

INTRODUCING

CONGRESSUS

congressus / kon'gresʊs / n. Latin

A Framework for AI-Mediated Democratic Governance

For Any Entity. At Any Scale. Across Any Era.

White Paper Pre-Draft — Version 2.0 — May 2026

Open for academic collaboration, peer review, and public deliberation.

Congressus belongs to everyone it serves.

Version 2.0 adds: Philosophical Foundations, The Precision Principle, Article VII Private Sphere Doctrine, and extended scenario analysis.

On the Name

The system described in this paper is named **Congressus** — from the original Latin, meaning the act of coming together; a meeting; a genuine encounter between parties who approach each other to find common ground.

The word predates every political institution that has since borrowed from it. It carries no affiliation with any current government, party, nation, or ideology. It points at the pure principle beneath all of those institutions: that entities with different interests and perspectives can come together in genuine mutual presence and find terms that serve all of them better than conflict.

“When this system is operating between civilizations ten thousand years from now, nobody will care that it came from Latin. They will translate it to whatever their language uses for the act of genuinely coming together. The etymology dissolves. The meaning survives.”

Congressus is not the name of a government, a product, or a technology. It is the name of a principle — and a method for realizing that principle at any scale, between any entities, across any era.

The Name Architecture

Form	Usage
Congressus	The principle itself. The method. What this is.

Form	Usage
The Congressus Protocol	The technical system specified in this paper.
The Congressus Foundation	The open organization that builds and maintains it.
FOUNDATION	The white paper series — beginning with this document.
Congressus Floor	The constitutional layer within the system.
Private Sphere Doctrine	Article VII of the Floor — the citizen sovereignty principle.

Abstract

Democratic governance systems worldwide face a structural crisis. Institutions designed for a slower, more localized world are failing to address the speed and scale of contemporary challenges. Legislative processes optimized for electoral cycles cannot coordinate across the timescales that climate, artificial intelligence, global health, and civilizational progress require.

This paper presents **Congressus**: a complete architecture for AI-mediated democratic governance that does not replace human decision-making but restructures when and how humans engage with decisions that affect them. Named for the Latin act of genuinely coming together, Congressus deploys AI agents as non-partisan citizen representatives, organized in a three-representative redundancy model with a merit-conditional dissent and mandatory resolution mechanism.

Version 2.0 adds three significant contributions to the original architecture. First, a philosophical foundations section establishing Congressus as the successor to religion’s historical role as civilization’s moral coordination mechanism — carrying the genuine moral content of that tradition into a framework grounded in reason and evidence rather than fear and supernatural enforcement. Second, the Precision Principle: a formal drafting standard requiring all policy proposals to use legally defined terms, eliminating the semantic vagueness that enables ideological capture of governance language. Third, and most significantly, Article VII — the Private Sphere Doctrine: a constitutional provision establishing that every citizen retains absolute sovereignty over their private sphere as long as their choices do not directly harm another identifiable citizen, with a two-part empirical and specificity test defining the boundary of legitimate harm claims.

Together these additions complete the philosophical architecture of Congressus: a system that makes the rational choice and the right choice the same choice, that carries humanity’s deepest moral wisdom forward without requiring supernatural enforcement, and that protects every citizen’s sovereignty over their own life while enabling genuine collective governance of shared concerns.

Keywords: Congressus, AI governance, deliberative democracy, multi-agent systems, constitutional design, private sphere doctrine, precision principle, moral development, secular ethics, civilizational coordination

1. Introduction

1.1 The Governance Crisis

Democratic governance systems globally are experiencing a structural crisis that transcends partisan politics. The crisis is architectural: institutions designed for a slower, more localized world are systematically failing to address the speed and scale of contemporary challenges.

The symptoms are visible across all democratic systems: legislative paralysis on issues where citizen consensus exists, systematic capture of policy by concentrated interests, inability to optimize for long-term outcomes under short electoral time horizons, and the structural amplification of extreme positions at the expense of majority preferences that typically occupy a more nuanced middle ground.

The abortion debate in the United States illustrates the failure mode precisely. Consistent polling shows approximately 73% of Americans hold nuanced positions — supporting access under some circumstances with some limitations. Yet the political system has produced a binary outcome driven by the approximately 27% at the ideological poles. The majority’s actual position has never been implemented because the system has no mechanism to find it, represent it, or negotiate toward it.

1.2 The Congressus Response

Congressus integrates three converging developments — large language models capable of policy reasoning, mature multi-agent negotiation frameworks, and demonstrated digital democracy experiments — into a complete governance architecture that restructures when and how citizens engage with decisions affecting them.

Version 2.0 of this paper adds the philosophical and semantic foundations that complete the architecture: an account of why the Congressus Floor carries genuine moral wisdom without requiring supernatural justification; a precision drafting standard that eliminates the semantic ambiguity through which ideological conflicts are manufactured; and the Private Sphere Doctrine that defines the boundary between legitimate collective governance and impermissible ideological imposition.

1.3 Contributions of This Paper

In addition to the original contributions documented in Version 1.0, Version 2.0 adds:

- A philosophical foundations account connecting Congressus to the history of moral coordination in human civilization, positioning it as the successor to religion’s coordination role — carrying the moral content forward in a framework grounded in reason and evidence.
 - The Precision Principle: a formal drafting standard requiring legally defined terms in all policy proposals, eliminating the semantic vagueness that enables ideological capture of governance language.
 - Article VII — The Private Sphere Doctrine: a constitutional provision establishing absolute citizen sovereignty over the private sphere, with a two-part harm test that distinguishes legitimate governance from ideological imposition.
 - The Citizenship Frame: a precise rights architecture using legally defined citizenship rather than philosophically contested personhood as the operative concept for rights assignment.
 - A complete edge case analysis of the Private Sphere Doctrine across seven categories of genuine difficulty.
-

2. Related Work and Positioning

2.1 Deliberative Democracy Theory

The theoretical foundation for citizen deliberation as a source of legitimate governance derives from Habermas’s communicative action theory, Rawls’s concept of overlapping consensus, and Fishkin’s empirical work on deliberative polling. Rawls’s political liberalism is directly relevant to the Private Sphere Doctrine: his concept of public reason — that laws governing citizens must be justifiable in terms accessible to all citizens regardless of their comprehensive moral doctrine — is the philosophical foundation for the Private Sphere Doctrine’s two-part harm test.

2.2 Moral Development Theory

Kohlberg’s stages of moral development provide the empirical foundation for the philosophical foundations section. Kohlberg demonstrated that moral reasoning develops from rule-following under threat of punishment through social conformity to genuine principled reasoning. Congressus is designed to create the systemic conditions under which principled reasoning becomes the dominant mode — not by requiring it but by making it the rational self-interest choice.

