

DIRECT DEMOCRACY & SORTITION ASSEMBLIES

A Civic Architecture for the British Isles

DDSA-RECON-001 | Edition 1.0

Corpus Reconciliation Report

The first full structural audit of the DD&SA; document corpus — sixty documents across seven audit categories

DOCUMENT INFORMATION

Version: 1.0

Author: Ian R. Graham

Document ID: DDSA-RECON-001

CLASSIFICATION

Confidentiality: Public Domain

Distribution: Unrestricted — For civic, academic, and public use

USAGE NOTICE & PERMISSION

This document is published by Direct Democracy & Sortition Assemblies (DD&SA) as part of its open civic corpus. It may be freely shared, quoted, adapted, and built upon for non-commercial civic, educational, journalistic, and research purposes, provided that attribution is given to DD&SA and the document reference number is cited. Commercial reproduction or use in partisan political campaigning requires prior written consent. This document does not constitute legal advice. All constitutional proposals are subject to democratic ratification processes as defined within the DD&SA framework. © DD&SA — Ian R. Graham. All rights reserved under applicable intellectual property law.

“We inherit the lessons of the past, not its chains.”

— **DD&SA Founding Principle**

dd-sa.org

A living document — subject to civic deliberation and democratic revision.

Contents

Executive Summary	4
1. Core Terminology — "Policy"	4
1.1 Scale of the Problem	4
1.2 Priority Correction Targets	4
2. Core Terminology — "The State"	4
2.1 Scale and Pattern	5
2.2 Genuine Violations Requiring Correction	5
2.3 Defensible Uses	5
3. Core Terminology — "Laws", "Courts", and "Judges"	5
3.1 "Laws"	5
3.2 "Courts" and "Judges"	5
4. "Citizens" versus "Residents" — The Corpus-Wide Split	6
4.1 The Evidence	6
4.2 The Architectural Decision Required	6
5. Duplicate Documents and Version Conflicts	6
5.1 Confirmed Duplicate: Foundational Blueprint	6
5.2 Confirmed Version Pair: CTIA Architecture	7
5.3 Reference Code Collision: Civic Building / Agroforestry	7
5.4 Probable Version Pair: Justice Architecture	7
5.5 Related but Distinct: Crisis Continuity Volumes	7
6. Document Reference Code Integrity	7
6.1 The Two Competing Conventions	7
6.2 Documents Requiring Immediate Reference Codes	7
7. Naming Convention and Filing Inconsistencies	8
7.1 Filename Prefix Variants	8
7.2 Critical Title Violations	8
8. Legacy Institutional Language — "United Kingdom" and "Parliament"	8
8.1 Permissible Uses	8
8.2 Violations Requiring Correction	9
9. Priority Action Plan	9

10. Conclusions

9

Executive Summary

This report presents the findings of the first full reconciliation pass across the DD&SA corpus. Sixty documents were audited across seven structural categories: (1) core terminology compliance; (2) citizens versus residents consistency; (3) duplicate and version conflicts; (4) document reference code integrity; (5) naming convention standardisation; (6) legacy institutional language; and (7) constitutional-grade vocabulary violations.

The corpus is architecturally coherent in its broad design and internally consistent in its core arguments. The problems identified are largely second-order: terminology drift, incomplete migration from early drafting conventions, and a small number of genuine structural conflicts. None require redesign of any architectural element. All are remediable through targeted revision.

1. Core Terminology — "Policy"

The DD&SA constitutional grammar rule is absolute: the word "policy" must not appear in any DD&SA document. Frameworks are adaptive architectures; they are not fixed directives. The word "policy" imports a parliamentary-era logic of directive governance that contradicts the DD&SA design philosophy.

1.1 Scale of the Problem

54 of 60 documents contain the word "policy" or "policies" in some form. This is the single most pervasive terminology issue in the corpus. However, the occurrences fall into three distinct categories, and only one category constitutes a genuine violation.

1.2 Priority Correction Targets

The following documents contain genuine constitutional-grade violations requiring immediate correction:

ARTICLES_OF_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_BRITISH_ISLES.docx: "Health Policy" (Article header), "Migration Policy" (Article header), "Tax policy shall be established", "No law, policy, or decision", "implement laws, policies, and directives". These violations are particularly serious because they appear in the foundational constitutional instrument.

Constitution_Revised_Edition.docx: "Policy Review Notices" appears throughout as a named mechanism of the CCAP system. This is a structural naming error. The correct term is "Framework Review Notice".

