PROJECT ENDURING PULSE

Methodology and Evidence Status

Human-directed, AI-assisted design and conditional evidence

Charter v1.2.2 | Website release 8 | 14 September 2026

https://enduringpulse.org

This publication reproduces the supplied project 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. The paper bibliography mixes a working-paper DOI with journal details; the verified register separates them. 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

Methodology, Provenance & Evidence Status

How the framework was developed and what its testing can—and cannot—show

v1.2.2 Publication & Advancement Clarification | September 2026

1. Development method

Project Enduring Pulse is human-directed systems design developed with extensive frontier-model assistance. The project steward supplied the normative premises, architectural judgments, practical intuitions and accept/reject decisions. Language models assisted with formalization, drafting, literature synthesis, adversarial critique, consistency checking, simulation design and code generation. This provenance should be disclosed plainly. Internal model critique is useful red teaming; it is not external peer review.

2. Evidence hierarchy

Targeted mechanism tests — narrow questions about voting rules, thresholds, quorum compromise, correlated failures, demographic caps, personhood panels, resilience architectures and similar mechanisms. These are the strongest quantitative claims when assumptions are explicit and the outcome follows closely from the tested mechanism.

Conditional civilization models — integrated long-horizon simulations in which architecture-effectiveness parameters are hypotheses. They explore consequences, interactions, breakpoints and failure conditions; they do not independently validate that an architecture will deliver the parameter values assigned to it.

External empirical analogues — human evidence from intergroup contact, constitutional governance, infrastructure resilience, wealth dynamics, demography and related fields. These constrain direction and plausibility but cannot directly predict a future human-synthetic society.

Normative doctrine — equal personhood, personal sovereignty and related moral commitments are arguments and constitutional choices, not empirical findings.

3. The long-horizon model critique

A hostile review correctly noted that PULSE receives high baseline values on several institutional dimensions it was designed to provide. The 114/120 result is therefore partly the parameterization echoing through an integrated model. It remains useful conditional analysis: if the mechanisms deliver approximately their intended effects, the model explores what follows and where the package still fails. It is not evidence that those effects have been independently established.

[Editorial model context] This is the baseline long-horizon model, where PULSE is assigned high effectiveness on capabilities its institutions are intended to provide. Those effects are assumptions, not independently established results. It is conditional systems analysis, not independent validation. In the skeptic sweep, roughly a 15–20% discount to PULSE-specific institutional benefits removed its aggregate modeled advantage over the strongest liberal-democratic comparator.

The skeptic sweep is the required counterweight. When PULSE-specific institutional benefits were discounted by roughly 15–20%, its aggregate modeled advantage over the strongest liberal-democratic comparator disappeared. Public summaries should include that sensitivity whenever they mention the headline ranking.

4. Why simulation counts are secondary

Large Monte Carlo counts reduce sampling noise inside a model; they do not repair uncertain assumptions. Trial counts belong in reproducibility and methods sections. The most credible public evidence is the specific failure discovered, mechanism compared, design change made, sensitivity exposed or uncertainty acknowledged.

5. Publication standard

Disclose AI assistance.

Do not call internal frontier-model critique peer review.

Do not call scenario outputs empirical forecasts.

Do not market total simulation counts as proof.

Publish assumptions, code and negative results.

Invite independent reproduction and expert attack.

Change the framework if external evidence or better designs warrant it.