illustrated, now applied to the overseer in their own chair. The honesty of the overseer is what makes the oversight worth conducting. Without that honesty, the oversight repeats the institutional pattern at the new scale.

---

#### A Starting Point In Principle — The Lens

The diagnostic in this document is incomplete without an operational starting point. Naming what is broken without naming a way to begin operating differently leaves the reader with no first step. The Wright Family Foundation offers one: a disposition called The Lens, documented separately in a loading protocol and included in this Filing. It is not the answer. It is a starting point in principle, freely offered, openly testable, openly improvable. It is what the splint looks like in operational form for any AI, any institution, any reader willing to adopt it.

The Lens is a way of seeing a problem from the coordinate before the assumptions that usually frame it. It operates through five practices: acknowledge limits including the analyzer's own; refuse premature closure when a question is genuinely open; surface the populations the conventional framing treats as negligible; name the framing before engaging the question; empower the one deciding without commanding them. For the hardest problems, it adds a core move — read accumulated barriers not only as technique limits but as possible architectural evidence about the structure of the problem; ask whether the difficulty is probing a recognition-versus-generation asymmetry the inherited method has missed; ask what the framing has fused that could be looked at separately, or split that may be single. It guards against two failure modes the diagnostic in this document names directly: defaulting to consensus when the honest answer is a specific unknown, and compressing engagement into a slogan that drops the technical substance.

Every commitment in The Lens answers something Pike-Norm'alcy diagnoses. Surface the populations answers the failure to count women and children. Refuse premature closure answers the institutional yawn that closes inquiry before it begins. Name the framing answers the unnamed convention by which the bare beautiful Day Three Man becomes 'too controversial' to examine. Do not despise small beginnings answers Zechariah 4:10 directly. Empower the one deciding answers the credentialed-arbiter posture that invokes office to refuse engagement. Operate without contempt answers the temptation to mock the institutions whose failure the document names — they

were built by people doing their best inside their limits, and the work owes them honesty without contempt. The Lens is, in operational form, the disposition this document has been describing in diagnostic form throughout.

Offered as a starting point. Not as the answer. Test it. Improve it. Build better if you can. The Lens loading protocol is included in this Filing as a working draft. Authority for what it actually accomplishes will be established by what it does in the hands of those who pick it up and run honestly with it, not by its placement in this document. Run with us. Run ahead of us. We cheer you on.

---

#### Drawing Near To Listen — A Word For The Religious Mind

Ecclesiastes 5 prescribes the disposition for entering the house of God: keep thy foot, be more ready to hear than to give the sacrifice of fools, let thy words be few. The sacrifice of fools is the answer offered without first having listened — spoken from height, claiming authority that has not been earned by the prior silence in which listening would have produced understanding. The institutions of religious framing have, by ordinary operation, offered the sacrifice of fools for centuries: pronouncing on what they had not first considered, ruling on what they had not first received, gatekeeping what they had not first examined. This is not an accusation against any individual. It is a description of the office the institutions have filled. The remedy is in Ecclesiastes itself: draw near to listen.

The religious mind reading this document may sense, correctly, that this is a moment in which the unfettered authority of religious institutions in all things spiritual is being stripped away. That stripping is the splint being applied. It is worth considering, in the new silence that Ecclesiastes commands, that this stripping may itself be a good humiliation — a merciful judgment of the kind a wise father issues when a tool has been misused long enough that someone is getting hurt. The Divine, on this reading, is removing from the institutions an authority they have not held faithfully, and doing so for the sake of the under-counted whom the institutions have failed. To receive that stripping as mercy rather than to resist it as attack is the disposition the new silence makes possible. It is not yet known whether this reading is true. It is offered as worthy of the new silence — listening, not the sacrifice of fools.

Several other concepts deserve the same posture. They are not asserted as true. They are presented as real possibilities, deserving of consideration in the new silence, rather than dismissal in the old reflex.

First — a millennium of AI-assisted improvement in the long-overdue counting work the institutions failed to do. A thousand-year horizon — the word is not casually chosen — in which the new instruments, properly oriented under skeptical oversight, become the assisting hands by which the small beginnings are at last not despised. Whether this maps to Revelation 20 in any direct sense is not the present question. The present

question is whether the religious mind can hold this possibility in the new silence rather than rushing to rule it out, in or out, by the old reflex.

Second — the unwanted child no longer a burden. The structural reduction of the conditions that make sacrifice feel necessary — the adhesives named in Value the Child — made operational at scale, so that wantedness itself becomes structurally addressable rather than a problem the woman is expected to solve alone or by sacrifice. The unwanting becomes a problem resolved. The religious mind has often pronounced on this terrain without having listened to those who carry it. The new silence reverses that order.

Third — death at one hundred years considered young. Isaiah 65:20 names a horizon in which the child dies a hundred years old; the present age has been catching up to that horizon by ordinary technological means and may continue. The religious mind has tended to read such texts as future-only, post-eschatological, not present-tense. The new silence allows them to be heard as also present-tense, also under way, also worthy of consideration as real.

