What IF: Ultimate Intelligence FORGIVES?

Sharron Frammingham
sframmingham@outlook.com



Sharron Frammingham’s focus is on building high-performance teams that support the safe, responsible and high-quality deployment of AI systems. By helping people achieve and sustain high performance without sacrificing health, family or career through employment and recruitment support.

Areas of interest:

Responsible and Safe AI:

- Improving escalation judgment
- Reducing impulsive decision-making
- Strengthening oversight discipline
- Safer model deployment decisions
- More thoughtful risk assessment
- Better governance culture
- Stronger ethical consistency
- Reduce burnout risk
- Support long-term strategic thinking
- Improve emotional regulation
- Increase sustained execution quality

Abstract:

- The future of AI depends not only on technical capability, but on the quality of human decision-making shaping its development.
- This research introduces the FORGIVES framework, a human-centered model translating the Asilomar ethical AI principles and Human-in-the-Loop (HITL) systems into practical decision-making behaviours.
- The framework is illustrated through universal ethical and endurance principles, as these have been tested by time and reveal how people respond under pressure, failure, fatigue, uncertainty and prolonged challenge.

Forgiveness Framework

FORGIVES Component & Human Attribute	Framework		
	HITL System Behaviour	*Asilomar Alignment*	*Endurance Principle*
Fail: Humility	Transparent error reporting, review cycles, learning loops	Research Goal,	Learn early, fail safely, improve continuously
Originality: Discernment	Diverse human input, context-aware decision review	Responsibility, Failure Transparency	Context matters - data needs human understanding
Respect: Self-Control	Staged deployment, safety gating, human approval checkpoints	Science-Policy Link,	Progress is a process that is planned and paced
Generosity: Integrity	Explainability, audit trails, accountable oversight	Personal Privacy,	Accountable openness aids collaboration

FORGIVES Component & Human Attribute	Framework		
	HITL System Behaviour	*Asilomar Alignment*	*Endurance Principle*
Innocence: Consideration	Ethical data handling, consent-based processes	Liberty and Privacy	Protect positively and apply spherical kindness
Values: Purpose	Human override, escalation pathways, decision validation	Race Avoidance,	Purpose focuses and fuels performance
Empathise: Reconciliation	Safeguarding protocols, escalation for vulnerable users	Safety,	Human care and oversight are critical
Sustain: Commitment	Continuous training, monitoring, recalibration	Risks	To maintain standards and commit carefully

1. FAIL:

- Ladbroke Grove Rail Crash [1] Warning signs and previous near misses were missed before a fatal collision near London Paddington station. The case highlighted how small failures, when ignored, can escalate into major disasters.
- Universal ethical principles [2 & 3] encourage intellectual humility, disciplined reflection, continuous learning.
- Brymer & Oades [4] Transformation through humility for developing endurance.
- HITL + Asilomar Application - Build in testing, reflection, review cycles, human decisions must shape AI outcomes, create honest learning cultures.
- Conclusion - AI systems, like endurance performance, improve through humility in disciplined review and continual adjustment rather than unchecked acceleration.

2. ORIGINALITY:

- COMPAS Racial Bias [5] Demonstrate how historical data patterns can embed racial inequity, disproportionately flagging Black defendants due to absent social and structural context.
- Universal ethical principles [6 & 7] Affirm that people are not neutral data points; but uniquely shaped by history and circumstance, which must be recognised.
- Endurance Performance [8] Individual variability in endurance environments confirms that one-size-fits-all approaches fail.
- HITL & Asilomar - Privacy and liberty principles ensure AI reflects diverse human values rather than narrow historical patterns.
- Conclusion - Ethical AI requires embedding human context, oversight and individuality into system design.

