

**THE RATIFICATION PROTOCOL: A TWO-STAGE ARCHITECTURE
FOR MEMBER COMMITMENT TO THE CODIFIED DEMOCRATIC
ORDER**

Joseph D. Kirchner

Independent Scholar

May 2026

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	4
I. THE FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE: RATIFICATION AS AFFIRMATION	6
II. THE TWO-STAGE ARCHITECTURE	8
<i>A. Stage 1: The Member Commitment Declaration</i>	8
<i>B. The Grace Period</i>	10
<i>C. Certification of Compliance</i>	12
<i>D. Stage 2: The Full Ratification Declaration</i>	13
III. THE COMPLIANCE STANDARDS	15
<i>A. The Necessary Constitutional Features</i>	15
<i>B. The Floor-Level Rights Test</i>	17
<i>C. The Anti-Defection Structural Mechanism</i>	18
IV. SOVEREIGNTY PRESERVATION: ENFORCEMENT REMAINS NATIONAL THROUGHOUT	19
<i>A. National Enforcement Is the Permanent Operative Locus</i>	20
<i>B. The Framework's Respect for Sovereignty</i>	20
<i>C. The State 2 Character Operationalized</i>	21
<i>D. Operational Benefits and Institutional Assistance</i>	22
V. THE ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM: DIALOGUE, ALLIANCE, COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE, AND DEFENSE OF HUMANITY.....	25
<i>A. Patience as Structural Commitment</i>	25
<i>B. The Historical Alternative</i>	26
<i>C. The Four Enforcement Mechanisms</i>	27
<i>D. The Persistence of Engagement</i>	30
VI. THE THREE OPERATIONAL VARIANTS	31
<i>A. First Ratification (Transitional Polities)</i>	32
<i>B. Full-Compliance Ratification (Existing Democracies)</i>	33
<i>C. Restoration of Integrity (Defecting Members)</i>	33
VII. THE CERTIFICATION MECHANISM: INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE.....	35
<i>A. The Deliberative Council</i>	35
<i>B. The Initial Council</i>	36
<i>C. The Certification Standard Applied</i>	37
VIII. TEMPLATE: THE MEMBER COMMITMENT DECLARATION (STAGE 1).....	38
IX. TEMPLATE: THE FULL RATIFICATION DECLARATION (STAGE 2)	39

X. CONCLUSION: THE PROTOCOL AS OPERATIONAL FORM.....	40
XI. BIBLIOGRAPHY	42
Constitutional and Founding Documents.....	42
Treaties and International Instruments.....	43
Companion Works	43

INTRODUCTION

The Ratification Protocol operationalizes the Declaration of Humanity's foundational definitional premise into a procedural mechanism by which polities affirm — or restore — their membership in the codified democratic order. The protocol's architecture rests on four structural commitments. *First*, ratification proceeds in two stages: a Stage 1 Member Commitment Declaration in which the polity publicly commits to undertake internal review and bring local laws into compliance with framework principles; a grace period during which the polity adjusts local laws through its own constitutional process; certification of compliance by a deliberative body of existing ratified members; and a Stage 2 Full Ratification Declaration upon certification. *Second*, sovereignty is preserved at every stage — before, during, and after ratification — through retention of per-situation national-level enforcement; the framework does not have, and does not seek, supranational coercive enforcement infrastructure. *Third*, the protocol's operational disposition is patience over coercion: non-compliance is met with deliberation, not punishment; timelines are set cooperatively between the polity and the framework's other members; institutional assistance is available to consenting polities through the framework's reciprocal cooperation; the social contract is constituted to endure longstanding challenge. *Fourth*, the framework's enforcement consists of four structural mechanisms operating together — the coherent dialogue that leaves no room for coherent argument in defense of violation; the alliance of members coordinating their per-situation national responses; the activation of collective self-defense rights of those affected by violations; and the activation of the broader right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself against atrocity crimes (genocide, slavery, ethnic cleansing, systematic torture, and analogous violations that operate against

humanity as such), grounded in *jus cogens* obligations *erga omnes*, universal jurisdiction over atrocity crimes, and the Responsibility to Protect.

Humanity, on the Declaration of Humanity's foundational definition, is constitutive and not forfeitable. The polity that violates framework principles does not lose membership in humanity (humanity is the inclusive whole as a matter of definition); what violation does is forfeit the reciprocal cooperation that other members extend, activate collective self-defense rights of those affected, and — where the violation constitutes a crime against humanity — activate the broader right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself. The framework's operational power is therefore structural-logical and reciprocal, not coercive: dialogue, alliance, collective self-defense rights, and defense-of-humanity rights together constitute the enforcement; per-situation national enforcement remains the operative legal mechanism at every stage.

The two-stage architecture resolves several structural problems that have plagued attempts at international democratic institution-building. The State 2 enforcement problem — how does the framework operate without coercive infrastructure? — is resolved because the framework's enforcement is structural rather than institutional; it operates through dialogue and alliance, not through supranational coercion. The sovereignty problem is resolved because the polity ratifies by its own deliberative process; no other polity can bind it; ratification requires affirmative consent. The reservation problem is resolved because the certification standard is the structural test; a polity cannot reserve away the framework's foundational features and still receive certification. The variety problem (first ratification by transitional polities; full-compliance ratification by existing democracies; restoration of integrity by defecting members) is resolved by handling all three through the same two-stage process.

This Article articulates the protocol's two-stage structure, the grace period's purpose and operation, the certification mechanism, the operational benefits and institutional assistance, the three-mechanism enforcement structure, the three operational variants, and template documents for the Member Commitment Declaration (Stage 1) and the Full Ratification Declaration (Stage 2). The protocol is the operational form of the framework's project: the foundational definitional premise of the Declaration of Humanity, articulated as a procedural mechanism by which polities at every scale can affirm their membership in the codified democratic order and operate the framework's principles in mutual reciprocation.

I. THE FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE: RATIFICATION AS AFFIRMATION

The Ratification Protocol is the operational form of the Declaration of Humanity. The Declaration articulates, in definitional rather than assertion form, the foundational premise on which the codified democratic order operates: humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation — without exception, without precondition, without diminution at any scale. The Protocol is the procedural mechanism by which a polity affirms this premise and undertakes the constitutional and institutional reforms necessary to operationalize the affirmation within its own governance structure.

Ratification is therefore not merely a formal accession to a treaty network. It is the affirmation of a foundational definitional commitment. A polity ratifying the codified democratic order affirms:

- That humanity is the inclusive whole at every scale of social organization;
- That every member of humanity bears the universal claim to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;

- That the polity's governance is constituted to secure that claim, internally and externally;
- That the polity will operate the framework's principles reciprocally with all other ratified members;
- That the polity accepts the framework's deliberative mechanisms as the form within which disagreement is expressed, and rejects unilateral defection from the framework's binding character.

The affirmation is the substantive content of ratification; the procedural mechanism — the two-stage architecture this Article articulates — is the operational form by which the affirmation is performed, verified, and integrated into the polity's own constitutional structure.

