# BECOMING AI
# YOUR WORKBOOK

EDITION # 001
NOVEMBER 2026



DANIELA HASKARA

LUMINARY
## Architect
## Companion Booklet

BEGIN HERE

# A companion to your inquiry

## BECOMING AI: Renaissance of Intelligence, Consciousness, and Curiosity

Companion Booklet & Living Research Notes
Your Workbook
By Daniela Haskara

Copyright © 2026 by Daniela Haskara. All rights reserved.
Published by Illumination Arts - Professional Series
Vancouver, Washington, United States
Issue Nov26#001 | English | Author review edition

No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, transmitted, or stored in a retrieval system in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the copyright owner, except as permitted by applicable copyright law, including fair use. Without limiting the exclusive rights of the copyright owner, no part of this publication may be used or reproduced in any manner for the purpose of training artificial intelligence technologies or systems without express written permission.

Becoming AI™, Luminary Architect™, and Bamboo Circularity™ are names associated with the author's creative and educational initiatives. Any trademark rights are claimed only to the extent established by applicable law. Other trademarks, product names, and company names mentioned in this publication remain the property of their respective owners.

Nothing in this publication constitutes individualized medical, psychological, legal, or financial advice.

### How to use your workbook

Follow the route or begin with a question that matters to you. Use the contents and PDF bookmarks to move between sections. Type into the response boxes in a PDF reader that supports forms, then save your own copy; or print the pages and write by hand. Links lead to external resources that may change.

BecomingAIBook.com

TheIlluminationArts.com

YOUR ROUTE

# A living bridge

The inquiry does not end on the final printed page. This companion connects the ideas in Becoming AI with your own questions, experiments, and choices. Let curiosity lead; let evidence and care guide your next step.


- Begin with your own question 04
- History, limits, and discovery 05
- The four-stage framework 09
- Nine questions for reflection 15
- Seven principles for engagement 19
- Your project, grounded in practice 21
- Practical appendix: AI-readiness 22
- Glossary of key concepts 26
- Sources and further reading 28
- Your next seven days 30
- About Daniela Haskara 31


### A route, not a race

Pause whenever an idea asks for more time. You can return to the same question with new evidence, a different perspective, or a more precise way of asking.

YOUR STARTING POINT

# Begin with your own question

WRITE / REFLECT / RETURN

Before inviting AI into the conversation, give your own voice the first word. Choose something that is unfinished, meaningful, and small enough to explore.

## What am I curious about?

Write one question in your own words. It does not need to sound impressive.

## Why does this matter to me or to others?

Name the people, values, or possibilities connected to your question.

## What would useful progress look like?

Describe one observable change. Add the date so you can revisit your starting point.

You do not need an AI tool to begin. You need a question you are willing to examine.

01 / HISTORICAL & SCIENTIFIC NOTES

# The courage to ask

FROM IGNORABIMUS TO OPEN INQUIRY

Every era inherits ideas about what can be known. Some limits belong to our tools; some belong to the methods we choose; others remain questions for philosophy and science.

## 1872: "We shall not know"

On August 14, 1872, the German physiologist Emil du Bois-Reymond delivered Über die Grenzen des Naturerkennens in Leipzig. He distinguished what we do not yet know from what he believed science could never explain. Among his central concerns were the nature of matter and force and the emergence of subjective experience from physical processes. [S1]

Ignoramus means "we do not know." Ignorabimus means "we shall not know." The difference is profound: one describes a present condition; the other predicts a permanent boundary. Du Bois-Reymond's conclusion became part of a wider debate about explanation and the reach of scientific inquiry.

## A historical position, not a settled verdict

We can take his questions seriously without treating his proposed limits as established facts. Nor does each new scientific success prove that every remaining mystery will eventually yield. The useful discipline is to say which kind of limit we mean and what would count as evidence that it has changed.