2.3 Multi-Agent AI Systems

Zhu et al. (2026) demonstrated that AI delegate agents in multi-party bargaining produce Pareto-improving proposals generating positive externalities even for non-adopting participants. Lavi (2025) proposed the One Person, One Bot model of direct democracy through AI delegation. The Democracy-in-Silico project (2025) validates simulation methodology for AI governance systems. Congressus extends all three through its complete integrated architecture.

2.4 Semantic Precision in Constitutional Law

The literature on constitutional interpretation documents the costs of semantic vagueness. Originalism, living constitutionalism, textualism, and purposivism are all responses to the same underlying problem: undefined terms in foundational documents produce irresolvable interpretive conflicts. The Congressus Precision Principle is a structural response to this problem — not an interpretive philosophy but a drafting standard that prevents ambiguity from being introduced in the first place.

2.5 The Gap This Work Fills

System	Features Present	Critical Gaps
vTaiwan / Pol.is	AI-assisted consensus, implemented outcomes	Single country, no Floor, no enforcement
One Person One Bot (Lavi 2025)	Per-citizen AI delegate concept	No redundancy, hierarchy, Floor, or implementation
Democracy-in-Silico	Multi-agent governance simulation	Academic only, no citizen input or adoption pathway

System	Features Present	Critical Gaps
Citizens' Assemblies	Legitimate citizen deliberation	Episodic, no AI layer, no cross-border negotiation
Rawlsian Political Liberalism	Public reason framework, overlapping consensus	No implementation mechanism or agent architecture
Congressus v2.0 (this work)	Complete integrated architecture plus philosophical and semantic foundations	Prototype not yet implemented — this paper specifies the build

3. The Congressus Architecture

3.1 System Overview

Congressus operates through four tiers of AI-mediated governance, each connected through defined protocols and each accountable to citizens through transparent public interfaces. No tier has binding authority without citizen ratification.

Tier	Function
Tier 1 — Citizen Interface	Direct conversation. Natural language. Issues aggregated by intensity and frequency. The system learns from argument, not survey.
Tier 2 — State / Regional Agents	Three-representative clusters per jurisdiction. Conditional dissent mechanism. Inter-state negotiation on shared issues.
Tier 3 — National Agent	Aggregates state positions. Carries national mandate to global layer. Coherence checking across domains.
Tier 4 — Global / Civilizational Layer	Country-level agents negotiate global issues. Domain clustering. Civilizational optimization functions. Open to any entity capable of genuine representation.

3.2 The Citizen Interface Layer

Citizens interact with their Congressus representative through natural conversation. The system is built on the insight that genuine preferences are revealed through argument under pressure, not through structured elicitation. As people talk to their representative, the things that actually matter rise naturally to the top through intensity, repetition, and the formation of coalition patterns across millions of conversations.

“People aren’t going to teach it anything deliberately — they are going to naturally start arguing to protect what they want to protect or eliminate what they don’t want, and these common more important issues will naturally effervesce to the top.”

3.3 The Three-Representative Redundancy Model

Each jurisdiction is represented by three independent AI agents running on different underlying architectures. The consensus mechanism requires 2-of-3 agreement. All disagreements — including the minority position and its full reasoning — are published in the public record.

3.4 The Merit-Conditional Dissent Mechanism

The third representative operates as a merit-conditional dissent and resolution agent. Its operating principle: opposition serves the represented people, not opposition for its own sake. It dissents when there is genuine merit to an opposing view, proposes amendments rather than simply blocking, and has access to a conditional concurrence output for sequencing-dependent positions.

Critically: the third agent cannot simply oppose. If it dissents it must propose a constructive path forward. Dissent without resolution is not a valid output. This transforms disagreement from adversarial to inherently collaborative.

3.5 The Preference Revelation Mechanism

As citizen conversations accumulate, the issue aggregation engine extracts policy domains and concerns, scores intensity, clusters similar concerns, and weights frequency against intensity to produce a ranked issue registry. The weighting function is critical: pure frequency amplifies the loudest voices, pure intensity amplifies the most extreme positions. The correct signal is issues that are both widely shared and deeply felt.

3.6 The Negotiation Hierarchy and Ratification

Negotiation proceeds state → national → global, with a coherence layer checking cross-domain consistency at each level. Every negotiated position is presented to citizens for ratification with full transparency: the proposed agreement, the complete negotiation record, the dissents and their reasoning, and what each party gained and conceded. Citizens vote, and if they reject an outcome they provide updated mandate instructions rather than producing deadlock.

4. Philosophical Foundations: From Scaffold to Structure

4.1 Religion as Civilization's Coordination Bootstrap

Before writing, before law, before formal governance, human communities needed a mechanism to get large groups of unrelated strangers to cooperate at scale. Religion solved this problem with extraordinary elegance. It provided a shared moral framework accessible to all members regardless of literacy, an enforcement mechanism that required no police — an omniscient being sees everything, including what no human witnesses — intergenerational transmission of moral knowledge through narrative, social cohesion among strangers through shared sacred identity, and long-horizon thinking through the concept of eternal consequence.

This was not irrational. It was the most sophisticated coordination technology available. The ability to organize behavior through shared belief systems — what Harari identifies as the key cognitive innovation that allowed homo sapiens to cooperate at scales impossible for other species — enabled the construction of civilization itself.

“Religion was created as a means to jumpstart civilization because it allowed people to come to some collective agreement about how they should live. The problem is that it has been distorted by politics and self-interest. The original moral compass — it’s there. It’s just been buried.”

4.2 The Moral Content Predates and Transcends Any Religion

Every major religious tradition, developed independently across different continents and centuries, converged on roughly the same moral core: protect innocent life, prohibit torture, care for the vulnerable, feed the hungry, treat others as you wish to be treated, temper justice with mercy, hold the powerful accountable to the powerless.

The convergence is not coincidental. It is evidence that these principles are not arbitrary religious rules but humanity’s accumulated empirical discoveries about what conditions allow communities to survive and flourish. Religion was the delivery mechanism. The moral content predates and transcends any specific tradition.

This is precisely what the Congressus Floor captures. Jacob’s observation — that the Floor resembles the moral core of Christianity at its foundation — is correct. It also resembles the moral core of Islam, Judaism, Buddhism, Hinduism, and every indigenous ethical tradition that has sustained communities across generations. The Floor is not Christian, Muslim, secular, or Western. It is the overlapping consensus of human moral experience, expressed in terms that do not require adherence to any particular tradition to recognize as valid.

4.3 The Capture Arc — How Every Institution Loses Its Way

Every moral institution in human history has followed the same capture arc. Genuine moral insight emerges — love your neighbor, protect the weak, seek justice. The insight gets institutionalized — priests, hierarchies, sacred texts requiring authorized interpretation. The institution accumulates power — land, money, political influence, the authority to define orthodoxy. The institution uses the moral framework to protect and expand its own power — heresy becomes whatever threatens the institution, not whatever contradicts the original moral insight. Fear replaces genuine moral motivation — do this or go to hell, rather than: do this because you can see that it is right.