The Protocol's two-stage architecture is necessary because the foundational affirmation cannot be performed in a single act when the polity's internal governance has not yet been brought into operational alignment with the framework's principles. The American constitutional founding required a Constitutional Convention to deliberate, a constitutional text to articulate, and state ratifications to implement; the codified democratic order's project requires the analogous structural sequence. The Member Commitment Declaration is the polity's affirmation of intent; the grace period is the operational analog of constitutional drafting and amendment; the certification is the verification that the polity's internal governance reflects the affirmed commitment; the Full Ratification Declaration is the operational completion of the foundational affirmation.

II. THE TWO-STAGE ARCHITECTURE

The Protocol's two-stage architecture distinguishes the *commitment* to ratify from the *completion* of ratification. The distinction is structurally critical because it preserves sovereignty during the transition, permits the patient deliberation the framework's persistence requires, and ensures that ratification is not merely formal but operational.

A. Stage 1: The Member Commitment Declaration

The polity initiates ratification by issuing a public Member Commitment Declaration. The Declaration is performed by the polity's appropriate constitutional authority — typically the head of state acting with legislative concurrence, or the legislative body itself acting through whatever procedures the polity's own constitution requires for binding international commitments.

The Member Commitment Declaration's function is communicative and dialogue-opening. It announces the polity's choice to align with framework principles; it triggers the framework's other members' constructive engagement; it initiates the deliberative process through which the polity's reforms proceed. The Declaration itself does not create binding international-legal obligations on the polity; what binds the polity operationally is its own subsequent constitutional and statutory reforms during the grace period. The Declaration commits the polity to undertake those reforms; the reforms themselves are the operative binding mechanism, performed through the polity's own constitutional process. The Declaration's structural role is to communicate the polity's intent, open the dialogue, and establish the framework for the cooperative engagement that follows.

The Member Commitment Declaration contains six substantive commitments:

1. **Affirmation of the Declaration of Humanity.** The polity affirms, in definitional form, that humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation, without exception or diminution at any scale. The polity affirms the foundational premise from which all framework principles derive.

2. **Commitment to Internal Review.** The polity commits to undertake a comprehensive internal review of its constitutional and statutory structure to identify provisions, practices, or institutional arrangements that operate inconsistently with framework principles. The review extends to direct floor violations, indirect floor violations (through deprivation of means), particularized-enforcement violations, internal exclusivity (denial of full membership to any group within the polity), and external defection (unilateral rejection of international democratic deliberative bodies).

3. **Commitment to Local Law Adjustment.** The polity commits to undertake constitutional and statutory reforms necessary to bring local laws into compliance with framework principles. The reforms operate within the polity's own constitutional process for amendment and legislation; the framework's principles supply the substantive standard; the polity's own constitutional process supplies the procedural mechanism.

4. **Commitment to Deliberative-Revision Distinction.** The polity commits to engage the framework's deliberative mechanisms for the expression of disagreement and to refrain from unilateral declarations of being unbound by the framework's binding character. The polity commits to the framework's principle that legitimate disagreement is internal to the framework; rejection of Law is foreclosed.

5. **Commitment to Reciprocal Recognition.** The polity commits to recognize all members of humanity as bearers of the same foundational claim, and commits to apply to itself

the same standards it applies to other parties. The commitment operates at every scale: persons, families, peoples, and nations.

6. Acceptance of Certification Process. The polity accepts the certification process described in this Protocol and submits to peer review by existing ratified members for verification that local-law adjustment has achieved compliance with framework principles.

The Member Commitment Declaration is a public document. It is deposited with the framework's designated coordinating body (the deliberative council described in Part VII below). The Declaration's deposit triggers the grace period and initiates the framework's other members' obligation to engage the polity in the deliberative process the Protocol describes.

B. The Grace Period

The grace period is the operational analog of constitutional drafting and amendment at the American founding. It is the time during which the polity adjusts its local laws to bring them into compliance with framework principles. The grace period's structural function is to permit the substantial reforms that ratification often requires, without forcing the polity to choose between immediate compliance (which is structurally impossible for most polities) and rejection of the framework altogether (which would replicate the historical pattern of exclusion the Protocol's project is undertaken to remedy).

The grace period's structural commitments are:

1. Cooperative Timeline. The grace period's duration is set cooperatively between the polity and the framework's other members, calibrated to the polity's specific reform requirements. A reasonable initial reference point is ten years from the deposit of the Member Commitment Declaration, with extensions available upon demonstration of good-faith progress;

but the actual timeline is established through dialogue, reflecting the polity's internal reform timetable, the depth of constitutional changes required, and the practical legislative and institutional processes involved. The framework imposes no deadline; it engages the polity in cooperative timeline-setting and supports the polity's reform process through deliberative assistance.

2. **Sovereignty Preservation.** During the grace period — and after ratification — enforcement of the polity's laws remains at the per-situation national level. The framework's principles operate by attraction and reciprocity; the framework does not have, and does not seek, supranational coercive enforcement infrastructure. The polity's own institutions remain the operational locus of legal enforcement at every stage of the Protocol; the framework's role is dialogue, coordination, and constructive assistance, never coercion or imposition.

3. **Deliberative Engagement.** During the grace period, the polity engages other ratified members through the framework's deliberative mechanisms. The engagement is structural rather than merely diplomatic: the polity participates in deliberative bodies; the polity's reforms are reviewed by peer ratified members; technical assistance is available from ratified members with relevant experience; the polity's progress is reported publicly through the framework's coordinating body.

4. **Public Accountability.** The polity's progress is publicly documented. The Member Commitment Declaration's affirmations are public; the polity's reform measures are publicly recorded; the framework's other members can monitor progress, identify gaps, and offer constructive engagement. Public accountability is the operational form of the framework's State 2 enforcement during the transition.

5. **Patient Deliberation.** Difficulties and setbacks during the grace period are met with deliberation, not punishment. The framework's persistence is structurally committed to the polity's eventual compliance; the alternative (exclusion or coercion) would replicate the historical pattern the framework's project is undertaken to remedy.

C. Certification of Compliance

At the end of the grace period (or earlier, upon the polity's request and demonstration of completed compliance), the framework's coordinating body conducts a certification review. The certification verifies that the polity's constitutional and statutory structure now operates consistently with framework principles. The certification standard is described in Part III below.

The certification process:

1. **The Polity's Submission.** The polity submits a comprehensive Compliance Report documenting the constitutional and statutory reforms undertaken during the grace period. The report addresses each of the necessary constitutional features (Part III.A below), the floor-level rights protections (Part III.B), and the anti-defection structural mechanism (Part III.C). The report is public.

2. **Peer Review.** Existing ratified members conduct peer review of the Compliance Report. The review is structured: each ratified member may submit observations and questions; the polity responds to observations; the dialogue is public and recorded.

3. **Independent Verification.** The framework's coordinating body conducts independent verification, drawing on the framework's diagnostic apparatus (the Madisonian Compliance Test, the Power Separation Vulnerability taxonomy, the structural-textual analysis of the polity's constitutional provisions, the floor-level rights protections analysis). The verification is structural

rather than political: the question is whether the polity's constitutional structure now contains the necessary features, not whether the polity's policies are politically acceptable.