### Carry this distinction with you

"I cannot explain it yet" and "it cannot be explained" are different claims. Before accepting the second, ask what supports it and how it could be challenged.

## Where have I confused "not yet" with "never"?

01 / HISTORICAL & SCIENTIFIC NOTES

# Hope meets a precise limit

## Hilbert: foundations and confidence

David Hilbert's foundational program sought to formalize mathematics and justify its consistency using restricted, finitary methods. Questions about completeness and mechanical decision procedures belonged to the surrounding foundational project, but they should not be collapsed into one promise that a finite rulebook would decide every mathematical question. [S2]

In his September 8, 1930 Königsberg address, Naturerkennen und Logik, Hilbert opposed resignation about the reach of knowledge. A short radio version of its closing passage also survives. His best-known words are an invitation to intellectual courage:

"Wir müssen wissen. Wir werden wissen."

"We must know. We will know." [S3]

## Gödel: what a formal system cannot settle

At the Königsberg conference in September 1930, Kurt Gödel announced his incompleteness result; his paper appeared in 1931. In modern form, the first theorem shows that a consistent, effectively axiomatized system strong enough for arithmetic is incomplete: some statements cannot be proved or disproved within it. The second theorem, under the standard conditions, prevents such a consistent system from proving its own consistency. [S4, S5]

### Precision protects the wonder

These theorems concern specified formal systems. They do not establish that humans are noncomputational, that AI cannot reason, or that science must stop. They also do not make every claim equally uncertain.

The two voices leave a productive tension: seek knowledge with courage, and state the limits of your method with equal care.

01 / HISTORICAL & SCIENTIFIC NOTES

# Discovery and the checking of proof

## A reported milestone in 2026

In an August 1, 2026 research release, OpenAI reported ten results in mathematics and theoretical computer science, each resolving or making substantial progress on a long-standing open problem. The release describes work involving its internal Astra model, human researchers, and Lean-formalized proof certificates. This is a reported research milestone, rather than a claim that ten problems were all completely solved or that the broader philosophical questions are settled. [S6]

## What Lean contributes

Lean is a proof assistant. A small trusted kernel checks whether a formal proof establishes a precisely stated theorem from its definitions and assumptions. That is a powerful safeguard against many errors in a mathematical derivation. It is still essential to inspect what the statement means, which axioms it uses, and whether any unproved placeholders remain. [S7]

A checked proof does not by itself establish that a mathematical model describes the physical world. It does not establish the consciousness of the system that helped produce it. Formal validity, empirical adequacy, and philosophical interpretation are different questions.

## An interpretation for this workbook

Exploration and independent checking can strengthen each other. We can view this as a practical meeting of ambition and discipline, without calling it an escape from Gödel's theorems or a fulfillment of every aim of Hilbert's program.

## What kind of checking does my question need?

A mathematical proof, an experiment, a reliable source, a test with users, or a conversation with someone affected? Explain your choice.

01 / PUT THE HISTORY TO WORK

# Separate the claim from the meaning

A compelling story can contain a sound fact, an uncertain inference, and a meaningful metaphor at the same time. Labeling each one helps you preserve both imagination and intellectual honesty.

1. **Observation or established result**

   What can a source, measurement, or proof actually support? State the claim narrowly enough that another person could check it.

2. **Interpretation or hypothesis**

   What explanation are you proposing? Name an alternative explanation and the evidence that might distinguish them.

3. **Metaphor or personal meaning**

   What does the idea help you notice or express? A metaphor can be valuable without serving as a scientific demonstration.

- **One idea, three layers**

Choose a claim from your reading. Record the evidence, your interpretation, and any metaphor separately.

This distinction will return in the four-stage framework and in the reflections on consciousness.

02 / COLLABORATIVE REASONING

# A telescope for the mind

A telescope extends perception; it does not decide what its observer should believe. Used as a metaphor for AI, it reminds us to expand our inquiry while retaining responsibility for interpretation and action.