DDSA_Addendum_F_Scalability_Blueprint_FULL.docx: "Policy Intelligence Unit" and "Policy Intelligence Function" — named bodies within the commission architecture. These should be "Framework Intelligence Unit" and "Framework Intelligence Function".

2. Core Terminology — "The State"

The DD&SA constitutional grammar prohibits reference to "the state" in all documents operating within the DD&SA framework. The correct formulation is "the Civic Commonwealth", "civic institutions", or "citizens acting through their assemblies", depending on context.

2.1 Scale and Pattern

28 of 60 documents contain "the state" in some form. As with "policy", occurrences split between genuinely problematic uses and defensible academic or historical references.

2.2 Genuine Violations Requiring Correction

DDSA_Emergency_Governance_Protocol.docx: "This Protocol exists for one reason only: to ensure that when genuine emergencies arise, the state can act with speed." This is constitutional text that should read: "...the Civic Commonwealth can act with speed." This is a critical error — emergency governance instruments are foundational constitutional documents.

DDSA_Complete_Document.docx: Multiple uses: "the state must be capable of acting decisively", "the state that lacks capacity", "the state that possesses power without discipline". All three should use "the Civic Commonwealth" or "civic governance".

DDSA_Civic_Pension_Architecture_v2.docx: "The state does not access, penalise, or reduce the citizen's existing Fund." Should read: "The Civic Commonwealth does not access..."

ARTICLES_OF_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_BRITISH_ISLES.docx: "The state shall protect the public from deliberate misinformation." Should read: "The Civic Commonwealth shall protect..."

2.3 Defensible Uses

Academic and transition documents legitimately reference "the state" in historical, comparative, or transitional contexts — for instance, the Treatise's discussion of Athenian governance, the implementation manual's description of the current UK state, or the transition pathway's analysis of state power during handover. These require no amendment.

3. Core Terminology — "Laws", "Courts", and "Judges"

3.1 "Laws"

17 documents contain "laws". The DD&SA constitutional vocabulary replaces "laws" with "Civic Rules" in all domestic constitutional contexts. Most occurrences in the corpus are legitimate — historical references to Draco's laws, discussion of the UK's existing legal framework in transition documents, and comparative academic analysis. The key violations are in the constitutional instruments themselves:

ARTICLES_OF_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_BRITISH_ISLES.docx: "No law, policy, or decision may diminish dignity" should read "No Civic Rule, framework, or decision". The PAS article "shall implement laws, policies" should read "shall implement Civic Rules and frameworks".

DDSA_White_Paper_Formatted.docx / The_New_British_Isles_Foundational_Blueprint.docx: The preamble correctly states "There are no 'laws'... there are Civic Rules" — but the body of both documents then uses "laws" in constitutional contexts, contradicting the declared vocabulary.

3.2 "Courts" and "Judges"

23 documents contain "courts"; 15 contain "judges". The large majority of occurrences are explicitly contrastive — explaining what the legacy system used and what DD&SA replaces it with. This is architecturally correct usage. Examples such as "replacing courts with Consequence Hearings" or "abolishes courts, judges, barristers" are not violations — they are definitional statements of the system's purpose.

The following are genuine violations where DD&SA text refers to its own system using legacy terminology:

DDSA_Restorative_Justice_Framework.docx: "Magisters and MCFs act as procedural stewards and neutral convenors (never as judges)" — acceptable as a clarification, but phrasing could be tightened to remove the comparative frame entirely.

DDSA_White_Paper_Formatted.docx: "Retained in reformed form as the Civic Justice System, with Magisters replacing judges in all matters of civic consequence" — the table entry is transitional text and is acceptable. It should be marked clearly as describing the legacy-to-new mapping.

4. "Citizens" versus "Residents" — The Corpus-Wide Split

This is the most architecturally significant inconsistency in the corpus. There is a clear generational split in the document set. The newer documents — those using the DD-SA-XXX-001 reference format, produced following the introduction of the Constitutional Grammar Document — predominantly use "residents" as the universal civic term. Older documents — particularly the foundational blueprint, the master architecture, the pension architecture, the implementation manual, and the constitutional articles — predominantly or exclusively use "citizens".