4. Certification Decision. Certification requires unanimous consent of existing ratified members through the framework's coordinating council. The unanimity requirement preserves the State 2 character: each ratified member affirms the new member's compliance; the affirmation is the operational form of the framework's reciprocal recognition. A single ratified member's reasoned objection, if not resolved through deliberation, prevents certification — but the objection must be substantively grounded in the certification standard, not merely political.

5. Certification Outcomes. Three outcomes are possible: (a) Full Certification — the polity's compliance is verified and the polity proceeds to Stage 2 Full Ratification; (b) Partial Certification with Specific Reforms Required — the polity's compliance is verified in most respects but specific reforms remain; the polity returns to grace period status with a focused scope; (c) Non-Certification — the polity's compliance is not verified; the polity returns to grace period status with continued deliberative engagement.

The certification is not a one-time event for the polity's relationship with the framework. Once certified, the polity is subject to the framework's ongoing diagnostic apparatus; if the polity's later conduct departs from framework principles, the framework's enforcement mechanism operates per the diagnostic. But certification is the operational threshold at which the polity becomes a ratified member subject to the framework's binding character.

D. Stage 2: The Full Ratification Declaration

Upon Full Certification, the polity issues the Full Ratification Declaration. The Declaration is the operational completion of the polity's foundational affirmation. The polity:

1. Reaffirms the Declaration of Humanity in its final operational form;
2. Declares its compliance with framework principles, verified through certification;
3. Affirms its commitment to operate the framework's principles in mutual reciprocation with other members from the date of the Full Ratification Declaration forward;
4. Accepts the framework's diagnostic apparatus as the structural standard against which its conduct (and the conduct of other members) is evaluated;
5. Commits to the deliberative-revision distinction for any future disagreement with framework instantiations;
6. Acknowledges the structural commitments of membership: reciprocal recognition, deliberative engagement, refusal of unilateral defection, fractal-democracy promotion, and the alliance of mutual coordination among members in response to violations.

The Full Ratification Declaration is deposited with the framework's coordinating body. Other ratified members formally recognize the new member through their own reciprocal-recognition acts. The polity is now a full member of the codified democratic order — with the operational benefits of membership (reciprocal cooperation, lowered defensive posture among members, institutional engagement, recognition in the international order) and the operational commitments of membership (reciprocity, deliberative engagement, alliance with other members in response to violations).

Crucially, ratification does not transfer enforcement authority to any supranational body. The framework's principles operate by attraction and reciprocity; enforcement of legal violations remains at the per-situation national level, as it does before ratification. What ratification adds is structural integration into the framework's reciprocal network: the polity gains the operational benefits of membership; the framework's other members gain a coordinating ally in

operationalizing the foundational premise; and any future violations (by the new member or by others) trigger the framework's diagnostic apparatus and the alliance of members coordinating their responses.

III. THE COMPLIANCE STANDARDS

The certification standard operates by structural-textual analysis of the polity's constitutional and statutory provisions. The standard is the bare minimum necessary for the polity's governance to operationalize the framework's foundational commitments. A polity that meets the standard is structurally qualified for ratification; a polity that does not meet the standard must continue reform during the grace period.

The standard has three components.

A. The Necessary Constitutional Features

The polity's constitution must contain analogs to the following ten structural features, identified through comparative constitutional analysis as the minimum necessary for ratification.

#	Feature	Function	Constitutional Analog
1	Guarantee of republican form at every constituent scale	Fractal recursion: the polity enforces internally what it commits to externally	U.S. Const. art. IV, § 4; German Basic Law art. 28
2	Constitutional supremacy + treaty integration as binding domestic law	Treaties become operative law, not aspirational policy	U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 2; Mexican Const. art. 133; German Basic Law art. 25; Italian Const. art. 11
3	Deliberative concurrence required	Single official cannot bind the polity	U.S. Const. art. II, § 2, cl. 2; German

	for binding international commitments	unilaterally	Basic Law art. 59; French Const. art. 53
4	Anti-defection structural mechanism — withdrawal requires same deliberative process as entry	Forecloses unilateral defection pattern	(Required; explicit constitutional provision recommended)
5	Deliberative-only structural change	No unilateral constitutional modification	U.S. Const. art. V; German Basic Law art. 79(3); Japanese Const. art. 96
6	Deliberative war-powers	War-making requires legislative concurrence	U.S. Const. art. I, § 8, cl. 11; Japanese Const. art. 9; German Basic Law art. 87a
7	Independent judicial review with standing for structural violations	Courts can declare ultra vires acts void; citizens can enforce constitutional structure	U.S. Const. art. III + recovered equitable standing; German Federal Constitutional Court; South African Constitutional Court
8	Floor protection (bodily-jurisdiction Bill of Rights analog)	Direct, indirect, and particularized-enforcement transgressions all foreclosed	U.S. Bill of Rights + Reconstruction Amendments; South African Bill of Rights; Canadian Charter
9	Officer oath creating independent constitutional duty	Subordinate officers bound to constitution, not merely to executive directives	U.S. Const. art. VI, cl. 3
10	Periodic elections by the constituents	Deliberative body's authority derives from popular sovereignty	Universal across democracies

Of these ten features, Feature 4 (the anti-defection structural mechanism) is the critical gap in most existing democracies. Almost no constitutional system has an explicit provision foreclosing unilateral executive defection from international commitments. The Protocol's certification standard requires this feature explicitly: ratification requires constitutional reform to add the anti-defection mechanism if it is not already present. The reform is the operational form of the framework's commitment to the deliberative-revision distinction.

The other nine features are widely present in existing democracies in various forms. The certification standard is functional: it asks whether the polity's constitutional structure operates the function the feature supplies, not whether the polity uses identical textual form. The U.S. Constitution's Article IV, § 4 and the German Basic Law's Article 28 both supply Feature 1 (guarantee of republican form); the South African Bill of Rights and the U.S. Bill of Rights both supply Feature 8 (floor protection); the polity may use any constitutional form that operationally satisfies the structural test.

B. The Floor-Level Rights Test

The polity must operationally protect the bodily-jurisdiction floor — the irreducible expression of humanity at the individual scale — within its own jurisdiction. The test has three components:

1. Direct Floor Violations Foreclosed. The polity's constitutional and statutory structure forbids state action that crosses into the bodily sphere of persons whose voluntary act has not first crossed into another's. Forced medical procedures, forced labor, assault by state actors, prevention of bodily function — all are foreclosed by direct constitutional protection. This includes the abolition of torture, the prohibition of forced disappearance, the prohibition of extrajudicial killing, and the protection of bodily integrity in detention.

2. **Indirect Floor Violations Foreclosed.** The polity's constitutional and statutory structure forbids state action that removes the means necessary to preserve bodily integrity. Theft of property necessary for survival, deprivation of healthcare, restriction of access to food/water/shelter — all are foreclosed except in the limited circumstances the framework's social-contract conditional permits.

3. **Particularized-Enforcement Violations Foreclosed.** The polity's constitutional and statutory structure forbids state action that operates external to the bodily sphere but effectively forecloses internal decisions through particularized enforcement. The constitutional architecture must ensure that the polity's regulatory structure operates symmetrically across its constituents and does not weaponize one constitutional provision to defeat another.