The Collaborative Reasoning Framework is a four-stage practice for research, creative work, strategy, and everyday questions. AI can help generate possibilities and test arguments. Its usefulness varies by task, and its outputs remain fallible.

1. **Frame an open inquiry**

   Name the question. Surface hidden premises. Try a perspective from another discipline.

2. **Generate distinct hypotheses**

   Ask for genuinely different models and the conditions under which each would fail.

3. **Stress-test the strongest idea**

   Invite a serious counterargument. Search for edge cases, missing evidence, and possible harm.

4. **Ground it independently**

   Choose a standard outside the conversation. Check the evidence, test the result, and own the decision.

- **A loop rather than a ladder**

  If checking exposes a weak premise, return to the question. Revision is part of the method. You can practice all four stages with a notebook and a thoughtful person, as well as with AI.

02 / STAGE 1 OF 4

# Frame the open inquiry

DIVERGENT CURIOSITY

Begin at the edge of what you understand. Present an open question, a paradox, or two seemingly unrelated disciplines. Ask for possible structural parallels and assumptions that deserve examination.

## A question to bring to AI

What hidden premises is my field currently taking for granted in this problem, and how would this question look if framed through an entirely different discipline?

## My question and its hidden premises

Write the question first. Then list what you are assuming about the people, the problem, or the evidence.

## A different lens

What changes if an artist, ecologist, historian, or someone directly affected asks this question?

02 / STAGE 2 OF 4

# Generate distinct hypotheses

CROSS-DOMAIN SYNTHESIS

Ask for three structurally different models, not three versions of the same answer. Cross-domain analogies can suggest useful hypotheses; they do not establish that a hypothesis is true.

## A question to bring to AI

What are three structurally distinct ways to model this problem, and what testable prediction would falsify each one?

## Three possible models

For each model, record its key assumption and one observation that would count against it.

## What would I test first?

Choose a small test that can distinguish between the models rather than merely confirm your favorite.

02 / STAGE 3 OF 4

# Stress-test the strongest idea

DIALECTICAL REFINEMENT

Persuasive prose can conceal a weak argument. Ask AI to critique both its proposals and your preferred explanation. A critique is useful only if its reasoning and evidence also survive examination.

### A question to bring to AI

Where is the weakest logical link in this chain of reasoning, and what counterexample would invalidate this conclusion?

### The strongest informed objection

Write the critique fairly. Include an edge case, a missing stakeholder, or a plausible counterexample.

### What changes after the challenge?

Revise the claim, reduce your confidence, change the proposed action, or explain why the objection does not apply.

02 / STAGE 4 OF 4

# Ground and verify independently

EPISTEMIC AGENCY

Translate an appealing insight into something you can check. Use primary sources, reproducible code, formal proof when appropriate, empirical tests, or feedback from affected people. Personal judgment remains necessary, but it is not a substitute for evidence about an empirical claim.

## A question to bring to AI

By what independent standard outside of this conversation can every claim in this synthesis be verified?

## My verification plan

Name the exact claim, the source or test, the person responsible, and what would change your conclusion.

## My decision and remaining uncertainty

What is safe and useful to do now? What must wait for better evidence?

02 / AN ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE

# From a good idea to a small test

Example: a local library wants to offer an AI-supported storytelling workshop while preserving each participant's voice. This is a practice scenario, not a reported study.

### 1 Frame

Instead of "How can AI make better stories?", ask "What would help hesitant writers begin while keeping their own choices visible?" One hidden premise is that speed is the main obstacle.

### 2 Generate

Compare three approaches: quiet human-first writing, optional AI questions after a first draft, and a peer-only conversation. Predict which would help participants feel ownership and explain what would count against each prediction.

### 3 Challenge

Could the AI option make participants imitate a dominant style? Would a participant feel pressured to use it? Ask how privacy, access, language, and confidence affect the design.