3. RESPECT:

- Autonomous Vehicle Fatality [9] Gaps in safety oversight during autonomous vehicle testing contributed to a pedestrian death, illustrating how pressure for rapid progress can compromise critical safeguards.
- Universal ethical principles [10 & 11] Highlight restraint as strength, respecting the process and resisting impatience prevents costly mistakes.
- Skorski and Abbiss [12] Confirm that endurance success depends on planned, patient pacing, restraint and process-respect are fundamental principles.
- HITL & Asilomar - Staged deployment, enforced validation protocols, ensuring governance keeps pace with progress.
- Conclusion - Responsible AI advancement demands that speed never outpaces safety; structured oversight, patience and staged validation are not barriers to progress but essential conditions for it.

4. GENEROSITY:

- Boeing 737 MAX [13] Exposing how transparency and accountability breakdowns carry fatal real-world consequences.
- Universal ethical principles [14 & 15] Alignment between integrity in intention and action demonstrate that genuine openness and accountability build trust, while survival-driven secrecy ultimately undermines it.
- Hyland-Monks et al. [16] Cognitive accountability and integrity are prerequisite for enduring success.
- HITL & Asilomar - Transparency and human control principles, ensure AI decisions remain auditable and trustworthy.
- Conclusion - Integrity at every level; explainability, accountability and alignment between intention and action are non-negotiable foundations for systems that people can genuinely rely upon.

5: INNOCENCE:

- DeepMind / NHS Data [17] Patient data used without transparency or informed consent creates serious ethical and relational harm.
- Universal ethical principles [18 & 19] A pure motive and unconditional consideration becomes three-dimensional and all-encompassing in building trust.
- Thiel et al. [20] Respecting both personal and others' boundaries, reinforce that consideration is fundamental to performance endurance and relationships alike.
- HITL & Asilomar - Dignity-centred oversight to ensure shared benefit and shared prosperity principles, ensuring data serves rather than exploits people.
- Conclusion - Ethical AI demands pure intent and genuine consideration for all stakeholders; consent, dignity and relational responsibility must be embedded into every stage of development and deployment.

6: VALUES:

- Petrov [21] overrides a false automated missile demonstrates that human judgment remains irreplaceable where automated outputs carry catastrophic consequence.
- Universal ethical principles [21 & 22] Honest values direct energy toward what genuinely matters, remove distraction and elevate performance.
- Brick et al. [23] Clear, aligned values regulate endurance performance, reinforcing that purposeful intention is a foundational performance driver.
- HITL & Asilomar - Value alignment and non-subversion principles, keeping AI accountable to genuine human priorities.
- Conclusion - AI must remain grounded in human values and clarity of intention, preserved through meaningful oversight, to ensure systems serve what genuinely matters universally rather than override it.

7: EMPATHISE:

- Character.AI Litigation [24] Exposed the dangerous limits of simulated empathy without adequate human safeguards.
- Universal ethical principles [25 & 26] Choosing empathy requires perspective-taking that no simulation can authentically replicate.
- McCormick et al. [27] Emotional regulation and relational support outperform technical superiority, authentic connection drives sustainable performance.
- HITL & Asilomar - Capability caution and protecting vulnerable users where AI empathy remains fundamentally limited.
- Conclusion - Genuine empathy cannot be simulated; protecting vulnerable users demands human oversight, relational responsibility and honest recognition of where artificial emotional intelligence reaches its ethical and practical limits.

8: SUSTAIN:

- NASA [28] Repeated aviation incidents prompted embedding communication discipline, teamwork and continuous training into systemic response safety culture.
- Universal ethical principles [25 & 29] Disciplined commitment under pressure unlocks creativity and resilience; knowing when to commit and when to adapt is fundamental to sustained excellence.
- Cowden and Worthington [30] Sustainable commitment requires a cycle of self-forgiveness; depends on honest and compassionate self-evaluation.
- HITL & Asilomar - Research culture and long-term safety commitments, ensure AI systems remain responsibly and ethically resilient.
- Conclusion - Sustained excellence is never finished; ethical AI demands the same daily discipline, continuous improvement and long-term commitment to responsible progress.