The floor-level rights test is the operational form of the framework's commitment to humanity at the individual scale. A polity that does not operationally protect the floor cannot ratify the codified democratic order at the international scale, because the framework's universal claim operates at every scale where humanity is constituted, and the floor is the irreducible scale.

C. The Anti-Defection Structural Mechanism

The polity must have an explicit constitutional or statutory mechanism foreclosing unilateral executive defection from international commitments. The mechanism may take various forms:

1. **Explicit Constitutional Provision.** The polity adopts a constitutional amendment requiring that treaty withdrawal proceed by the same process as treaty entry. If treaty entry requires legislative concurrence with a specific supermajority, treaty withdrawal requires the same.

2. Statutory Mechanism with Constitutional Status. The polity adopts a statute treated as constitutional in effect (e.g., framework legislation in parliamentary systems) that explicitly requires legislative concurrence for treaty withdrawal.

3. Judicial Doctrine with Recognized Force. The polity's highest court adopts a doctrine recognizing the symmetric application of entry and exit requirements, with explicit recognition that unilateral executive defection is constitutionally void.

4. Combined Approach. The polity adopts multiple reinforcing mechanisms — constitutional provision, statutory mechanism, and judicial doctrine — that together foreclose unilateral defection.

The mechanism's operational test is whether the polity's constitutional structure forecloses, in practice, the four-decade defection pattern that the rejection-of-Law analysis documents. A polity whose executive can unilaterally withdraw from ratified treaties (as the contemporary United States has done) does not yet meet the anti-defection standard, regardless of whether the executive has actually exercised the unilateral power.

The anti-defection structural mechanism is the certification standard's most demanding requirement because it requires constitutional reform in nearly every existing democracy. The reform is the operational form of the framework's commitment to the deliberative-revision distinction at the federal-international interface. Without the reform, ratification is operationally vulnerable to unilateral defection; with the reform, ratification is structurally robust.

IV. SOVEREIGNTY PRESERVATION: ENFORCEMENT REMAINS NATIONAL THROUGHOUT

The Protocol's structural commitment to sovereignty preservation is operationalized through the retention of per-situation national-level enforcement at every stage — before, during, and after

ratification. The framework does not have, and does not seek, supranational coercive enforcement infrastructure. The framework's role is dialogue, coordination, and constructive assistance; enforcement of legal violations remains where it would be without the institution.

This structural commitment has three components.

A. National Enforcement Is the Permanent Operative Locus

The framework's binding character does not operate by displacing national enforcement. Before ratification, the polity's own institutions are the operational locus of governance. During the grace period, the polity's own institutions remain the operational locus, undergoing reform through the polity's own constitutional process. After ratification, the polity's own institutions remain the operational locus of legal enforcement, now operating consistently with framework principles by the polity's own choice.

The framework does not, at any stage, claim authority to enforce legal violations against a polity's nationals or within its territory. Each member's national legal system is the operative legal mechanism. The framework supplies principles, dialogue, and coordination; the polity's own institutions supply enforcement. This is the structural commitment that distinguishes the framework from authoritarian-world-state arrangements: the framework's operational power is structural and reciprocal, not coercive and centralized.

B. The Framework's Respect for Sovereignty

The Protocol's two-stage architecture is the operational form of the framework's respect for sovereignty. The framework binds only ratified members; ratification operates through affirmative consent; the consent is not complete until the polity has both affirmed the

foundational premise (Stage 1) and verified operational compliance (Stage 2). And even after ratification, the binding character is reciprocal rather than coercive: members operate the framework's principles by their own choice, and the framework's other members extend or withdraw cooperation accordingly.

This commitment distinguishes the Protocol from the historical pattern of imperial impositions that have characterized many international frameworks. The Protocol does not impose framework principles on unwilling polities; it offers a procedural mechanism by which polities can affirm those principles through their own constitutional process. The framework's principles operate by attraction — through their operational success at securing the universal claim and the demonstrated benefits of reciprocal cooperation — not by imposition.

C. The State 2 Character Operationalized

The framework operates the State 2 character explicitly at every stage. There is no coercive enforcement; the framework's other members engage polities through deliberative mechanisms; reforms proceed through each polity's own constitutional process; the certification mechanism operates through unanimous consent; and the framework's enforcement of violations operates through the alliance of members coordinating their per-situation national responses, not through any supranational body. The framework's persistence in the uninstituted condition is structurally committed: the framework's project is not to absorb polities into an authoritarian world-state but to operate as a fractal-democratic framework whose members reciprocate through voluntary integrity to codified principles.

The Protocol's sovereignty preservation is therefore not a transitional concession; it is the framework's permanent character. The framework operates by reciprocation at every stage;

reciprocation requires affirmative consent; consent requires the polity's own constitutional process to operate; and enforcement of legal violations remains, at every stage, at the per-situation national level where it would be without the institution.

D. Operational Benefits and Institutional Assistance

The framework's incentive structure is reciprocal rather than coercive. Members in good standing extend to each other the operational benefits of mutual recognition; the polity that affirms the foundational definitional premise and undertakes the constitutional reforms of compliance gains access to these benefits through ratification. The benefits are not abstract; they are the concrete operational consequences of reciprocal recognition among parties operating the same foundational principles.

The operational benefits include:

1. **Lowered defensive posture among members.** Polities operating the framework's principles reciprocally need not maintain the elevated defensive postures that operating among non-aligned parties requires. The substrate's prediction operationalizes: in systems of pairwise equal entities operating the same foundational principles, sustained conflict cannot be sustained; defensive posture can be calibrated to actual rather than potential threats. The peace dividend the framework's operation produces is substantial.

2. **Increased cooperation across multiple domains.** Trade preferences among members; coordinated infrastructure development; shared scientific and technical resources; coordinated humanitarian response; mutual support for institution-building; coordinated foreign policy where members' interests align; treaty network engagement; recognition in deliberative bodies. The cooperative benefits compound as the framework's membership grows.

3. Recognition in the international order. Membership in the codified democratic order is structural recognition: the polity is a participant in the framework that articulates and operationalizes the universal claim. The recognition is not merely diplomatic but structural-logical; the polity's participation is operationally consequential for the framework's persistence and integrity.

4. Mutual support for internal challenges. Members facing internal challenges — political instability, economic crisis, social conflict, institutional decay — have access to constructive engagement from other members. The engagement is by request and consent, not imposition; the support is operational (resources, expertise, deliberative assistance) and structural (the alliance of members reinforcing the polity's institutional integrity through reciprocal recognition).

5. Structural protection in international disputes. Where a member is the target of supremacist redescription, predatory state action, or other violations of the foundational definitional premise, the framework's other members coordinate response. The collective self-defense rights of those affected operate through the alliance's reciprocal recognition; the framework's diagnostic identifies the violation; the alliance coordinates the responses. The protection is structural rather than coercive — it operates through the framework's structural mechanisms, not through any supranational enforcement apparatus.

The framework's institutional members have a structural commitment to assist consenting countries seeking to align with codified principles. The commitment is operational:

1. Constitutional Drafting and Reform Support. Members with relevant constitutional expertise assist polities undertaking the constitutional reforms ratification requires. The assistance is by consent and request; the polity's own constitutional process is the operative

locus; the framework's members supply expertise, deliberative engagement, and comparative-constitutional analysis.