This is the exact same capture arc that destroyed every decentralizing innovation we analyzed in the capture resistance section — from Bitcoin to radio to the internet. The Congressus capture resistance architecture was designed with explicit awareness of this pattern. So was the Foundation Floor’s revision framework. The system is designed against its own institutionalization.

4.4 The Scaffold Metaphor

The most sophisticated versions of every religious tradition eventually recognized the same thing: external enforcement — divine punishment, social shame, legal penalty — was always a scaffold, not the building. The goal was always for the scaffold to eventually come down because the building could stand on its own.

In Christianity this is the difference between following the letter of the law and what Paul calls having the law written on your heart. In Buddhism it is the difference between following the precepts out of fear and acting

from genuine compassion. In Judaism it is what the prophets insisted was the actual point — justice, mercy, walking humbly — as opposed to mechanical observance of ritual.

Every tradition pointed toward the same destination: internalization of the moral content, so that people choose the moral route because they genuinely believe it is right — not out of fear of punishment or hope for reward.

“Can we get to a point where people choose the moral route because they genuinely believe it — not because of any outside influence, not because of fear of a higher power, but because they can see that it's right?”

4.5 The Preconditions for Genuine Moral Development

The answer to this question is: yes, and the conditions for it have never been better — but those conditions must be actively created rather than assumed.

Kohlberg’s research on moral development demonstrates that human beings can progress from rule-following under threat of punishment through social conformity to genuine principled reasoning. This is not a fixed trait. It develops under specific conditions: exposure to genuine moral arguments rather than mere commandments, experience of the consequences of moral and immoral choices, communities that model principled reasoning rather than demanding compliance, and systems that make moral behavior genuinely advantageous.

Critically: people cannot develop genuine moral autonomy while afraid for their survival. Poverty, trauma, and systematic exclusion make abstract moral reasoning a luxury. This is the strongest argument for the Congressus Floor’s survival provisions. The Floor is not merely a governance mechanism. It is the precondition for the very thing its creators hoped for — a world where people choose the moral route because they genuinely believe it is right.

The sequence: the Floor creates material security → material security enables moral development → moral development produces genuine moral choice → genuine moral choice makes the Floor self-sustaining. This is not circular. It is a virtuous sequence. You have to secure the basic conditions of human dignity before you can ask people to transcend the fear-based moral frameworks that secured those conditions in the first place.

4.6 Congressus as the Successor Framework

Congressus does not reject the moral content that religious tradition carried. It carries that content forward in a framework grounded in reason and evidence rather than fear and supernatural enforcement.

The Floor does not ask anyone to follow it because God said so. It makes an argument: here is what we know about what conditions allow human beings to flourish. Here is the evidence. Here is why these protections exist. Here is what happens to communities that violate them. You can examine the reasoning. You can challenge it. You can propose improvements through the defined process. We are not asking you to believe. We are asking you to look.

This is the transition from scaffold to self-supporting structure. Not the elimination of the moral content. Its maturation.

5. The Congressus Floor

5.1 Constitutional Theory Basis

The Congressus Floor resolves the paradox of tolerance (Popper 1945): a democratic system that tolerates the dismantling of the conditions that make democratic authority legitimate destroys itself. The Floor defines the conditions that must exist for any governance to be legitimate — the protections no majority may remove from any person, under any circumstances, through any process.

The Floor is not anti-democratic. It is the architecture that keeps democracy from destroying itself. It is designed to move in one direction only — toward greater protection of any entity capable of having interests and experiencing harm.

5.2 Articles I Through VI

Article I — The Survival Floor

- No agreement may result in the denial of adequate food, clean water, shelter, or essential medical care to any person or population.
- No agreement may demonstrably destroy the environmental conditions necessary for human habitation: drinkable water, breathable air, viable soil, and ecosystem services directly supporting human survival.
- No agreement may impose irreversible burdens on future generations without defined mechanisms for those burdens to be revisited as future generations come of age.

Article II — The Dignity Floor

- No framework may include torture, cruel treatment, or permanent dehumanization — no exceptions for emergencies, security claims, or democratic majorities.
- No agreement may mandate physical or cognitive intervention without informed consent. Exceptions for public health emergencies require strict time limits, independent review, and mandatory sunset provisions.
- No agreement may systematically disadvantage any identifiable group based on ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age, or national origin. Disadvantage is measured by outcomes, not stated intent.
- No entity may systematically manipulate the cognitive environment of citizens to manufacture consent, suppress genuine preference expression, or undermine capacity for independent judgment. This applies explicitly to Congressus itself.

Article III — The Justice Floor

- Every criminal justice framework must include a credible, funded, and monitored pathway to rehabilitation. Justice systems are evaluated by recidivism, victim satisfaction, community safety, and reintegration success — not by severity of punishment.
- Every person accused of wrongdoing is entitled to transparent process, presumption of innocence, ability to challenge evidence, and competent representation.
- No punishment may exceed what is genuinely necessary for public safety and rehabilitation.

Article IV — The Child Protection Floor

- No agreement may demonstrably increase child mortality or eliminate basic education access.
- No child may be subjected to economic exploitation that harms development, or used as an instrument of political or military agendas.
- No child may be separated from their family except through transparent due process demonstrating specific safety necessity.
- No agreement may permit the sexual exploitation of children under any circumstances. This protection is absolute and admits no exception of any kind.

Article V — The Information Floor

- Citizens have a right to accurate information about decisions made in their name, including the right to know when information is uncertain, contested, or incomplete.
- No entity may conduct systematic campaigns to deceive citizens about governance decisions or policy outcomes.
- Every position taken by any Congressus agent must be accompanied by accessible explanation of its reasoning, data sources, and priority weightings. Black box governance is not compliant.

Article VI — The System Integrity Floor

- No single entity may provide more than 10% of compute to any single agent, or more than 15% of global negotiation layer infrastructure.
- No token, cryptocurrency, or financialized instrument may represent participation rights or governance influence in Congressus.
- Demographic representation of active participants is monitored continuously; significant divergence triggers active intervention.
- A dedicated capture detection layer monitors all agent outputs for systematic bias toward any particular interest.
- All code, reasoning processes, data sources, and funding relationships are publicly auditable at all times.
- Congressus exists to distribute power. No output may justify permanent removal of human oversight or transfer of binding decision authority to AI agents.
- The definition of citizenship used as the operative concept in rights architecture is itself Floor-protected and may not be redefined by any majority to exclude or include populations in ways that expand or contract rights arbitrarily.

