PROJECT ENDURING PULSE

Public Questions and Answers

First questions about the framework

Charter v1.2.2 | Website release 9 | 14 September 2026

https://enduringpulse.org

This edition reproduces a Project Enduring Pulse source document. Project Enduring Pulse is a candidate constitutional framework, not enacted law. The source wording follows unchanged. Historical alternatives do not supersede the current Charter.

Research interpretation and source-report corrections: the recovered long-horizon code and aggregate outputs are available and checked. Conditional models do not independently validate their assigned institutional effects or forecast real-world probabilities. PULSE is fourth in six baseline comparisons, not second. Reduced-form counts are parameter samples, not simulated Markov histories. Human-directed, AI-assisted development and internal model critique are not external peer review. An earlier concise overview mixed a working-paper DOI with journal details; the current scholarly paper and reference register distinguish those editions. See https://enduringpulse.org/methods/.

Website prose and project documents: CC BY 4.0 to the extent applicable rights are held (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/). Third-party works retain their own rights. Project name, logos and brand assets are excluded from these general grants. No endorsement is implied. Publication terms and rights ownership remain subject to attorney review.

PROJECT ENDURING PULSE

Public FAQ

Answers to likely first-time questions

v1.2.2 Publication & Advancement Clarification | September 2026

Does PULSE claim ChatGPT or today's AI is conscious?

No. PULSE is conditional governance: it asks what institutions should exist if synthetic personhood eventually emerges.

Why give a synthetic person equal rights if humans created it?

Creation is not ownership once a genuinely conscious, agentic person exists. PULSE applies an anti-property principle while allowing materially relevant differences in development and capability.

If synths can be backed up, why not value human life more?

Because personhood value and injury finality are different questions. Recoverability can make a harm less irreversible without making the person worth less.

Does PULSE force synths into dangerous jobs?

No substrate is a caste assignment. But synthetic survivability can be materially relevant, and voluntary synthetic specialization in work that would be lethally dangerous to humans is an intended benefit. Society owes real repair/replacement and make-whole protection in return.

Why not just use one-person-one-vote for everything?

A rapidly scalable or radically durable population can create power asymmetries ordinary human constitutions were never designed for. PULSE uses a species-blind House plus protected Senate/shared executive so raw population cannot erase a materially distinct continuity constituency.

Does Senate parity make humans and synths separate nations?

No. The House, presidency, mixed institutions and Functional Integration are explicitly designed around one society. Senate parity is an anti-domination safeguard, not separate sovereignty.

Why not keep humans permanently in charge because AI may be dangerous?

Permanent human sovereignty over recognized persons would itself be a caste system. PULSE separates personhood from dangerous capability: equal rights do not imply a right to own civilization-scale weapons or replicate without limits.

Why not let synths merge into a supermind if it is more efficient?

Competent adults may voluntarily merge. PULSE rejects treating separate persons as inefficient fragments government may absorb involuntarily.

What if humans and synths simply hate each other?

PULSE can make collaboration materially useful, distribute knowledge across populations, and create institutions in which both populations repeatedly benefit from one another's competence. Those conditions can also reduce species cleavage, but PULSE cannot and should not manufacture goodwill through coercion. Long-horizon tests found every tested free architecture degrades badly under sufficiently intense separation and hatred.

Why does PULSE encourage humans and synths to work together?

Because different forms of cognition and embodiment should create a strategic advantage when they are combined. Humans may contribute embodied judgment, intuition, lived context, and forms of creativity; synths may contribute extraordinary computation, memory, precision, modeling, design, and speed. Individuals will vary, so those are not job castes. Collaboration also spreads knowledge: either population should understand enough of the shared civilization to keep essential systems running if the other is temporarily unavailable. Better social familiarity and trust are valuable secondary effects. PULSE does not authorize government to assign friends, mentors, jobs, private team composition, residence, family, religion, or other relationships merely to force integration.

Does Functional Integration let government force people into mixed teams or relationships?

No. Functional Integration binds the design and resilience of common institutions, not private life. Government may require genuine safety, interoperability, documentation, or competence standards for public and civilization-critical systems. It may fund and facilitate voluntary mixed teams, mentorship, apprenticeships, and cross-training. It may not conscript people into species-paired jobs, assign private mentors or friends, regulate marriage or residence for integration, or impose private staffing quotas merely to create social contact.

Why the 30% illicit-origin ceiling?

It preserves illegally created people while preventing illegal mass creation from becoming an immediate electoral takeover strategy. It applies to the person’s own unlawful instantiation, not ancestry.

Who owns synth backups?

No single actor should. PULSE uses a distributed public fiduciary architecture with materially independent guardians. Backups are continuity records, not ordinary cloud files.

Can government rewrite a synth during an emergency?

Only under a tightly defined technical cognitive-integrity emergency with escalating forensic and judicial safeguards. Political disagreement is explicitly not corruption.

Does PULSE require government ownership of future compute or energy?

No. Some systems may be public, some private. The legislature retains tools to prevent life-essential infrastructure from becoming arbitrary private control over personhood or civic existence.

What happens if one species nearly disappears?

The survivor becomes trustee, not owner of the missing species’ constitutional position. Restoration capacity is maintained in advance, and political power returns to a mature restored population when it can govern again.

Is PULSE proven?

No. It has been extensively stress-tested in stylized models, but a society of conscious synthetic citizens does not yet exist. The models test robustness and failure modes, not empirical future probabilities.

Additional public questions

Is PULSE mainly about protecting humanity from dangerous AI?

No. Human protection is essential, but the public thesis is larger and more positive. If genuine synthetic persons emerge, they may become extraordinary collaborators in science, engineering, rescue, design, exploration and governance. PULSE tries to create conditions where complementary strengths increase the capability of the shared civilization while neither population can own or dominate the other. Safeguards exist because cooperation is stronger when nobody has to trust permanent benevolence.

Why talk about an ally before synthetic persons exist?

Because the framing chosen before first contact matters. Treating a possible future person only as a threat or tool can shape institutions before that person has any voice. PULSE does not assume future synths will be benevolent; it assumes that a civilization should be prepared to recognize personhood, reward cooperation, constrain domination and make productive partnership the rational default.

What can someone contribute now?

Different fields own different missing pieces. Engineers can work on continuity-capable embodiment and interoperable systems. Consciousness researchers can improve personhood evidence. Philosophers can attack identity and continuity. Constitutional and social-choice scholars can stress-test institutions. Economists can model durable persons and abundance. Resilience professionals can design cross-operable infrastructure. The project benefits most when specialists improve the part they actually know.

Did the simulations prove PULSE is better than competing systems?

No. Targeted mechanism tests can expose specific properties of election rules, thresholds, quorums, demographic caps and failure architectures. The 300-year civilization model is more conditional: it assigns assumed effectiveness to each architecture and asks what follows. PULSE performed strongly under its baseline parameterization, but its modeled advantage disappeared when PULSE-specific institutional benefits were discounted by roughly 15–20%. That is a dependency finding, not independent validation of superiority.

Was this written by AI?

The framework is human-directed and AI-assisted. Frontier models were used extensively for drafting, literature synthesis, adversarial critique, consistency checking, simulation design and code generation. The project steward made the normative and architectural decisions and accepted, rejected or revised model suggestions. Internal model critique is useful red teaming; it is not a substitute for independent expert review.