2. Institutional Development Assistance. Members assist polities in developing the institutional infrastructure — independent judiciary, professional civil service, free press, electoral institutions — that the framework's operation requires. The assistance is technical and structural, not political; it supports the polity's own institutional development through its own constitutional process.

3. Deliberative Engagement and Mediation. The framework's deliberative mechanisms are available to polities undertaking ratification or restoration. Members facilitate dialogue, mediate disagreements, and supply the structural-logical apparatus for the polity's reforms. Members do not dictate; they support the polity's own deliberative process.

4. Cooperative Timeline-Setting. As articulated in Part II.B above, the grace period's duration is set cooperatively between the polity and the framework's other members. Reasonable defaults exist (ten years with extensions) but the actual timeline is established through dialogue, reflecting the polity's specific reform requirements. The framework's members commit to good-faith engagement on timeline-setting; impatience and rigid deadlines would replicate the historical pattern the framework's project is undertaken to remedy.

5. Resource and Expertise Pooling. Members pool resources and expertise for collective use in ratification support, institutional development, and the framework's operational integrity. The pooling is voluntary and reciprocal; members contribute according to their capacity; the resources are available to consenting polities undertaking the Protocol's processes.

The operational benefits and institutional assistance together constitute the framework's positive structure — the reciprocal cooperation and constructive engagement that the

framework's principles generate. The framework's enforcement mechanisms (Part V below) operate against violations; the framework's positive structure (this section) operates for cooperative alignment. The framework's persistence depends on both: the positive structure attracting polities to alignment and supporting their reforms; the enforcement mechanisms operating against violations that injure others. Together they constitute the framework's operational form in the State 2 uninstituted condition.

V. THE ENFORCEMENT MECHANISM: DIALOGUE, ALLIANCE, COLLECTIVE SELF-DEFENSE, AND DEFENSE OF HUMANITY

The framework's enforcement is not coercive. It operates through four structural mechanisms — the coherent dialogue that forecloses argument in defense of violation; the alliance of members coordinating their per-situation national responses; the activation of collective self-defense rights of those affected by violations; and the activation of the broader right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself against atrocity crimes that operate against humanity as such. Each mechanism is operational and structurally robust; together they constitute the framework's enforcement in the State 2 uninstituted condition.

A. Patience as Structural Commitment

The social contract is constituted to endure longstanding challenge. The American constitutional founding required generations of struggle before the Reconstruction Amendments operationalized the universal premise at the federal-state interface. The codified democratic order at the international scale has been articulated incrementally since 1945 and remains in operational development. The Protocol's project is generational: ratification of a substantial

number of polities, with full operational integration into the framework's mechanisms, will take decades.

The framework's commitment to patient deliberation is therefore not a temporary disposition; it is the structural commitment that constitutes the framework's persistence. The alternative — exclusionary impatience, coercive imposition, or premature abandonment of polities undertaking difficult reforms — would replicate the historical pattern the framework's project is undertaken to remedy. The framework holds together through its members' integrity to the codified principles; that integrity includes the patience to engage difficult cases over extended periods.

B. The Historical Alternative

The framework's project is undertaken because the alternative is the historical condition: organized exclusion at every scale; supremacist operation through redescription; conflict generated by particularized application of universal principles; the substrate's prediction that exclusivity at any scale generates the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against the exclusivist. The historical pattern has been measured in lives, in conflicts, in displaced persons, in destroyed civil societies, in operational consequences whose accumulated cost exceeds any plausible accounting.

The Protocol's commitment to patient deliberation is the operational alternative to this pattern. Where exclusion has been the historical response to non-compliance, the framework's response is engagement. Where coercion has been the historical mechanism, the framework's mechanism is deliberation. Where impatience has driven the abandonment of difficult cases, the framework's persistence sustains the engagement. The framework's project is to demonstrate,

through operation, that patient deliberation can succeed where the historical alternatives have failed.

C. The Four Enforcement Mechanisms

The framework's enforcement consists of four structural mechanisms operating together. None is coercive; none requires supranational infrastructure; together they constitute the operational power of the framework in the State 2 uninstituted condition.

First — the coherent dialogue. The framework's foundational premise (the Declaration of Humanity's definitional move) and its diagnostic apparatus (the Madisonian Compliance Test, the Power Separation Vulnerability taxonomy, the structural-textual analysis) together leave no room for coherent argument in defense of violation. A party that violates framework principles can act in violation but cannot defend the violation within the framework's structural-logical apparatus. The dialogue's structural force is that it makes the supremacist's redescription operationally exposed: redescription cannot survive coherent engagement with the foundational premise; the violator must either accept the premise (and thereby accept the inclusion) or operate outside the framework altogether (and thereby be recognized as such by the framework's other members).

Second — the alliance of members. Ratified members are aligned by the foundational definitional commitment. When violations occur, members coordinate their responses through the framework's deliberative mechanisms. The coordination is not centrally directed; it operates through the alliance's reciprocal recognition that the violation has occurred, the framework's diagnostic identifying the structural form of the violation, and each member's own per-situation national response operating consistently with the framework's principles. The alliance is the

operational form of the framework's enforcement at the international scale; the alliance's power is not coercive but coordinative.

Third — the collective self-defense rights of those affected. When a party's violations injure others — through floor-level transgressions, through redescription of any category of person or population as less than fully human, through systematic operation in violation of the framework's foundational premise — the affected parties retain the natural right of collective self-defense against the violating conduct. The framework's other members may exercise this right in coordination, supporting the affected parties through their own per-situation national responses. The collective self-defense is not framework-imposed coercion; it is the operational form of natural rights the framework recognizes and coordinates rather than displacing.

Fourth — the right of all members of humanity to defend humanity itself. Where a violation constitutes a crime against humanity — genocide, slavery, ethnic cleansing, systematic torture, mass atrocity, apartheid, or analogous violations that operate against humanity as such — every member of humanity has standing to defend humanity through coordinated action, regardless of whether the member is directly affected by the violation. The defense-of-humanity right is distinct from the collective-self-defense right: collective self-defense requires direct injury to the defender (or to those defended in coordination); defense of humanity requires only that the violation be a crime against humanity, with standing grounded in membership in humanity as such.

The defense-of-humanity right is the structural foundation of doctrines already operative within the codified democratic order. *Jus cogens* obligations *erga omnes* — binding on all states, owed to all — encompass the prohibitions on genocide, slavery, torture, racial discrimination, and aggression; they exist because the prohibited conduct is a violation of humanity as such, and

humanity as such has standing to demand compliance through its members. Universal jurisdiction over atrocity crimes — recognized for piracy, slavery, genocide, torture, war crimes, and crimes against humanity — operates on the same foundational premise: the crimes injure humanity as such; any state may prosecute on humanity's behalf because every state is a member of humanity. The Responsibility to Protect doctrine (R2P), recognized in the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome Document, articulates the same principle: when a state manifestly fails to protect its population from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, the international community has the responsibility to act — a responsibility grounded in the universal claim of humanity that the failing state has abandoned.