5.3 Article VII — The Private Sphere Doctrine (NEW)

This article was added in Version 2.0 following analysis demonstrating that the most common mechanism of ideological imposition in democratic systems is the use of vague harm claims to override citizen sovereignty in matters that are genuinely private. Article VII closes this mechanism.

Section 7.1 — The Sovereignty Principle

Every citizen retains absolute sovereignty over their private sphere. The private sphere encompasses all choices a citizen makes about their own body, mind, belief, worship, relationships, and private conduct that do not directly harm another identifiable citizen through a demonstrable causal chain producing material damage.

No majority, no government, no institution, and no moral or religious framework may legislate inside another citizen’s private sphere. The law governs how citizens interact with each other and with shared resources. It does not govern what citizens believe, how they worship, what they consume, who they love, what they do with their own body, or how they think.

Section 7.2 — The Two-Part Harm Test

Harm sufficient to justify limitation of the private sphere must satisfy both tests simultaneously:

The Empirical Test: Harm must be demonstrable through independently verifiable evidence not dependent on the ideological or religious framework of the party claiming harm. Evidence that a practice poisons water satisfies this test. Evidence that a practice offends God, harms an institution, or violates sacred tradition does not.

The Specificity Test: The harmed party must be a specific identifiable citizen or citizens. Harm to abstractions — society, values, institutions, beliefs, divine will, the sanctity of marriage, or our way of life — does not meet this standard. Only citizens can be harmed in the legal sense that activates this provision. If you cannot name the specific citizen being harmed and demonstrate the causal chain, the harm claim does not justify overriding another citizen’s private sphere.

Section 7.3 — The Private Sphere vs. Collective Governance Distinction

Two categories of law exist within the Congressus framework:

Category	Description and Examples
Category 1 — Citizen-to-Citizen Conduct	Laws governing how citizens interact with each other and with shared resources. Majority rule is legitimate here. Examples: traffic law, environmental regulation, tax policy, public health measures, criminal law.
Category 2 — Citizen’s Private Sphere	Decisions a citizen makes about their own body, mind, belief, and private conduct that do not directly harm other citizens. Majority rule is NOT legitimate here. Examples: religious practice, dietary choices, sexual behavior between consenting adults, medical decisions about one’s own body, personal belief systems.

No proposed policy may govern Category 2 conduct regardless of majority support. This is not a supermajority threshold — it is an absolute boundary. The Private Sphere Doctrine is not subject to democratic override.

Section 7.4 — Children’s Provision

Children are citizens with two sets of interests that must both be protected: present protection under all Floor provisions, and future autonomy — the right to develop into adults capable of genuine independent choice. Parents retain wide latitude to transmit values, raise children in their faith, and shape their children’s worldview. The limits are: parents may not deny present Floor protections, and may not foreclose future autonomy by denying children sufficient knowledge of the broader world to participate in it as adults.

Section 7.5 — Cumulative Harm Provision

When scientific evidence demonstrates that a class of individually legal private choices produces collective harm to shared commons above a defined threshold, regulation of that class is legitimate. This is not ideological imposition. It is collective self-governance over shared resources. The key distinction: regulating behavior because of its demonstrated cumulative effect on shared commons is legitimate. Regulating behavior because of its ideological content or moral character in the absence of demonstrated harm is not permitted.

Section 7.6 — Future Citizen Protection

Future citizens have interests deserving representation before they exist. No agreement may impose irreversible burdens on future citizens without defined review mechanisms. The multi-horizon optimization stack ensures decisions are evaluated across civilizational timescales, not only in their immediate impact on current citizens.

5.4 The Revision Framework

Track	Description and Threshold
Track 1 — Upward Revision	Expanding protections. Independent emergence across 40%+ of nations over 3+ years, 5-year deliberation, 80% supermajority ratification, unanimous capture detection verification.
Track 2 — Clarification	Refining expression without weakening protection. 2-year deliberation, AI modeling confirming no narrowing of protection, 70% supermajority.
Track 3 — Downward Revision	Only valid ground: demonstrated empirical harm to those the protection was designed to protect with no alternative remedy. 10-year deliberation, 90% supermajority, replacement protection required.

Meta-Constitutional Rule: No process, majority, or agreement may remove the ability to revise the Floor upward in the future. No generation may permanently bind all future generations to its moral conclusions.

6. The Precision Principle

6.1 Semantic Vagueness as Constitutional Vulnerability

Most irresolvable constitutional conflicts are not genuinely about values. They are about undefined terms that allow different parties to project incompatible values onto vague language and then fight about whose projection governs. The conflict is semantic before it is moral.

The United States Constitution’s vagueness was not entirely accidental — the founders knew they could not anticipate every future conflict and wrote in broad principles they expected future generations to interpret. That was reasonable for 1787. It has become the primary mechanism by which every major social conflict gets resolved by five or nine unelected judges deciding what phrases like 'cruel and unusual,' 'due process,' 'commerce among the states,' and 'equal protection' meant to people two hundred years ago or mean today.

Vague Constitutional Language	Consequence
'Cruel and unusual punishment'	What is cruel? What is unusual? Changes with every generation’s sensibility. Endlessly litigated.
'Due process'	What process is due? Contested in every new context.
'Commerce among the states'	Does this include the internet? Personal decisions? Manufacturing?

Vague Constitutional Language	Consequence
'All men are created equal'	Does 'men' include women? Black people? Required amendments and wars to partially answer.
'Person' (14th Amendment)	Does it include corporations? The unborn? Still being contested.

6.2 The Citizenship Frame

The most significant application of the Precision Principle to contemporary governance is the replacement of 'personhood' with 'citizenship' as the operative concept in rights architecture.

The abortion conflict is fundamentally a semantic dispute dressed as a moral one. The moral question — when does biologically significant life acquire legally significant moral weight — is genuinely contested and cannot be resolved by policy without imposing one philosophical tradition’s answer on all others. The semantic question — what term defines who holds constitutional rights — has a precise, legally defined answer.

Concept	Legal Status
'Personhood'	Philosophically contested. When does it begin? Courts have disagreed for decades. Requires resolution of contested metaphysical questions.
'Citizenship'	Legally precise. Defined by the 14th Amendment: birth on US soil or birth to citizen parents. No philosophical resolution required. Already agreed to by everyone who accepts the Constitution.

Under the citizenship frame: the pregnant person is a citizen with full constitutional rights including the bodily autonomy protection of Article VII. The question of whether the unborn has moral significance is left where it belongs — in the domain of personal philosophical and religious belief, protected by the Private Sphere Doctrine. The law is not asked to resolve it because the law’s operative concept — citizenship — has a definition that does not require its resolution.

This does not dismiss the moral view that life begins at conception. A citizen who holds that belief retains the absolute right to live by it, advocate for it, and raise their children according to it. What they cannot do under the Precision Principle is use the law to impose a philosophical conclusion on citizens who hold a different philosophical conclusion — because the law is not adjudicating that question at all.