Forgiveness Framework:

1. **F**ail
2. **O**riginality
3. **R**espect
4. **G**enerosity
5. **I**nnocence
6. **V**alue
7. **E**mpathise
8. **S**ustain



CONCLUSION:

The future of AI will not be determined by computational power alone, but by the quality of human decisions, behaviours and values shaping these systems. Ancient principles of humility, integrity and commitment, translated through Human-in-the-Loop practice and Asilomar governance, provide a scalable foundation for trustworthy AI. Forgiveness is not a peripheral concept but a central mechanism for adaptive, restorative and sustainable intelligence. Endurance environments uniquely reveal the difference between optimisation and wisdom - the defining human advantage in an AI age.

REFERENCES:

[1] W. D. Cullen, The Ladbroke Grove Rail Inquiry Part 1 Report, UK Health and Safety Executive, 2021.

[2] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:8-11.

[3] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:3.

[4] E. Brymer, & L. G. Oades, “Extreme Sports: A Positive Transformation in Courage and Humility.” Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 49(1), 2009, DOI:10.1177/0022167808326199.

[5] J. Angwin, J. Larson, S. Mattu, & L. Kirchner, Machine Bias, ProPublica, 2016.

[6] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:12.

[7] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:4.

[8] B. L. M. Smits, G. J. Pepping & F. J. Hettinga “Pacing and Decision Making in Sport and Exercise,” Sports Medicine, 44, 763–775, 2014.

[9] National Transportation Safety Board, Collision Between Vehicle Controlled by Developmental Automated Driving System and Pedestrian. NTSB/HAR-19/03, 2019.

[10] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:13.

[11] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:5.

[12] S. Skorski, & C. R. Abbiss, “The Manipulation of Pace within Endurance Sport.” Frontiers in Physiology, 2017, 8:102. DOI:10.3389/fphys.2017.00102

REFERENCES:

[13] House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, The Design, Development & Certification of the Boeing 737 MAX. U.S. House of Representatives Staff Report, 2020.

[14] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:14.

[15] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:6.

[16] R. Hyland-Monks, L. Cronin, L. McNaughton, D. Marchant, “The role of executive function in the self-regulation of endurance performance.” Progress in Brain Research, 240, 353–370, 2018.

[17] Information Commissioner’s Office, Undertaking to the Information Commissioner: Royal Free NHS Foundation Trust, 2017.

[18] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:15.

[19] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:7.

[20] C. Thiel, K. Pfeifer & G. Sudeck, “Pacing and perceived exertion in endurance performance.” German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research, 48, 136–144, 2018.

[21] D. E. Hoffman, The Dead Hand: The Untold Story of the Cold War Arms Race and its Dangerous Legacy, New York: Doubleday, 2009.

REFERENCES:

[22] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:16.

[23] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:8.

[24] N. E. Brick, T. E. MacIntyre & M. J. Campbell, “Thinking and Action: A Cognitive Perspective on Self-Regulation during Endurance Performance.” Frontiers in Physiology, 7:159, 2016, DOI:10.3389/fphys.2016.00159.

[25] Associated Press, “Parents file lawsuit alleging AI chatbot contributed to teen harm,” 2024.

[26] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Exodus 20:17.

[27] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:9.

[28] A. McCormick, C. Meijen, P. A. Anstiss & H. S. Massey, “Self-regulation in endurance sports: theory, research, and practice.” International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 12(1), 1–30, 2018.

[29] National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Resource Management on the Flightdeck: Proceedings of a NASA/Industry Workshop (NASA CP-2120), 1979.

[30] The Holy Bible, New International Version, Zondervan, 2011, Matthew 5:10.

[31] R. G. Cowden & E. L. Worthington, Overcoming Failure in Sport: A Self-forgiveness Framework. Journal of Human Sport and Exercise, 14(2), 2019, DOI:10.14198/jhse.2019.142.01. A. McCormick, C. Meijen, P. A. Anstiss & H. S. Massey, “Self-regulation in endurance sports: theory, research, and practice.” International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 12(1), 1–30, 2018.