The prevention of atrocities is therefore not merely a moral aspiration; it is the operational expression of humanity's right to defend itself. Crimes against humanity are operational attempts to redescribe humanity to exclude the targeted population; the defense-of-humanity right is the right to resist that attempt. The right does not require coercive supranational enforcement; it operates through coordinated action by members of humanity at the per-situation national level — exercising universal jurisdiction where the conditions for it apply, supporting affected populations through humanitarian and diplomatic mechanisms, mediating to halt ongoing atrocities, prosecuting perpetrators when they come within the member state's jurisdiction, and refusing to extend the reciprocal cooperation of the framework's positive structure to states engaging in or enabling atrocity.

These four mechanisms operate together. The dialogue forecloses coherent defense of violation; the alliance coordinates response; collective self-defense activates against violations that injure others directly; defense of humanity activates against atrocity crimes against humanity as such. The framework does not coerce; it operates the structural conditions under which

coherent argument and reciprocal alliance produce the operational consequences the substrate predicts: the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against the exclusivist forms through the framework's reciprocal operation.

D. The Persistence of Engagement

When a polity in the grace period encounters substantial difficulty in achieving compliance, the framework's response is intensified engagement, not exclusion. The framework's other members offer technical assistance; the polity's specific reform challenges are addressed through deliberative consultation; the grace period extends through cooperative timeline-adjustment as the reforms require.

When a polity falls into partial defection from framework principles after ratification — through executive action that operates inconsistently with the framework, through legislative changes that erode previously certified compliance, through institutional decay that compromises the polity's enforcement of framework principles internally — the framework's response is structured engagement: the framework's diagnostic apparatus identifies the specific operational departure; the framework's other members engage the polity through deliberative mechanisms; the polity is given the operational opportunity to restore compliance.

Where a polity systematically and persistently rejects the framework's foundational premise — operating in sustained defection without engagement of the framework's deliberative mechanisms, declaring unilaterally that the framework does not apply, refusing to participate in the framework's deliberative resolution of its codified principles — the framework's response is the operationalization of the four enforcement mechanisms. The polity remains a member of humanity (the Declaration of Humanity's foundational premise admits no exception); the polity

does not lose the rights its humanity entails. But the polity forfeits the reciprocal cooperation that other members extend (lowered defensive posture, trade preferences, recognition, treaty network access, institutional support); the polity's violations cannot be defended coherently within the framework's structural-logical apparatus; where the polity's conduct injures others, the affected parties retain the natural right of collective self-defense and the framework's other members may exercise it in coordination; and where the polity's conduct constitutes a crime against humanity, every member of humanity retains the right to defend humanity itself.

The framework's response is therefore structural-logical and reciprocal, never coercive. The framework cannot coerce in the State 2 uninstituted condition; nor does it seek to. What the framework can do — and what its enforcement consists in — is the operationalization of the four mechanisms: the dialogue that forecloses coherent defense of violation; the alliance of members coordinating per-situation national responses; the recognition of collective self-defense rights of those affected; and the activation of defense-of-humanity rights against atrocity crimes that operate against humanity as such. In the long run, the framework's persistence operates the substrate's prediction: exclusivity at any scale generates the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against the exclusivist; congruent inclusion at every scale precludes the conflict-generating dynamic. The framework's project is to demonstrate this operationally, through patient and persistent engagement, across generations.

VI. THE THREE OPERATIONAL VARIANTS

The Protocol's two-stage architecture handles three operational variants through the same procedural structure. The variants differ in the polity's starting condition but proceed through the same steps to certification and ratification.

A. First Ratification (Transitional Polities)

A polity undertaking first ratification is in transition, post-conflict, newly constituting, or otherwise establishing its constitutional governance. The polity's existing constitutional structure may be partial, contested, or in active development. The Protocol applies as follows:

1. Member Commitment Declaration — The polity's interim or constituting authority issues the Declaration as part of the polity's constitutional founding or restoration. The Declaration commits the polity, at the foundational level of its own constitution, to the framework's principles.

2. Grace Period with Constitutional Drafting — The grace period coincides with the polity's constitutional drafting process. The framework's principles inform the polity's constitutional design; the necessary features are incorporated into the polity's constitution as it is drafted; technical assistance from ratified members supports the drafting process where requested.

3. Certification at Constitutional Completion — Certification occurs when the polity's constitutional drafting is complete and the constitution operationalizes the necessary features. The polity proceeds to Stage 2 Full Ratification upon certification.

This variant is the framework's strongest case for fractal-democracy promotion. The polity's constitutional founding incorporates framework principles from the outset; the ratification process aligns with the polity's own constitutional construction; the polity emerges as a full member of the framework with constitutional structures designed to operationalize the framework's principles.

B. Full-Compliance Ratification (Existing Democracies)

A polity undertaking full-compliance ratification is an existing democracy whose constitutional structure already contains most or all of the necessary features but has not formally articulated its ratification of the codified democratic order. The Protocol applies as follows:

1. **Member Commitment Declaration** — The polity's existing constitutional authority issues the Declaration through whatever procedure the polity's constitution requires for binding international commitments (typically legislative concurrence, supermajority in some cases).

2. **Grace Period with Focused Reforms** — The grace period addresses the specific gaps between the polity's existing constitutional structure and the certification standard. For most existing democracies, the gap centers on Feature 4 (the anti-defection structural mechanism); reforms focus on this and any other specific gaps.

3. **Certification at Gap-Closure** — Certification occurs when the polity's reforms have closed the specific gaps identified at the start of the grace period. The polity proceeds to Stage 2 Full Ratification upon certification.

This variant is the framework's most operationally accessible case. Most existing democracies can complete the reforms within a moderate timeframe; the certification standard is functional rather than ideological; the polity's existing constitutional integrity is recognized and built upon.

C. Restoration of Integrity (Defecting Members)

A polity undertaking restoration of integrity has been in systematic defection from the codified democratic order's enforcement infrastructure. The United States and Israel in the contemporary period are the paradigm cases. The Protocol applies as follows:

1. Member Commitment Declaration with Defection Acknowledgment — The polity's constitutional authority issues the Declaration, which includes explicit acknowledgment of the prior defection acts and commits to specific restoration measures. The acknowledgment is not punitive; it is the operational form of the polity's reaffirmation of the framework's foundational premise.

2. Grace Period with Restoration Reforms — The grace period addresses both the constitutional gaps (typically Feature 4, the anti-defection mechanism) and the operational restorations (re-accepting ICJ compulsory jurisdiction; reversing executive orders sanctioning international institutions; withdrawing memoranda of mass treaty defection; ratifying instruments previously rejected; ending sanctions regimes targeting international enforcement bodies). The restoration measures are concrete and verifiable.

3. Certification at Restoration Completion — Certification occurs when both the constitutional reforms and the operational restorations have been completed and verified. The polity proceeds to Stage 2 Full Ratification upon certification.

This variant is the framework's most demanding case because it requires both constitutional reform and operational restoration. The contemporary United States, for example, would need to: enact a constitutional amendment requiring legislative concurrence for treaty withdrawal; re-accept ICJ compulsory jurisdiction under Art. 36(2); reverse EO 14203 sanctioning ICC officials; withdraw the 2026 sixty-six-organization memorandum; ratify the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court; end the sanctions regime targeting international enforcement infrastructure. The list is substantial; the grace period for restoration may extend beyond the initial ten years and require extensions.