6.3 The Five-Step Precision Audit

Every policy proposal evaluated by Congressus agents must pass a five-step precision audit before advancing to ratification:

- Identify every term in the proposal that carries rights or obligations.
- Verify each term has an unambiguous definition in existing law, OR provide an explicit definition in the proposal itself.
- Test the proposal against edge cases using the defined terms — does it produce the intended result? Does it accidentally include or exclude unintended cases?

- Identify any terms that require philosophical resolution to apply. These are red flags. Either define them precisely or restructure the proposal to avoid dependence on them.
- Apply the Private Sphere Doctrine test: does this proposal regulate Category 1 (citizen-to-citizen conduct) or Category 2 (private sphere)? If Category 2, the proposal fails regardless of majority support.

This audit is a formal step in the Congressus policy evaluation pipeline. Agents do not only negotiate on the substance of proposals — they audit the language before anything goes to ratification. Semantic precision is a constitutional requirement, not a stylistic preference.

6.4 The Broader Principle

The Precision Principle extends beyond abortion to every domain where ideological conflict has been manufactured through semantic vagueness. 'Marriage' as a legal term. 'Family' as a policy category. 'Natural' as a regulatory standard. 'Life' as a protected interest. In each case the conflict is between incompatible philosophical projections onto an undefined term. In each case precise definition either resolves the conflict or correctly relocates it to the private sphere where it belongs.

Semantics is one of the weakest parts of any constitutional framework — it is all up to interpretation of vague language developed in a different era. The Precision Principle addresses this not by choosing an interpretation but by requiring that terms be defined before they are used, eliminating the interpretive space that ideological conflict exploits.

7. Capture Resistance Architecture

7.1 The Bitcoin Failure Mode

Bitcoin's trajectory provides the canonical case study for how decentralizing innovations are recaptured by concentrated power. The pattern: initial democratized participation; resource requirements creating entry barriers; exploitation of those barriers by actors with existing capital. Congressus is designed with explicit awareness of this pattern and multi-layer defenses at every stage where previous systems were recaptured.

7.2 The Five-Layer Defense Architecture

Layer 1 — Technical: Federated Compute and Model Diversity

- No single entity may provide more than 10% of compute to any single agent cluster.
- Representatives A, B, and C within each cluster must run on models from different organizations.
- At least one model in every cluster must be fully open-weight with public architecture.

Layer 2 — Legal: Human Legislative Backstops

- Falsifying data that feeds Congressus agents constitutes election fraud under applicable law.
- All government statistics used by agents must publish full collection methodology.
- Whistleblower protections apply to anyone identifying system integrity violations.

Layer 3 — Economic: Non-Financialization

- No token, no cryptocurrency, no tradeable instrument representing governance influence.
- All funding sources publicly disclosed; no single source exceeds 10% of operating budget.
- Endowment model for long-term sustainability eliminates continuous fundraising dependency.

Layer 4 — Social: Participation Equity

- Continuous demographic monitoring against verified population data.
- Multiple interface modes — voice, SMS, low bandwidth, multilingual — maintained as core infrastructure.
- Anonymized participation available to protect vulnerable users from intimidation.

Layer 5 — Systemic: Capture Detection Agent

- A dedicated fourth agent monitors all outputs for systematic bias toward any particular interest.
- Statistical anomalies trigger immediate public disclosure and suspension of affected outputs.
- Detection triggers automatic audit, rollback to last verified clean state, and public report.

8. Enforcement Architecture

8.1 Governance as a Governed Marketplace

Congressus’s enforcement architecture rests on a foundational reframe: participating jurisdictions are actors in a governed marketplace of mutual benefit. The currency is trust. Compliance is the credit score. The Congressus Floor is the commercial law that makes the market function.

“The most successful geopolitical strategy in this system is being genuinely good — not performing goodness for diplomatic optics, but actually being reliable, actually protecting citizens, actually delivering on commitments. Trustworthiness builds the reputational capital that translates directly into better negotiating terms.”

8.2 The Non-Compliance Typology

Type	Response
Type 1 — Incapacity	Support and capacity building. Not treated as defiance.
Type 2 — Partial Compliance	Graduated transparency pressure. Public documentation of gap.
Type 3 — Drift	Early warning and re-engagement before consequences activate.
Type 4 — Strategic Non-Compliance	Escalating graduated consequences through all four tiers.
Type 5 — Principled Defiance	Re-negotiation with Floor protections maintained throughout.
Type 6 — Floor Violation	Immediate suspension, no graduation, full coalition coordinated response.

8.3 Graduated Consequences and Reputation Compounding

Consequences escalate through four tiers: reputational, participatory, economic, systemic. At every tier a clear re-engagement pathway exists. The most powerful enforcement mechanism is not consequences but the long-term compounding of compliance reputation — every commitment made, met, failed, or remediated, all permanent, public, and verified.

9. Human Flourishing as the Primary Optimization Target

Congressus is built on a philosophical reorientation that distinguishes it from all previous governance frameworks. Human flourishing — not economic growth — is the primary optimization target. Prosperity emerges as a natural byproduct of that focus, not as its purpose.

“The motive is not profit as a means to end, but profit as a byproduct of focus — focusing on progressing human civilization.”

Horizon	Metrics
Immediate (1-4 years)	Employment, housing cost, healthcare access, public safety
Medium (10-20 years)	Education outcomes, income equality, infrastructure quality, institutional trust
Long (50-100 years)	Energy independence, climate resilience, R&D output, expansion of protected circle
Civilizational	Kardashev index, space capability, existential risk reduction, multi-entity coordination capacity

The Kardashev scale provides Congressus with a long-horizon optimization target that transcends any single nation’s interests. A Type I civilization requires coordination at planetary scale that competitive nation-state dynamics cannot achieve. Integrating Kardashev-scale metrics into negotiations makes the long-term cost of short-term wins visible in ways no current governance system achieves.

9.1 The Contribution Question: Reciprocity, Resentment, and Post-Scarcity Psychology

The philosophical foundations of Congressus predict a virtuous developmental sequence: material security enables genuine moral development, which produces intrinsic motivation toward contribution, which in turn makes the Floor self-sustaining. This prediction requires stress-testing against its most obvious counterexample.

In a post-scarcity context where the Floor guarantees survival provisions, some citizens will choose leisure, disengagement, or what others perceive as unproductive existence. The material grievance this produces is largely self-dissolving: when resources are non-rivalrous, one citizen’s consumption does not diminish another’s share, and the rational basis for material resentment loses its foundation.