4.1 The Evidence

4.2 The Architectural Decision Required

Before any corpus-wide correction can be made, a decision must be taken on the following question: is "residents" the universal term for all people within the Civic Commonwealth, replacing "citizens" entirely — or is "citizens" the correct term for the constitutional relationship, with "residents" reserved for administrative and service-delivery contexts?

The evidence from the newer documents (particularly the DD-SA- series vocabulary compliance notes) is clear: the intended direction of travel is "residents" throughout, with "citizens" reserved for documents that are explicitly public-facing or are written in the voice of civic aspiration rather than constitutional architecture. Documents such as "A Public Address to the Citizens of Britain" and "Citizen Edition" are deliberately using "citizens" as rhetorical and political language — this is correct.

The recommendation is: confirm "residents" as the universal operational and constitutional term; permit "citizens" in public-facing and rhetorical documents only; and schedule a correction pass on all non-public constitutional instruments currently using "citizens".

5. Duplicate Documents and Version Conflicts

The following conflicts were identified. Each represents either two documents sharing a reference code, two documents that appear to be different versions of the same instrument with no clear authority hierarchy, or filename-level naming collisions.

5.1 Confirmed Duplicate: Foundational Blueprint

Conflict: DDSA_White_Paper_Formatted.docx and
The_New_British_Isles_Foundational_Blueprint.docx both carry reference code
DD&SA-CORE-FBP-001 and open with near-identical text.

Resolution: Determine which is the canonical current edition. Retire the other with a header note indicating it has been superseded. Retain both in archive only.

5.2 Confirmed Version Pair: CTIA Architecture

Conflict: DD-SA-CTIA-001.docx and DD-SA-CTIA-001-v1_1.docx both exist with the same reference code. Version 1.1 is clearly the later iteration.

Resolution: DD-SA-CTIA-001-v1_1.docx is the authoritative version. Retire DD-SA-CTIA-001.docx.

5.3 Reference Code Collision: Civic Building / Agroforestry

Conflict: DD_SA_ARCH_001_Civic_Building_Forestry.docx and agroforestry_integration.docx both carry the reference code DD&SA-ARCH-001.

Resolution: These appear to be separate documents covering related but distinct subjects (civic building design versus agroforestry integration). Both need unique reference codes. Suggested: DD&SA-ARCH-ENV-001 for agroforestry; DD&SA-ARCH-BLD-001 for civic building.

5.4 Probable Version Pair: Justice Architecture

Conflict: Civic_Justice_Architecture_CJA-001.docx and DD-SA-CJA-001.docx appear to be an earlier and later version of the same instrument. The DD-SA-CJA-001 format is newer.

Resolution: DD-SA-CJA-001.docx is the authoritative version. Civic_Justice_Architecture_CJA-001.docx should be archived and marked superseded.

5.5 Related but Distinct: Crisis Continuity Volumes

Status: THE_CRISIS_CONTINUITY_VOLUME.docx ("Crisis Override Architecture and Civilisational Survival Command") and The_Crisis_Continuity_Volume_Master.docx (reference code DD&SA-CONST-LBV-001 — "Leadership Crisis Continuity Volume") are separate documents addressing different aspects of crisis governance. They are not duplicates.

Resolution: No merge required. However, cross-reference obligations between the two documents should be verified and added if absent. THE_CRISIS_CONTINUITY_VOLUME.docx requires a formal reference code.

6. Document Reference Code Integrity

The DD&SA corpus has developed two naming conventions simultaneously, neither of which has been applied consistently across the full document set. The result is a corpus with 30 unregistered documents, two reference code collisions, and three distinct filename prefix styles.

6.1 The Two Competing Conventions

6.2 Documents Requiring Immediate Reference Codes

The following major documents currently carry no reference code. Given their importance to the corpus, this is an architectural gap:

DDSA_Implementation_Manual.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-IMPL-001

DDSA_Transition_Pathway.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-TRAN-001

DDSA_Emergency_Governance_Protocol.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-GOV-EGP-001

DDSA_Threat_Register.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-GOV-THR-001

International_Civic_Compact_DDSA.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-INT-ICC-001

THE_ARCHITECTURE_OF DISSOLUTION.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-CONST-AOD-001

ARTICLES_OF_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_BRITISH_ISLES.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-CONST-ART-001

Constitution_Revised_Edition.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-CONST-CON-002 (revised edition)

The_Inevitable_Charter.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-CONST-ICH-001

DD_and_SA_Defence_posture.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-DEF-001

DD_and_SA_National_Equity_Fund_Strategy.docx — Suggested: DD&SA-FIN-NEF-001

National_Farming_Renaissance_Policy.docx — Rename to
National_Farming_Renaissance_Framework.docx; Suggested ref: DD&SA-ENV-NFR-001

7. Naming Convention and Filing Inconsistencies

7.1 Filename Prefix Variants

There are five distinct filename prefix styles currently in use across the corpus. These need to converge on a single standard. The recommended standard is the DD-SA- prefix used in the most recently produced documents, as it reflects the canonical ampersand-free file naming convention appropriate for cross-platform compatibility.

