

VOTECLARITY

Civic Integrity Charter

The ethical and methodological foundation for AI-assisted evaluation
of political behaviour

Version 1.0 · April 24, 2026 · voteclarity.org

Grounded in the US Constitution, the Bill of Rights,
and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

CONTENTS

- 01** Preamble & Purpose

- 02** Foundational Legal & Ethical Authorities

- 03** Core Principles of the Charter

- 04** The Scoring Methodology

- 05** Platform Architecture & Governance

- 06** Transparency Commitments

- 07** Amendment & Review Process

- 08** Statement of Non-Partisanship

- 09** Versioning & Legal Notice

01 — PREAMBLE & PURPOSE

Why VoteClarity Exists

Democratic societies depend on informed citizens making meaningful choices about who represents them. Yet in an era of information overload, deliberate disinformation, and declining civic trust, voters face an unprecedented challenge: how to evaluate the actual ethical behaviour of those who seek and hold public office.

VoteClarity was founded on a simple but powerful premise: **politicians should be held to the standard they themselves swore an oath to uphold.** Every elected official in the United States takes an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. VoteClarity exists to make visible — transparently, consistently, and without partisan bias — the degree to which they honour that oath.

This Charter is the ethical and methodological foundation of the VoteClarity platform. It defines what we measure, how we measure it, and why. It is a living document, subject to structured community review, and every version is permanently archived. Nothing in this Charter changes privately or unilaterally.

**"VoteClarity does not decide morality.
It measures observable behaviour against publicly-defined ethical standards
that any citizen can read, challenge, and help improve."**

VoteClarity is not a replacement for democracy. It is a decision-support and accountability infrastructure — a civic intelligence layer that makes political ethics measurable, visible, and actionable for every voter.

02 — FOUNDATIONAL AUTHORITIES

The Legal & Ethical Foundations

The VoteClarity Charter draws its ethical authority from three foundational sources, chosen for their universality, democratic legitimacy, and legal weight. These are not ideological references — they are the agreed-upon cornerstones of American democracy and universal human dignity.

The United States Constitution & Bill of Rights

The supreme law of the United States. Every federal and state official swears an oath to uphold it. VoteClarity evaluates political behaviour against the constitutional principles most directly relevant to democratic governance: the First Amendment (free speech, press, assembly, religion), the Fourth Amendment (privacy and due process), the Fourteenth Amendment (equal protection and due process), and the constitutional design of checks and balances as articulated in Articles I, II, and III.

Source: U.S. Const. art. I–III; amend. I, IV, XIV (1791, 1868)

The Declaration of Independence (1776)

The foundational statement of American political philosophy: that all people are created equal, endowed with unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. VoteClarity treats these principles as the moral foundation beneath the Constitution's legal framework.

Source: The Declaration of Independence (1776); Jefferson, T. et al.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948)

Adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948, the UDHR was drafted under the leadership of Eleanor Roosevelt, representing the United States. It represents the international consensus on the rights that belong to every human being. As an American-led document that predates and helped inspire subsequent human rights law, the UDHR provides VoteClarity with a universal ethical framework that extends constitutional principles to their broadest human application.

Source: G.A. Res. 217A, U.N. Doc. A/810 (Dec. 10, 1948)

The Federalist Papers (1787–1788)

The foundational texts of American constitutional interpretation, written by Madison, Hamilton, and Jay. Federalist No. 51 articulates the necessity of checks and balances; Federalist No. 10 warns against the abuse of faction. These texts inform VoteClarity's evaluation of rule-of-law behaviour and institutional integrity.

Source: Hamilton, A., Madison, J., Jay, J. The Federalist Papers (1787–1788)

03 — CORE PRINCIPLES

The Six Principles of the Charter

The following six principles form the evaluative backbone of the VoteClarity Charter. Each principle is grounded in specific constitutional or international legal provisions, and each is translated into observable, measurable behavioural criteria for political evaluation.

I Human Dignity & Equal Protection

Every person possesses inherent dignity regardless of race, religion, gender, origin, or political affiliation. Politicians are evaluated on whether their actions uphold or undermine the equal dignity of all people. This includes voting records on anti-discrimination legislation, public statements about specific groups, and policy positions affecting vulnerable populations.

Constitutional basis: 14th Amendment (Equal Protection); UDHR Arts. 1–2; Declaration of Independence

II Constitutional Freedoms

The Bill of Rights guarantees specific freedoms that define a free society. VoteClarity evaluates alignment with the First Amendment (freedom of speech, press, assembly, and religion), the Fourth Amendment (freedom from unreasonable search and seizure), and related protections. Support for legislation that expands or restricts these freedoms is scored accordingly.

Constitutional basis: U.S. Const. amend. I, IV; UDHR Arts. 12, 18, 19, 20

III Transparency & Truthfulness in Governance

Democratic self-governance requires accurate information. The Founders considered a free press and an informed citizenry essential to the republic. VoteClarity scores politicians on the accuracy of their public statements (cross-referenced against verified sources), consistency between stated positions and legislative actions, and compliance with financial disclosure requirements. Documented disinformation directly lowers a score.

Constitutional basis: 1st Amendment (free press); UDHR Art. 19; Madison, Federalist No. 51

IV**Non-Violence & Responsible Security Policy**

The legitimate use of force by the state must be proportional, lawful, and subject to civilian democratic oversight. VoteClarity evaluates politicians on their support for civilian control of the military, proportional and lawful security policy, opposition to extrajudicial force, and — critically — any documented incitement to political violence. This principle draws on both constitutional civilian oversight provisions and UDHR Article 3 (right to life and security).