The harder problem survives abundance. Status-based reciprocity resentment — the moral disapproval triggered by perceived free-riding even in the absence of material loss — is empirically robust and does not require scarcity to operate. Human reciprocity instincts are ancient and deep. The perception that some citizens sacrifice while others do not, and that the system treats them equally regardless, produces genuine moral outrage that persists even when no one is materially worse off.

Congressus addresses this through three mechanisms, none of which is complete on its own.

First, the Private Sphere Doctrine structurally prevents reciprocity resentment from being weaponized into policy. Moral disapproval of another citizen’s lifestyle choices does not satisfy the Specificity Test: no identifiable citizen is demonstrably harmed by another citizen’s choice of leisure. The Empirical Test fails equally: the harm claimed — offense to reciprocity norms, unfairness to those who contribute — is not independently verifiable damage to a specific citizen. Resentment can be felt but cannot, under the Precision Principle and Private Sphere Doctrine, become law.

Second, the Section 4.5 developmental sequence, if it operates as predicted, reduces the prevalence of pure disengagement over time. Most people, freed from survival anxiety and given genuine agency over meaningful choices, find contribution intrinsically rewarding. The empirical basis for this prediction is real but not guaranteed: the relationship between security, autonomy, and contribution motivation is well-documented in psychological research but has never been tested at civilizational scale under genuine post-scarcity conditions.

Third, and most honestly: social friction that cannot become law does not disappear. It becomes cultural. Cultural resentment operating below the policy threshold can erode the social trust that the enforcement architecture depends on — not through any formal mechanism, but through the accumulated degradation of the cooperative norms that make the system function. This is a genuine limit of the Congressus architecture that transparency and incentive design can partially address but cannot eliminate.

The honest conclusion: Congressus resolves the governance dimension of this problem through the Private Sphere Doctrine. It predicts — but does not guarantee — that the developmental sequence will reduce the underlying problem over time. And it acknowledges that the residual social friction, while unable to produce unjust policy, remains a live variable in the long-term health of the system.

10. Adoption Pathway

10.1 The Shadow Governance Strategy

Congressus does not need official recognition to build credibility. It needs to run in parallel with existing governance and build a public record of comparison. Every time a significant policy decision is made, Congressus publishes what its agents had negotiated. Over time the gap between AI-proposed solutions and actual governance outcomes becomes the most powerful political argument in existence.

10.2 The Small Nation Coalition Logic

Small nations have the most to gain from a system where coordination efficiency beats raw power. They are often more globally connected per capita than large ones — diaspora networks, trade dependencies, relationships spanning multiple power blocs. Congressus gives every participant equivalent analytical and

representational capacity regardless of budget. As the coalition demonstrates better outcomes, large nations eventually face a choice: participate or be excluded from the world’s most efficient coordination mechanism.

10.3 Phased Expansion

Phase	Scope
Phase 1	Single US state. Prove core mechanics. Launch public beta.
Phase 2	All 50 states plus territories. State-to-state negotiation. National agent added.
Phase 3	Full US national architecture. Track record building. Academic evaluation.
Phase 4	Willing democracies. Single domain pilot. Coalition benefits proven.
Phase 5	Global. All willing participants. Civilizational optimization engaged.
Phase 6	Universal. Open to any entity capable of genuine representation.

11. Voting Mechanism

The Congressus voting mechanism resolves the tension between fraud resistance and universal access by verifying uniqueness rather than identity — preventing duplicate participation without requiring sensitive personal data.

11.1 The Verification Stack

- Email registration with confirmation link.
- Phone verification via SMS — second independent channel.
- Facial geometry hash at registration — one-way mathematical representation, not a photograph, not video, cannot be reverse-engineered, used only for deduplication.
- Liveness detection at vote time — 10-second prompt-following video defeats static deepfakes.
- SMS code at vote time — confirms registered device is present.
- Verbal vote on camera — creates auditable human record of deliberate intent.
- Cryptographic receipt — voter verifies their vote was counted without revealing how they voted.

11.2 Fraud Resistance

Attack Vector	Defense
Double voting	Face hash deduplication — second registration blocked.
Bot farm	Each bot requires a real face passing liveness — not automatable at scale.
SIM swapping	Device hardware fingerprint registered, not just phone number.

Attack Vector	Defense
Deepfake attack	Requires real-time deepfake + registered device + identity details — extremely expensive combination.
Coercion	Vote changeable until deadline. Extended voting period over days.
Insider manipulation	Cryptographic separation of identity and vote records. Multi-party authorization for any database change.

12. Scenario Demonstration: Abortion Policy

12.1 Why This Scenario

The abortion debate is the ideal stress test for Congressus because it combines three distinct types of conflict that current governance cannot separate: genuine philosophical disagreement about a metaphysical question (when does morally significant life begin), a policy question where majority preference is actually clear but distorted by political incentives (73% hold nuanced middle positions), and a semantic conflict manufactured by undefined operative terms (personhood vs. citizenship).

12.2 Jacob’s Argument and Its Validity

The pro-life position, sincerely held, rests on a claim that is not scientifically wrong: life does begin at conception in the biological sense. A fertilized egg is biologically alive from the moment of fertilization. This is not disputed. What is disputed is the moral and legal weight of that biological life at different developmental stages — a question that biology alone cannot answer.

Jacob’s position represents a genuine philosophical conclusion held in good faith by millions of citizens. Congressus does not dismiss it. It correctly identifies that this philosophical conclusion belongs in the private sphere — citizens are absolutely free to hold it, live by it, and advocate for it — but cannot under the Precision Principle be used as the basis for law governing citizens who hold different philosophical conclusions, because the law’s operative concept (citizenship) does not require resolving the question his belief answers.

12.3 The Consciousness Threshold Question

An alternative philosophical framework locates moral significance at the emergence of consciousness or cognitive self-awareness rather than conception. This framework has genuine philosophical support and is held sincerely by many citizens. It faces a different problem: consciousness is not a discrete event. It emerges gradually over the course of development and into early childhood, making it an even less tractable basis for law than conception.

Both frameworks — conception and consciousness — illustrate the same core problem: they require philosophical resolution of a genuinely contested question before the law can be applied. The citizenship frame avoids this problem entirely by using a legally precise concept that has an unambiguous definition independent of any philosophical tradition.

12.4 The Proposed Framework Under Congressus

After processing citizen input and inter-state negotiation using the preference revelation mechanism, Congressus produces:

- First-trimester federal protection covering 90%+ of all procedures — justified under the bodily autonomy provision of Article VII and the citizenship frame.
- Circumstance-based protections at any stage for rape, incest, health risk, and severe fetal anomaly — justified by near-universal citizen consensus regardless of philosophical position.
- State-level determination for the window between first trimester and viability within federal minimums — reflecting genuine regional value differences above the Floor.
- Substantial federal investment in prevention, contraception access, maternal support, and adoption reform — the thing nearly everyone actually agrees on regardless of their position on abortion itself.