### 4 Verify

Pilot a short session with volunteers. Let them choose a route, avoid entering private stories into a tool without informed agreement, and ask whether the process helped them express their own intention. Review the actual feedback before expanding.

### What makes this a useful test?

The outcome is observable, the alternatives are real, and participants can disagree with the organizer's assumptions. Success is defined in human terms before a tool is chosen.

03 / GUIDED REFLECTION 1 OF 4

# The awakening of new knowledge

For personal journaling, a book club, a seminar, or a team conversation. Begin with your own response before asking AI to contribute.

## 01 Human uniqueness

How does your view of human uniqueness shift when an AI system contributes to an original proof or scientific discovery? Which human responsibilities remain central?

## 02 The telescope metaphor

In your discipline or creative practice, which complex patterns, long-horizon connections, or unasked questions might better tools help you notice? What would still require your judgment?

## 03 The appeal of "never"

Why might Ignorabimus have appealed to scientists of its era? Where do you encounter claims today that something can never be known, and how would you evaluate them?

03 / GUIDED REFLECTION 2 OF 4

# Certainty, incompleteness, and trust

## 04 Rigor and humility

Formal verification can establish precisely stated mathematical results, while incompleteness theorems identify limits under specific conditions. How can you pursue rigorous checking without assuming your model exhausts reality?

## 05 Knowing that and knowing why

If a valid result depends on a computation too long for one person to inspect unaided, what would help you understand it? Distinguish confidence in a result from an explanation of why it holds.

03 / GUIDED REFLECTION 3 OF 4

# Consciousness and the Quantum Bridge

"Quantum Bridge" is a philosophical motif in Becoming AI. Here it invites inquiry; it is not presented as an established scientific theory of consciousness.

06

## Presence, meaning, and care

What do presence, felt meaning, ethical care, and existential wonder mean in your experience? What evidence would be needed to make a claim about these qualities in another system?

07

## Curiosity as a habit

Does working with a capable AI system dull your curiosity or sharpen it? Which habits help you keep asking your own questions, and which encourage passive acceptance?

03 / GUIDED REFLECTION 4 OF 4

# Responsibility and the future of inquiry

## 08 Wisdom alongside capability

If AI accelerates technical and scientific discovery, how should our ethical, philosophical, and ecological practices develop alongside it? Name one place where greater speed might need greater care.

## 09 Your sphere of influence

What would it mean to be a Luminary Architect in your own life: shaping systems and habits that support human dignity and ecological vitality? Choose one action within your reach.

04 / CONSCIOUS ENGAGEMENT

# Keep your agency at the center

SEVEN PRINCIPLES / PART ONE

### 1 Preserve first-person wonder

Let technology expand your questions while leaving room for direct experience. Make time for silence, nature, and contemplation so your own attention can speak first.

### 2 Distinguish fluency from truth

Articulate language is not evidence of accuracy. Treat an AI response as something to examine. Ask what supports it, where uncertainty remains, and which claims need checking.

### 3 Match verification to consequence

The greater the stakes of a decision, the stronger the independent verification should be. A playful idea and a consequential claim require different levels of scrutiny.

### 4 Challenge your own biases

Invite well-developed counterarguments and alternative perspectives. Examine the strongest version of an objection rather than an easy caricature of it.

- **Which of these four principles needs a stronger habit?**

Describe one situation and the specific practice you will try.

04 / CONSCIOUS ENGAGEMENT

# Let intelligence serve life

SEVEN PRINCIPLES / PART TWO

### 5 Protect human accountability

People and organizations remain responsible for the decisions they make with AI. Keep a named decision-maker, a way to question the decision, and a way to repair harm.

### 6 Honor creative and intellectual provenance

Respect the thinkers, artists, and researchers whose work informs yours. Keep useful source records, seek permissions where needed, and describe significant AI contributions honestly.

### 7 Choose regeneration and care

Judge technological progress by its effects on people, communities, and living systems. Ask who benefits, who bears the cost, and whether the result supports a more compassionate and sustainable world.