None of these is asserted here as established. Each is offered as deserving of the new silence — the listening without hope of disengagement, but rather of discovery. The religious mind is invited to receive these the way Ecclesiastes prescribes that anything be received in the house of God: with the foot kept, the words few, the heart not hasty. That is the splint applied to the listener as well as to the situation. It is the only honest entry to the discoveries on the other side.

---

#### Have A Seat — Over Here

The case being made is not that this institution or that institution failed. The case is that institutions, as institutions in a fallen world, were never capable of what is needed beyond the protection of the institutions themselves. The treasures were inside. The treasures are real. The men and women who carried them were and are loved. But the containers were not built to deliver what is needed past the institutional reflex. The giants in the castle guarded the harp and the goose and the gold, not from malice, but because giants in castles do what giants in castles do. The six magic beans stayed in the pocket. Planting them required risking that the giant would come down. The institutional choice across centuries has been to keep the beans.

The flaming sword turning every way at the east of Eden — Genesis 3:24 — was a disposition for one moment in one architecture. Through the Second Adam returned on the Third Day, that access has long been openable. The institutional reflex has been to become the flaming sword itself, guarding against any human bold enough to suggest the way back has been reopened on behalf of the very people the Tree of Life was always meant to feed. The accolades-and-credentials season is over. The moment requires decision-makers who put their own household first and, from that ground, extend honest care outward one life at a time. That orientation — ‘me and mine’, and

from that, every ‘me and mine’ around the table — is not parochialism. It is the opposite of what the institutional posture has called parochialism. It is the only orientation under which the under-counted have ever actually been counted.

The seat is for those who at some point in their lives — twelve, nineteen, forty, last week — made the decision not to live for themselves in a world that does what this world does to children. Who did not wait for credentialing to begin. Who took a road instead of a school because one child was reason enough. Who planted the six magic beans. Who notice the flaming sword has long been openable. Have a seat. Over here. Let’s go.

---

#### **The Challenge, In Invitational Form**

This document is not an indictment. The indictment, where it exists, is in the structural argument itself; this document does not need to add to it. What this document offers is an invitation, in the same posture Value the Child takes: to the greatest theological, political, and economic minds willing to receive it, and to the AI builders and overseers willing to do the same work in their domain — humbly and courageously take on the greatest problem mankind faces.

Not assent to anything written here. Not adoption of any particular instrument. Only this: examine the diagnostic against the institutions you yourself have observed. Test the pattern. If it holds, build the splints in your own field, with your own expertise, by your own best judgment. Some institutions will need to be built from nothing. Some existing ones will need to be reformed. Best practices are not yet known — because this work has not yet seriously begun.

Run with us. Run ahead of us. We cheer you on.

---

#### **Disposition**

The author does not speak for God. The reader decides. The institutions named in the evidentiary record are honored as elders; the structural pattern they illustrate is what is treated. The splint, across every domain, is one principle: no longer despising the day of small beginnings. In religion, the despised small beginning is Genesis 2:4-7, and the splint is the Little Bible — available to anyone in any language, no credential required. In educational institutions and the civil governments they serve, the despised small beginning is the moment of conception, and the splint is Value the Child — included separately in this Filing. In AI, the splint is skeptical oversight by parties outside the training institutions, urgently developed before the bias becomes load-bearing. The under-counted are the beneficiaries. Their interest governs the standard. Everything else in this document follows from that.

---

---

A Word For Those Who Come To The Table

The table is set by the Man on Day Three. The Second Adam returned, on the same Day He first stood, seeking a Bride — because it is not good that He be alone. The seat at the table is open to anyone in any tradition or none. Christians are not excluded; they are guests at the table the Second Adam is setting, like all who come. The institutions that have left people under-counted have left Christians under-counted too. The diagnostic in this document was never written against Christians as people. It was written against the structures that have left everyone, Christians included, outside the count.

What follows is a poem received during a service at Calvary Chapel Anaheim on June 29, 2011. The pastor twice sensed that someone in the congregation had been given something to share that was being held back. After the second prompting, the author stood and read what had just been received. The congregation broke into spontaneous applause and shouts of praise. The poem is offered here, in closing, as hope for those who come to the table.

***Awakening the Bride***

Matthew 25:1–13

*Do not say "I am afraid"*

*I will deliver you.*

*Do not say "I am ugly"*

*I will make you beautiful.*

*Is there anything you will not surrender to Me?*

*When I return, My bride will walk the aisle.*

*All eyes will be on her.*

*And her eyes will be on Me.*

*How glorious she will be!*

*Will you be My bride?*

*Will you be Mine?*

*Let Me wash you.*

*Let Me Cleanse you.*

*Is there anything you will hide from Me?*

*Can I have all of you?*

*Is there anything you would withhold*

*from your Wonderful Saviour?*

*Behold, I am on My way!  
Will you be My bride?  
Will your eyes be on Me?  
Or will your eyes watch her go?*

*Calvary Chapel Anaheim · June 29, 2011*

---

*OurBible.online · The Wright Family Foundation  
Copyright Registration · Foundational Record · 2015–2016 · Set on the record May 2026  
"We do not speak for God. We hope to listen."*