7.2 Critical Title Violations

Two document titles directly violate the "no policy" rule at the most visible level:

National_Farming_Renaissance_Policy.docx — Title and filename both use "Policy". This should be renamed National_Farming_Renaissance_Framework.docx and its internal title corrected throughout.

DD_and_SA_Economic_policies.docx — Filename uses "policies". This should be renamed DD-SA-ECO-001_Economic_Frameworks.docx or similar.

8. Legacy Institutional Language — "United Kingdom" and "Parliament"

37 documents reference "United Kingdom" or "UK"; 27 reference "Parliament". These require context-sensitive rather than wholesale treatment.

8.1 Permissible Uses

References to the United Kingdom and Parliament are entirely appropriate in the following document categories, and require no amendment:

Transition documents (DDSA_Transition_Pathway.docx, DDSA_Implementation_Manual.docx) — these documents explicitly operate in the transition era and must reference existing institutions by name.

Academic treatise (DD_SA_Treatise_Main_Document.docx) — scholarly analysis of constitutional systems, historical comparisons, and legislative history legitimately refers to UK and Parliament throughout.

Threat register and deep critique (DDSA_Threat_Register.docx, DDSA_Deep_Critique.docx) — risk analysis of the transition necessarily names the institutions presenting the risk.

Citation documents (DIRECT_DEMOCRACY_and_SORTITION_ASSEMBLIES_citations.docx) — academic citations refer to scholarship about existing systems.

8.2 Violations Requiring Correction

The following documents speak from within the post-transition constitutional order — as if DD&SA is already operational — but then refer to the "United Kingdom" or "Parliament" as if they still exist. This is an internal contradiction:

ARTICLES_OF_THE_CONSTITUTION_OF_THE_BRITISH_ISLES.docx: Constitutional articles that describe the new civic order should not reference Parliamentary structures except in an explicit supersession clause.

Constitution_Revised_Edition.docx: "Citizens" and "Parliament" references sit alongside new constitutional architecture — requires careful surgical review.

THE_CRISIS_CONTINUITY_VOLUME.docx: Crisis architecture that references "Parliament" needs to either be contextualised (as legacy system) or corrected to Civic Commonwealth language.

9. Priority Action Plan

The following sequencing is recommended for the correction programme. Items are ordered by architectural priority, not volume of work.

10. Conclusions

The DD&SA corpus is in better structural health than a first-pass audit of 60 documents might suggest. The core architecture is coherent. The foundational principles are consistently applied. The newer documents — particularly those in the DD-SA- format produced since the introduction of the Constitutional Grammar Document — demonstrate near-perfect terminology discipline. The vocabulary compliance notes in CSIA-001, CTIA-001, and CPF-001 are exemplary.

The problems are concentrated in the older generation of documents, most of which pre-date the formal grammar conventions. These are correctable without redesign. The citizens/residents split is the single most consequential issue because it runs through the corpus's most publicly significant documents — the foundational blueprint, the constitution, and the master architecture — and these are the documents most likely to be scrutinised by external audiences.

The duplicate document problem is straightforward to resolve once the canonical authority question is settled. The unregistered document problem is an administrative task, not an architectural one.

None of the findings in this report identify a structural contradiction within DD&SA's governance design. The system's internal logic — non-domination, sortition, restorative justice, distributed authority, anti-capture — is architecturally intact and consistently applied. What this report addresses is the surface: the language through which that architecture is expressed. Getting the surface right

matters, because the surface is what citizens, critics, and allies will read first.

Recommended next step: address Priority 1 (duplicates) and Priority 2 (residents/citizens ruling) in a single working session, as these decisions cascade through the rest of the correction programme. All other items can then be addressed document by document.

DD&SA-RECON-001 | Corpus Reconciliation Report | DD&SA Foundation | April 2026

— END OF DOCUMENT —