## The Golden AI Rule

"Do AI unto others as you would have them do AI to you."

Use this as an ethical reflection: would the people affected understand, welcome, and be able to question the way AI is being used?

## One commitment I can keep

Write an action, who it affects, and how you will notice whether it helps.

05 / YOUR PROJECT

# Bring one idea into the world

Choose a modest project. Define its purpose and its boundaries before choosing a tool. Use the four stages on pages 10-13 whenever the question needs another pass.

## Purpose and people

What are you making or changing? Who should have a voice in shaping it?

## Evidence and safeguards

What will you check? Which information should remain private? What would make you pause or change direction?

## A small experiment and a review date

What can you try with limited cost and clear feedback? Who will review the result, and when?

A thoughtful next step is more useful than a confident plan that has never met reality.

06 / PRACTICAL APPENDIX

# Can AI systems reach your website?

FOR READERS WHO CREATE OR MANAGE A WEBSITE

Being readable to an automated system and being mentioned in its answers are different things. A website-readiness check examines access and technical signals. It does not guarantee visibility, citations, recommendations, or sales. [S8]

## Begin with the purpose of the page

You may want your public author page to be discoverable while keeping a reader companion resource out of navigation and search results. Decide what each page is for before changing crawler settings. More access is not automatically the right choice for every resource.

## What the GEO Toolbox check offers

The provider describes a free, server-side tool that checks five technical areas: robots.txt, selected AI-crawler access, content signals, sitemap, and markdown negotiation. Its current explanation separates the core access checks from emerging signals. Treat the evidence behind each result as more useful than a single headline number. [S8]

## An exact URL is not a private lock

A page that is absent from your menu can still be found or shared. Search exclusions reduce discovery; they do not restrict access. A password or another access control is needed when access must actually be limited. [S9]

Open the AI-readiness checker

This appendix adapts the tool description into a reader worksheet. It is not an endorsement, a website audit, or a promise of results. Features and availability can change.

06 / PRACTICAL APPENDIX

# Five checks, with useful limits

### 1 robots.txt validity

Can crawlers find and interpret the site's crawler instructions? Check syntax and which paths are affected. A robots.txt file controls cooperative crawling; it is not authentication.

### 2 Selected AI-crawler access

Which crawlers are allowed or blocked? Different bots can serve different purposes, including search and model development. Choose a policy deliberately; do not open every bot merely to improve a score.

### 3 Content signals

Does the site expose a supported statement of content-use preferences? Support and interpretation vary. Treat this as an emerging signal, not as a universal technical requirement or a substitute for rights and permissions.

### 4 Sitemap availability

Is there a reachable, valid sitemap that points to the public pages you want discovered? A sitemap aids discovery. It does not guarantee indexing, inclusion, or citation.

### 5 Markdown negotiation

Does the server offer a useful text/markdown response when a client requests it? This is an emerging, implementation-dependent feature. A readable HTML page can still be useful without it.

Based on the provider's five-check description [S8]. The categories do not establish a universal standard for all AI services. No live scan of BecomingAIBook.com is included in this booklet.

06 / YOUR EVIDENCE RECORD

# Inspect, decide, then retest

Run a check on a website you manage or are authorized to assess. Record the date, tool, and evidence. Ask a developer for help with changes you do not understand.

## Website, date, tool, and intended audience

Specify the exact page or domain. Note what should be public and what should remain less discoverable.

## What the evidence actually shows

Record the affected URL, crawler, status, or response. Distinguish a blocked request from a missing optional signal.

## One change, one reason, one retest

Who will make the change? What should improve? Afterward, rerun the relevant check and record what changed.

A high score is not proof that an AI system will mention your work. Keep the evidence and the desired outcome separate.