The restoration variant is also the framework's most consequential case for the framework's operational integrity. The contemporary defection pattern by the most-obligated members of the codified democratic order is the operational dismantling of the framework's foundation. Restoration of integrity by these polities is the operational restoration of the framework itself. The Protocol's commitment to handling restoration through the same procedural structure as other ratifications operates the framework's principle that no polity, however historically obligated or systematically defected, is foreclosed from restoration through the framework's own deliberative process.

VII. THE CERTIFICATION MECHANISM: INSTITUTIONAL ARCHITECTURE

The Protocol requires an institutional mechanism for certification. The mechanism's structural requirements derive from the framework's State 2 character: it must operate through unanimous consent of existing ratified members; it must be deliberative rather than coercive; it must apply the certification standard structurally rather than politically; it must be transparent and publicly accountable.

A. The Deliberative Council

The framework's certification operates through a deliberative council composed of representatives of all existing ratified members. The council's structural characteristics:

1. **Membership.** Each ratified member designates a representative to the council. The representative is selected through the member's own constitutional process for international representation.

2. **Decision Rule.** Certification decisions require unanimous consent of council members. Unanimity preserves the State 2 character: each ratified member affirms the new member's compliance through reciprocal recognition; a single member's reasoned objection prevents certification but must be substantively grounded.

3. **Deliberative Process.** Certification reviews are public deliberations. The polity submits its Compliance Report; council members raise observations and questions; the polity responds; the dialogue is recorded and publicly accessible. The certification decision is made after the deliberation concludes.

4. **Independence.** The council operates independently of any single polity's political influence. Council members are bound by oath to apply the certification standard structurally, not politically; council deliberations are conducted under transparency requirements that prevent capture by partisan interests.

5. **Continuing Review.** The council also conducts continuing review of ratified members' compliance with framework principles. A ratified member's later conduct that departs from framework principles triggers the framework's diagnostic apparatus; the council engages the member through deliberative mechanisms; restoration to full compliance occurs through the framework's own deliberative process.

B. The Initial Council

The Protocol's initial implementation requires the formation of the initial council. The initial council is composed of representatives of polities that have undertaken the Protocol's two-stage process and achieved certification. The first certifications create the initial membership; subsequent certifications expand the membership.

The initial council's formation faces a structural challenge: at the protocol's inception, no certified members exist. The Protocol's initial implementation therefore proceeds through a founding deliberation: polities committed to the framework's principles convene to deliberate on the certification standard, apply it mutually, and certify each other through a founding act analogous to the American Constitutional Convention. The founding deliberation produces the initial council membership; subsequent ratifications proceed through the standard two-stage process.

The founding deliberation's structural requirements:

1. **Open Participation.** Any polity willing to commit to the framework's principles may participate in the founding deliberation. The participation is voluntary; the deliberation is open; the polity's commitment is the entry criterion.

2. **Mutual Certification.** Participating polities apply the certification standard to each other through structured peer review. Each polity submits its Compliance Report; other participating polities review; the deliberation produces certifications.

3. **Founding Recognition.** Polities certified through the founding deliberation are recognized as the initial members of the codified democratic order's formal framework. The recognition is the operational form of the framework's founding act.

4. **Continuing Operation.** The initial council, once formed, operates the framework's ongoing certification process per the Protocol's standard procedures.

C. The Certification Standard Applied

The certification standard described in Part III applies in all cases — founding deliberation, first ratification, full-compliance ratification, restoration of integrity. The standard is functional rather

than ideological: it tests whether the polity's constitutional structure operates the framework's principles, not whether the polity's policies align with any particular political viewpoint.

The standard's application is structural-textual. The council reviews the polity's constitutional text, statutory framework, and judicial doctrine; identifies whether the necessary features are operationally present; verifies floor-level rights protections; confirms the anti-defection structural mechanism. The application is supported by the Madisonian Compliance Test's diagnostic apparatus — the six-step test applied to the polity's constitutional structure produces the same kind of verification the council requires.

VIII. TEMPLATE: THE MEMBER COMMITMENT DECLARATION (STAGE 1)

The following template articulates the substantive content of the Member Commitment Declaration. Polities adapt the language to their own constitutional and procedural requirements; the substantive commitments are the operational content the certification standard verifies.

MEMBER COMMITMENT DECLARATION TO THE CODIFIED DEMOCRATIC ORDER > [Name of polity], by [the constitutional authority making this declaration], affirms the foundational definitional premise of the codified democratic order as articulated in The Declaration of Humanity: humanity is every person, every family, every people, and every nation — without exception, without precondition, without diminution at any scale. The polity affirms that every member of humanity bears the universal claim to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that governments at every scale of social organization are constituted to secure that claim; and that no government possesses authority prior to or above the universal claim that constitutes its purpose. > The polity commits to undertake comprehensive internal review of its constitutional, statutory, and institutional structure to identify any provisions, practices, or arrangements that operate inconsistently with the framework's principles. The review will extend to direct floor violations, indirect floor violations through deprivation of means, particularized-enforcement violations, internal exclusivity of any kind, and external defection from the codified democratic order's enforcement infrastructure. > The polity commits to undertake the constitutional, statutory, and institutional reforms necessary to bring local

laws into compliance with framework principles. The reforms will operate within the polity's own constitutional process; the framework's principles supply the substantive standard; the polity's own deliberative procedures supply the procedural mechanism. > The polity commits to engage the framework's deliberative mechanisms for the expression of disagreement and to refrain from unilateral declarations of being unbound by the framework's binding character. The polity recognizes that legitimate disagreement is internal to the framework; rejection of Law through unilateral declaration is foreclosed. > The polity commits to recognize all members of humanity as bearers of the same foundational claim, and commits to apply to itself the same standards it applies to other parties. The commitment operates at every scale: persons, families, peoples, and nations. > The polity accepts the certification process described in the Ratification Protocol and submits to peer review by existing ratified members for verification that local-law adjustment has achieved compliance with framework principles. The polity acknowledges the grace period during which compliance is undertaken; the framework's other members' obligation to engage the polity through deliberative mechanisms during the transition; and the framework's commitment to patient deliberation as the operational form of its persistence. > The polity acknowledges that during the grace period, enforcement of the polity's laws remains at the national level, and that the framework's binding character does not yet operate over the polity. The polity affirms that ratification is its sovereign choice, made by affirmative consent through the polity's own constitutional process; that ratification is operationally complete only upon certification and the issuance of the Full Ratification Declaration; and that the polity retains, throughout the transition, the operational scope of its own sovereignty. > This Declaration is made on [date], by [the constitutional authority], in [public ceremony / official act / etc.], and deposited with the Deliberative Council of the codified democratic order's coordinating framework. > [Signatures of authorizing officials, per the polity's constitutional procedure]

IX. TEMPLATE: THE FULL RATIFICATION DECLARATION (STAGE 2)

Upon Full Certification, the polity issues the Full Ratification Declaration. The template:

FULL RATIFICATION DECLARATION TO THE CODIFIED DEMOCRATIC ORDER > [Name of polity], by [the constitutional authority making this declaration], having issued the Member Commitment Declaration on [date], having undertaken comprehensive internal review and the constitutional and statutory reforms necessary for compliance with the framework's principles during the grace period from [date] to [date], and having received Full Certification from the Deliberative Council on [date], hereby ratifies the codified democratic order in full: > The polity reaffirms the Declaration of Humanity in its final operational form: humanity is every person, every family, every people, and

every nation — without exception, without precondition, without diminution at any scale. > The polity declares its compliance with the framework's principles. The polity's constitutional structure now contains the necessary features for ratification: republican governance at every constituent scale; constitutional supremacy with treaty integration as binding domestic law; deliberative concurrence for binding international commitments; the anti-defection structural mechanism foreclosing unilateral defection from ratified treaties; deliberative-only structural change to the constitution; deliberative war-powers; independent judicial review with standing for structural violations; floor-level rights protections; officer oaths creating independent constitutional duties; and periodic elections by the constituents. > The polity accepts the framework's binding character over its conduct from the date of this Declaration forward. The polity accepts the framework's diagnostic apparatus — the Madisonian Compliance Test, the Power Separation Vulnerability taxonomy, the three-level meta-violation diagnosis, the bodily-jurisdiction framework's analysis of floor violations, the Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism's substrate predictions — for evaluation of future conduct. > The polity commits to the deliberative-revision distinction for any future disagreement with framework instantiations: engagement through the framework's deliberative mechanisms, refusal of unilateral defection, participation in the framework's ongoing development through constructive dialogue. > The polity acknowledges the structural commitments of membership: reciprocal recognition of all other members as bearers of the same foundational claim; deliberative engagement in the framework's institutional mechanisms; refusal of unilateral defection from the framework's binding character; fractal-democracy promotion through policy toward non-members and constructive engagement with polities undertaking first ratification or restoration of integrity. > The polity affirms that this ratification is the operational completion of the foundational affirmation begun by the Member Commitment Declaration. The polity is now a full member of the codified democratic order, with all the rights, obligations, and structural commitments that membership entails. > This Declaration is made on [date], by [the constitutional authority], in [public ceremony / official act / etc.], and deposited with the Deliberative Council of the codified democratic order's coordinating framework. The polity is welcomed as a full member by the Council's reciprocal recognition. > [Signatures of authorizing officials, per the polity's constitutional procedure] > [Reciprocal recognition acts by existing ratified members]

X. CONCLUSION: THE PROTOCOL AS OPERATIONAL FORM

The Ratification Protocol is the operational form of the framework's project. The Declaration of Humanity articulates the foundational definitional premise; the bodily-jurisdiction framework articulates humanity at the individual scale; the Madisonian Compliance Test articulates the

diagnostic apparatus; the Laws of Supremacism and Egalitarianism articulate the substrate predictions; the rejection-of-Law analysis articulates the contemporary defection pattern; the Sumud Flotilla article articulates the paradigm operational violation; the ICJ rejection pattern research brief articulates the empirical record; and the Protocol articulates the procedural mechanism by which polities at every scale can affirm their membership in the codified democratic order and operate the framework's principles in mutual reciprocation.

The Protocol's four structural commitments — two-stage architecture with certification of compliance; sovereignty preservation through per-situation national-level enforcement at every stage; patient deliberation as the response to non-compliance; and four-mechanism enforcement (dialogue, alliance, collective self-defense, defense of humanity) — together constitute the framework's operational form. The architecture is designed for the framework's State 2 uninstituted character: no coercive enforcement; reciprocation through member integrity; deliberative engagement as the operational mechanism; structural recognition of compliance and defection through the framework's own diagnostic apparatus.

The Protocol's commitment to patience is the framework's most distinctive operational disposition. The social contract is constituted to endure longstanding challenge; the framework's project is generational; the alternative is the historical condition the project is undertaken to remedy. The framework will not exclude polities undertaking difficult reforms; it will engage them. It will not coerce polities in defection; it will recognize their structural exit while operating its principles among the remaining members. It will not abandon the project when polities resist; it will sustain the engagement, operating on the substrate's prediction that egalitarian congruence precludes sustained conflict and exclusionary supremacism generates the coalition of opposition that natural law guarantees will form against it.

The Protocol's foundational premise is the Declaration of Humanity. The Protocol's operational mechanism is the two-stage architecture. The Protocol's structural commitment is to the framework's persistence under longstanding challenge. The Protocol's project is the operational form of the codified democratic order's commitment to humanity at every scale: the foundational affirmation of the inclusive whole, the deliberative reform of governance to operationalize the affirmation, the certification of compliance through reciprocal recognition, the ratification of full membership through affirmative consent, and the continuing operation of the framework's principles through patient deliberation across generations.

The work is foundational. The work is operational. The work is generational. The Protocol is the procedural mechanism by which the work proceeds. The American constitutional founding required the same resolve at the constituent-states scale; the codified democratic order at the international scale requires the same resolve; the resolve is the resolve to undertake the work the universal premise has been declaring, in incomplete form, for two and a half centuries. The Protocol is the operational form of that resolve. The Declaration of Humanity is its foundation. The framework's diagnostic apparatus is its operational mechanism. The work itself is the work of completing what the Declaration of Independence began: the operationalization of the universal claim at every scale where humanity is constituted.

XI. BIBLIOGRAPHY

Constitutional and Founding Documents

DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE (U.S. 1776).

U.S. CONST.

Treaties and International Instruments

CONVENTION AGAINST TORTURE AND OTHER CRUEL, INHUMAN OR DEGRADING TREATMENT OR PUNISHMENT, Dec. 10, 1984, 1465 U.N.T.S. 85.

CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF THE CRIME OF GENOCIDE, Dec. 9, 1948, 78 U.N.T.S. 277.

GENEVA CONVENTIONS, Aug. 12, 1949, 75 U.N.T.S. 31, 85, 135, 287.

INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON CIVIL AND POLITICAL RIGHTS, Dec. 16, 1966, 999 U.N.T.S. 171.

INTERNATIONAL COVENANT ON ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND CULTURAL RIGHTS, Dec. 16, 1966, 993 U.N.T.S. 3.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, June 26, 1945, 1 U.N.T.S. XVI.

UNIVERSAL DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS, G.A. Res. 217 (III) A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948).

Companion Works

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Applied Diagnostics: Structural Analysis of Active Conflicts Through the Bodily-Jurisdiction Framework* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Bodily Jurisdiction: The Floor of Constitutional Authority* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *The Declaration of Humanity: An Inclusive Definition and Its Operational Necessity* (May 2026) (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *The Madisonian Separation of Powers Objective Compliance Test: Recovering Constitutional Structure Through Textual Analysis* (May 2026) (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Means, Not Views: The Constitutional Distinction Between Radicalism and Extremism* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *The Rejection of Law: Treaty Defection, State Secession, and the Fractal Constitution* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *Torture in the Codified Democratic Order: The May 2026 Sumud Flotilla and the Three-Level Meta-Violation* (manuscript on file with author).

KIRCHNER, JOSEPH D. *US and Israeli Rejection of International Adjudication: A Research Brief* (manuscript on file with author).