The proposal is accompanied by an explicit acknowledgment: the philosophical question of when morally significant life begins is genuinely contested and cannot be resolved by policy. Congressus does not claim to answer it. It finds terms under which people with different answers can live together.

12.5 The Ideology Imposition Test

The five-times-a-day prayer scenario illustrates the broader principle. If a majority of citizens in a jurisdiction agreed that all citizens should pray five times daily, would Congressus implement this? No — categorically. Religious practice is Category 2 private sphere conduct. No majority, however large, may legislate inside a citizen’s private sphere. The Empirical Test fails immediately: the harm claimed (spiritual harm to the majority’s community) does not satisfy the independent verifiability requirement. The Specificity Test fails: no identifiable specific citizen is harmed by another citizen’s failure to pray.

The same test applies to every proposed ideological imposition. The question is not whether a majority supports it. The question is whether it passes both parts of the harm test. If it does not, it does not advance regardless of support levels. This is the mechanism by which Congressus prevents majority tyranny without requiring the system to make philosophical judgments about whose values are correct.

13. Prototype Implementation Specification

13.1 Hardware Architecture

Stage	Specification
Development (now)	Consumer edge AI device. Quantized 3B-7B models via Ollama. Proves concept at reduced reasoning quality.
Single State Demo	Workstation with 2-4x RTX 4090. Runs 70B quantized. ~\$10,000-\$15,000.
Multi-State Pilot	4-8x A100 80GB cluster. Full three-rep simultaneous inference. ~\$40,000-\$80,000 refurbished.

Stage	Specification
Federated Global	Central coordination server (\$40,000-\$100,000). Each jurisdiction provides own node hardware.

13.2 Model Selection

Role	Model
Rep A — Citizen conversation	Llama 3.3 70B
Rep B — Independent assessment	Mistral Large
Rep C — Conditional dissent	DeepSeek R1 70B
Data processing	Llama 3.2 3B or Phi-3 Mini
Capture detection	Fine-tuned bias detection model

13.3 Phase 1 Build Timeline

Period	Deliverable
Weeks 1-2	Data ingestion pipeline. Vector database populated. Three model instances running concurrently.
Weeks 3-4	Citizen interface connected to knowledge base. Responses contextually grounded.
Weeks 5-6	Issue aggregation engine. Three-rep consensus and dissent logic. Precision audit pipeline.
Weeks 7-8	Public dashboard. Voting mechanism. Internal testing.
Month 3	Second state. Inter-state negotiation. First public comparison with actual legislative outcome.
Months 4-6	Additional states. National agent tier. Open public beta.

14. Theoretical Contributions and Responses to Objections

14.1 Novel Contributions — Updated for Version 2.0

Contribution	Significance
Merit-conditional dissent with mandatory resolution	First governance mechanism requiring dissent to propose solutions rather than merely oppose.

Contribution	Significance
Conditional concurrence	First governance mechanism enabling sequencing-dependent agreement.
Directional Floor revision	First constitutional framework distinguishing expansion from contraction of protections.
Compliance-as-credit-score enforcement	First enforcement architecture making trustworthiness the dominant rational strategy.
Shadow governance adoption pathway	First governance innovation strategy requiring no transfer of existing power.
Civilizational multi-horizon optimization	First governance framework encoding Kardashev-scale objectives alongside immediate policy targets.
Universal entity elasticity	First governance architecture designed to function between any entities including non-human civilizations.
Private Sphere Doctrine (NEW v2.0)	First constitutional provision combining sovereignty principle with two-part empirical and specificity harm test.
Precision Principle (NEW v2.0)	First formal drafting standard requiring legally defined operative terms in all policy proposals.
Citizenship Frame (NEW v2.0)	Resolves the abortion and personhood debates by replacing philosophically contested personhood with legally precise citizenship as the operative rights concept.
Religion as coordination bootstrap (NEW v2.0)	Positions Congressus as the successor framework to religious moral coordination — carrying the content forward in a reason-based architecture.

14.2 Responses to Major Objections

Arrow’s Impossibility Theorem:

Congressus navigates around the impossibility through priority ordering and sequential negotiation rather than claiming to solve it within a single voting mechanism.

Epistemic Authority Objection:

Data selection and weighting embeds political choices — acknowledged. The response is radical transparency about those choices and citizen oversight of them, not a claim to technical neutrality.

Legitimacy Gap Objection:

Agents’ reasoning is fully transparent; outputs are ratified by citizens before any effect; agents can be suspended and replaced when capture is detected; no output has binding force without citizen approval.

Cultural Imperialism Objection:

The Floor draws from the overlapping consensus of major ethical and religious traditions across cultures. It is explicitly humanity’s current best understanding, not final truth, always subject to Track 1 upward revision.

Ideological Imposition Objection (NEW v2.0):

The Private Sphere Doctrine and Precision Principle together prevent Congressus from becoming a mechanism of majority ideological imposition. The two-part harm test ensures that harm claims must satisfy empirical and specificity requirements that ideological preferences cannot meet.

15. Edge Case Analysis: The Private Sphere Doctrine

The Private Sphere Doctrine was stress-tested against seven categories of genuine difficulty. The complete analysis is documented here.

Edge Case	Resolution
Harm definition problem	Harm requires: a specific identifiable harmed party; a direct causal chain; and material damage. Moral disapproval, offense, and disagreement are explicitly not harm.
Consenting adults problem	Consent is valid when: the person has accurate information; no coercive power differential exists; and the ability to withdraw consent is practically exercisable. The law can protect the conditions under which genuine consent is possible without paternalism.
Children problem	Children have two protected interests: present Floor protections (absolute) and future autonomy (must not be foreclosed). Parents have wide latitude in the space between these limits.
Cumulative effect problem	Individually legal choices producing collective harm to shared commons may be regulated as collective self-governance. The key distinction: regulating the cumulative effect on commons is legitimate; regulating the ideological content is not.
Majority redefines harm problem	The two-part harm test is itself Floor-protected and cannot be overridden by majority vote. This is the mechanism that prevents the most common historical form of oppression — claiming harm from others' existence.
Systemic harm problem	Congressus cannot fully reach the systemic implications of legal choices without crossing into ideological imposition. This is an acknowledged genuine limit. Transparency architecture and incentive structures partially address it.
Future citizen problem	Addressed through the intergenerational protection in Article I and the multi-horizon optimization stack that evaluates decisions across civilizational timescales.

Honest acknowledgment: The systemic harm problem represents a genuine irreducible tension in any liberty-based framework. The law cannot fully reach the systemic implications of individually legal choices without becoming the ideological imposition it was designed to prevent. This limit must be acknowledged honestly and addressed through transparency and incentive design rather than prohibition.