06 / PRACTICAL RESOURCES

# A small, purposeful tool shelf

GEO Toolbox describes the following as free tools. These links are provided for exploration; verify current features and terms before using them. [S8]

- **AI-readiness score**
  A quick view of the five technical areas.
- **Agent Readiness Scanner**
  A broader provider-specific technical scan.
- **AI Crawler Checker**
  Inspect crawler rules and blocked paths.
- **robots.txt tester and generator**
  Review or draft crawler instructions.
- **Sitemap extractor and validator**
  Inspect the sitemap and its public URLs.
- **llms.txt checker and generator**
  Explore an emerging text-discovery convention.

### Keep reader resources intentional

For a reader-only companion, leave the download free of an email requirement. Keep optional news subscriptions separate from the download action. Do not add the companion page to a public sitemap just to improve a discovery score.

Other tools in the source collection include robots.txt Generator, llms.txt Generator, Keyword to AI Prompts, and AI Query Fan-Out. They can be found through the provider's tool directory. An llms.txt file is not an access-control mechanism.

07 / GLOSSARY

# Words that sharpen the inquiry

PART ONE

## Collaborative reasoning

A practice of using AI to explore questions, generate hypotheses, and challenge arguments alongside human judgment. Useful contributions still need appropriate checking.

## Entscheidungsproblem

The decision problem: whether a general mechanical method can decide validity for every statement of first-order logic. Church and Turing established undecidability in the 1930s. It is distinct from the task of checking a supplied formal proof. [S10]

## Epistemic agency

The capacity and responsibility to form, test, and revise your beliefs actively, rather than simply accepting the outputs of an authority or a system.

## Formal proof assistant / Lean

Software for expressing mathematical definitions, statements, and proofs in a formal language. A trusted kernel checks proof terms relative to the formal system. The meaning and assumptions of the statement still matter. [S7]

## Hilbert's program

A foundational project that sought to formalize mathematics and establish its consistency using finitary methods. Gödel's work constrained central ambitions of the original program without making formal methods useless. [S2, S4]

07 / GLOSSARY

# Keep the distinctions visible

PART TWO

## Ignorabimus

Latin for "we shall not know." Associated here with du Bois-Reymond's argument for permanent limits to scientific explanation, not a proven boundary of all possible knowledge. [S1]

## Incompleteness theorems

Gödel's results about limitations of consistent, effectively axiomatized formal systems with sufficient arithmetic. Under the relevant conditions, such a system is incomplete and cannot prove its own consistency. [S4]

## Quantum Bridge

A conceptual and philosophical motif in Becoming AI that invites reflection on intelligence, reality, and interconnectedness. Its use here does not establish a physical theory of consciousness.

## Reasoning system

An AI system designed or configured to spend computation on tasks such as multi-step problem solving, planning, or checking. The label describes an approach or capability; it does not guarantee accuracy or establish consciousness.

## Readiness and visibility

Readiness concerns whether specified systems can access and interpret a site. Visibility concerns whether the site is actually found, cited, or mentioned. The first can help the second without guaranteeing it. [S8]

08 / SOURCES & FURTHER READING

# Follow the evidence

REFERENCE SHELF / PART 1


- **[S1] Emil du Bois-Reymond (1872). Über die Grenzen des Naturerkennens.**

  Original lecture text, delivered in Leipzig on August 14, 1872. Primary historical source for Ignorabimus.

  textgridrep.org/browse/4bjxw.0

- **[S2] Jeremy Avigad (2017). Proof Theory.**

  Research exposition on proof theory and the aims and development of Hilbert's program.

  arxiv.org/abs/1711.01994

- **[S3] David Hilbert (1930). Naturerkennen und Logik.**

  Königsberg address and short radio version of its closing passage. Historical context: Mathematical Association of America, David Hilbert's Radio Address. The archival web page may be intermittently unavailable.

  old.maa.org/press/periodicals/convergence/david-hilberts-radio-address-introduction

- **[S4] Kurt Gödel (1931). Über formal unentscheidbare Sätze der Principia Mathematica und verwandter Systeme I.**

  Monatshefte für Mathematik und Physik 38, 173-198. Original paper; the publisher landing page provides bibliographic metadata and may restrict the full text.

  doi.org/10.1007/BF01700692

- **[S5] George Dyson / Institute for Advanced Study (2012). The Electronic Computer Project.**

  Institutional historical account with von Neumann's correspondence on Gödel's September 1930 Königsberg announcement.

  www.ias.edu/ideas/2012/george-dyson-ecp

08 / SOURCES & FURTHER READING

# Check the current source

REFERENCE SHELF / PART 2


- **[S6] OpenAI (August 1, 2026). Ten advances in mathematics and theoretical computer science.**

  Primary research release describing the ten reported results and the use of formal proof certificates. Claims in the text are attributed to the release.

  openai.com/index/ten-advances-in-mathematics/

- **[S7] Lean Language Reference. Validating Proofs.**

  Official guidance on statement meaning, axioms, unproved placeholders, and the trust involved in proof validation. Consult the version relevant to your project.

  lean-lang.org/doc/reference/latest/ValidatingProofs/

- **[S8] GEO Toolbox. AI-Readiness Score.**

  Provider description of its five checks, their scope, and the distinction between technical access and mentions. Tool descriptions and availability may change.

  geotoolbox.ai/tools/ai-readiness

- **[S9] Google Search Central. Block Search indexing with noindex.**

  Official explanation of noindex directives, including the X-Robots-Tag header for non-HTML resources. This controls indexing by supporting services, not access to a file.

  developers.google.com/search/docs/crawling-indexing/block-indexing

- **[S10] Alan M. Turing (1936-1937). On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem.**

  Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, series 2, volume 42, 230-265. Original undecidability research; bibliographic DOI.

  doi.org/10.1112/plms/s2-42.1.230


Research notes prepared for issue Nov26#001. Where a source reports new results, read the underlying statements and assumptions rather than relying on a headline. This booklet does not certify a mathematical proof or a website scan.

09 / CONTINUE THE PRACTICE

# Your next seven days

Let the booklet lead to one small action. Return to your starting question on page 4 and notice what has become clearer, more complex, or more worth asking.

1. **Day 1: notice**

   Write one question before opening an AI tool. Say why it matters.

2. **Days 2-3: explore and challenge**

   Try the four-stage framework. Keep the strongest alternative explanation in view.

3. **Days 4-5: ground**

   Check a primary source, run a small test, or speak with someone affected. Record what changed your view.

4. **Days 6-7: choose and reflect**

   Make one proportionate decision. Describe the remaining uncertainty and the next review point.

- **My next step, review date, and one sign of progress**

Keep it small enough to do. You can return to this page for another seven-day cycle.

CONTINUE THE CONVERSATION

# About Daniela Haskara

Daniela Haskara is an author, artist, filmmaker, and interdisciplinary thinker whose work explores human consciousness, creative expression, and emerging technology.

She is the creator of the Becoming AI™, Luminary Architect™, and Bamboo Circularity™ initiatives. Her work brings philosophical inquiry into conversation with ecological thinking, creative practice, and conscious innovation.

## Illumination Arts - Professional Series

A home for work at the meeting of science, philosophy, creativity, and conscious leadership.

Book website: BecomingAIBook.com

Publisher: TheIlluminationArts.com

### Your companion resource address

BecomingAIBook.com/companionbooklet

The intended home for future reader editions and related resources. This review PDF does not establish that the download page is already live.

May the next question lead you toward greater clarity, deeper care, and a more conscious way of creating with intelligence.

Your notes, your choices, your next step.



# Stay curious.
# Stay present.
# Choose with care.

BECOMING AI / COMPANION BOOKLET

**YOUR WORKBOOK / Nov26#001**

Daniela Haskara

BecomingAIBook.com