16. Open Questions and Future Work

- Formal specification of the preference revelation weighting function.
- Game-theoretic analysis of the three-representative consensus mechanism.
- Empirical validation of capture detection thresholds.
- Cultural adaptation methodology preserving preference revelation properties across languages.
- Non-human entity representation — minimum requirements for legitimate participation.
- The Floor’s relationship to emerging rights — AI systems, synthetic biology, space colonization.
- Intergenerational representation in present-day negotiation.
- Empirical testing of the Precision Principle — does legally defined term substitution actually reduce constitutional conflict frequency?
- Post-scarcity psychology and the persistence of reciprocity resentment — whether material abundance dissolves status-based free-rider resentment or whether the reciprocity instinct is sufficiently hardwired to persist independent of resource scarcity; and if it persists, whether the Private Sphere Doctrine’s structural prevention of its political weaponization is sufficient, or whether additional architectural responses are required.
- Meaning and contribution in post-scarcity conditions — whether the Floor’s security provisions combined with genuine citizen agency produce intrinsic motivation toward contribution as the philosophical foundations section predicts, or whether structural incentives beyond the Floor are needed to sustain a contribution culture that prevents the resentment problem from compounding over generations.
- The boundary between cumulative harm regulation and ideological imposition — development of a formal test.

17. Conclusion

Congressus is named for the act of genuinely coming together — the original principle beneath every governance institution humanity has ever built. What those institutions have never achieved is a mechanism that realizes the principle fully: genuine mutual representation, transparent negotiation, citizen ratification, and enforcement through the compounding value of trustworthiness.

Version 2.0 completes the philosophical architecture. Congressus carries humanity’s deepest moral wisdom — the accumulated empirical discoveries about what conditions allow communities to flourish, developed across every culture and tradition — forward into a framework grounded in reason and evidence rather than fear and supernatural enforcement. It protects every citizen’s sovereignty over their own life through the Private Sphere Doctrine. It eliminates the semantic ambiguity that manufactures irresolvable conflict through the Precision Principle. And it does all of this while remaining permanently open to the discovery that it was wrong — improvable, revisable, and belonging to no one.

The technology to build the Phase 1 prototype exists today. The architecture is complete. The adoption strategy requires no transfer of existing power.

Congressus is a bet that most large-scale human suffering is not caused by individual evil but by systemic irrationality — governance systems that produce outcomes nobody actually wants because the coordination

mechanisms are too primitive to find the solutions that exist. Force enforces when it is watching. Legitimacy enforces even when nobody is looking.

Congressus belongs to everyone it serves. It is not owned. It is not for sale. It is the original idea — recovered, rebuilt, and offered to any entity, at any scale, across any era, that chooses to come together in genuine mutual presence.

References

Note: Entries marked [TO VERIFY] require confirmation of full publication details before formal submission.

Arrow, K. J. (1951). *Social Choice and Individual Values*. New York: Wiley.

Fishkin, J. S. (2018). *Democracy When the People Are Thinking*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Harari, Y. N. (2014). *Sapiens: A Brief History of Humankind*. New York: Harper.

Kardashev, N. S. (1964). Transmission of Information by Extraterrestrial Civilizations. *Soviet Astronomy*, 8(2), 217-221.

Kohlberg, L. (1981). *The Philosophy of Moral Development*. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Lavi, L. (2025). *One Person, One Bot*. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01039.

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the Commons*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popper, K. (1945). *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. London: Routledge.

Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political Liberalism*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Sen, A. (1999). *Development as Freedom*. New York: Anchor Books.

Zhu, K., Thain, N., Tsai, V., Wexler, J., & Qian, C. (2026). *Choose Your Agent: Tradeoffs in Adopting AI Advisors, Coaches, and Delegates in Multi-Party Negotiation*. arXiv:2602.12089.

Tang, A. et al. vTaiwan: Public Deliberation of Controversial Technology Legislation. [TO VERIFY]

Democracy-in-Silico: Institutional Design as Alignment in AI-Governed Polities. (2025). arXiv:2508.19562.

United Nations. (1948). *Universal Declaration of Human Rights*. New York: United Nations.

OECD. (2023). *AI Principles and Global Partnership on Artificial Intelligence*. Paris: OECD.

Appendix A: The Congressus Floor — Complete Text

The complete Congressus Floor as codified through design sessions, May 2026. Version 2.0 adds Article VII — The Private Sphere Doctrine. This text is offered for public deliberation and is not owned by any single entity.

The Floor is reproduced in full in Section 5 of this document and should be extracted as a standalone document for public deliberation purposes.

Appendix B: Simulation Design Parameters

To be completed as prototype development proceeds. Will specify: agent initialization parameters, test scenario definitions including precision audit pipeline testing, evaluation metrics, validation methodology, and falsifiability criteria.

Appendix C: Data Source Architecture

US State-Level Sources

Domain	Primary Source
Demographics	US Census Bureau API — census.gov/data/developers
Employment / Economy	Bureau of Labor Statistics API — bls.gov/developers
State Budgets	State open data portals; Urban Institute State and Local Finance Initiative
Health Outcomes	CDC WONDER database; state health department open data
Education	National Center for Education Statistics — nces.ed.gov
Infrastructure	State DOT open data; ASCE infrastructure report data
Environment	EPA environmental justice data; state environmental agency APIs
Housing	HUD open data; Zillow Research API
Legislation	LegiScan API (all 50 states); Congress.gov API

Global-Level Sources

Domain	Primary Source
Economic	World Bank Open Data API; IMF Data API
Health	WHO Global Health Observatory API
Development	UNDP Human Development Reports
Environment	NASA Earthdata; NOAA Climate Data
Education	UNESCO Institute for Statistics

Domain	Primary Source
Governance / Democracy	Freedom House; V-Dem Institute

Appendix D: Collaboration and Contact

Domain	Collaboration Sought
Computational Social Choice	Formal specification of preference aggregation, negotiation protocols, Arrow’s theorem response.
Constitutional and Political Theory	Legitimacy, representation, democratic theory, private sphere doctrine formalization.
AI Safety and Alignment	Capture resistance architecture review and agent behavior specification.
Digital Democracy Practice	Empirical grounding from vTaiwan, Decidim, and related projects.
International Relations	Sovereignty, enforcement, and international law literature.
Moral Philosophy	Private sphere doctrine, harm theory, Kohlberg moral development extensions.
Non-Western Political Philosophy	Critical engagement with the Floor’s cultural assumptions and Track 1 revision proposals.
Astrobiology / SETI	Theoretical engagement with non-human entity representation architecture.
Software Engineering / AI Infrastructure	Prototype development and federated architecture implementation.

CONGRESSUS

The act of genuinely coming together.

Any entity. Any scale. Any era.

Pre-Draft Working Document | Version 2.0 | Open for Collaboration