Constitutional basis: U.S. Const. art. II, sec. 2; UDHR Arts. 3, 5; Geneva Conventions

V**Accountability & Rule of Law**

Madison's constitutional design depends on no person or branch being above the law. Elected officials are evaluated on their support for judicial independence, compliance with court decisions, respect for congressional oversight, cooperation with legitimate investigations, and actions that strengthen or weaken democratic institutions. This is among the most heavily weighted dimensions, as rule-of-law behaviour is foundational to all other rights.

Constitutional basis: U.S. Const. arts. I–III; Madison, Federalist No. 51; UDHR Art. 8

VI**Long-Term Responsibility to Citizens**

The Preamble to the Constitution charges elected officials to 'promote the general Welfare' and 'secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity.' VoteClarity evaluates policy positions on public health, environmental stewardship, economic fairness, and social infrastructure — asking whether decisions serve citizens in the long term or prioritise short-term political advantage. This principle reflects the intergenerational responsibility implicit in constitutional governance.

Constitutional basis: U.S. Const. preamble; UDHR Arts. 22–27; Federalist No. 10

04 — SCORING METHODOLOGY

How Scores Are Calculated

The VoteClarity score is a weighted composite of five empirical dimensions. Each dimension is assessed using verified public data and AI-assisted classification, with human oversight applied to all disputed or borderline cases. The score ranges from 0 to 100.

Voting Alignment	Record	30%	Congressional voting records from Congress.gov and GovTrack are analysed against Charter principles across key policy areas including civil rights, rule of law, civil liberties, and long-term welfare. Abstentions are weighted separately from votes cast.
Public Consistency	Statement	20%	Public statements, interviews, speeches, and social media posts are cross-referenced with verified factual databases and compared to the politician's own prior statements and legislative record. Documented disinformation and significant reversals reduce this score.
Policy Proposals		20%	Sponsored and co-sponsored legislation is evaluated for alignment with Charter principles. Both the content of proposals and their likely societal impact (as assessed by independent policy analysis) contribute to this dimension.
Integrity & Corruption Risk		15%	Financial disclosures (FEC, OpenSecrets), ethics investigations, campaign finance compliance, and any documented conflicts of interest are assessed. Criminal convictions, civil fraud judgements, and substantiated misconduct findings significantly impact this dimension.
Crisis & Rule-of-Law Behaviour		15%	How a politician behaves during crises — national emergencies, contested elections, public health emergencies, and security incidents — reveals their commitment to constitutional norms. Respect for judicial outcomes, civilian oversight, and institutional processes are evaluated here.

Score Categories

Score Range	Category	Meaning
-------------	----------	---------

75 – 100	Strong Alignment	Consistent, documented alignment with Charter principles
50 – 74	Moderate	Generally positive record with notable exceptions or gaps
25 – 49	Concerning	Significant documented departures from Charter principles
0 – 24	High Risk	Systematic or severe violations of core Charter principles

05 — PLATFORM ARCHITECTURE & GOVERNANCE

Three Layers. One Mission.

Layer 1

VoteClarity — Public Platform

The voter-facing website and application. Allows any citizen to search any public official, view their score and full breakdown, compare candidates, and access the complete evidence trail behind every evaluation. Access is free, always, to every citizen.

Layer 2

Civic Integrity Engine — AI Evaluation System

The AI-assisted evaluation pipeline. Aggregates data from verified primary sources, applies rule-based and machine-learning classification, cross-checks claims, and generates weighted scores with full reasoning logs. All AI decisions are auditable. Disputed cases are routed to a human review panel before publication.

Layer 3

VoteClarity Charter — Ethical Foundation

This document. Defines every principle, weighting, and criterion used in evaluation. Fully public, versioned, and open to structured community amendment proposals. The Charter is maintained by an independent Ethics Board. No changes are made privately or unilaterally. Every version is permanently archived.

06 — TRANSPARENCY COMMITMENTS

What VoteClarity Commits To

- ✓ All scoring criteria, weights, and methodology are publicly documented and freely accessible.
- ✓ Every score includes a complete evidence trail citing primary sources.
- ✓ All AI decisions are logged and available for independent audit.

- ✓ Politicians or their authorised representatives may submit formal rebuttals through the platform.
- ✓ Accepted rebuttals are incorporated into the record and the score is recalculated.
- ✓ No score is changed privately. All revisions are logged with reasons.
- ✓ VoteClarity accepts no advertising, no payments from political organisations, and no financial relationships that could influence scoring.
- ✓ The full Charter and all previous versions are permanently archived and publicly accessible.
- ✓ An annual independent audit of methodology and data sources is published publicly.
- ✓ VoteClarity will publish its own governance structure, funding sources, and Ethics Board membership in full.

07 — AMENDMENT & REVIEW PROCESS

How the Charter Evolves

The VoteClarity Charter is a living document. It must be capable of evolving as democratic challenges evolve — but it must never change arbitrarily, secretly, or under political pressure.

Proposal

Any member of the public, registered user, or Ethics Board member may submit a proposed amendment through the VoteClarity platform. Proposals must specify the principle or section to be amended and provide reasoned justification.

Public Comment

All proposals are published publicly for a minimum 60-day comment period. The community may support, oppose, or modify proposals during this window.

Ethics Board Review

The independent Ethics Board reviews all proposals and public comments. Proposals require a supermajority (two-thirds) of the Ethics Board to advance.

Publication

Approved amendments are published as a new version of the Charter, with a full changelog. The previous version remains permanently archived. No retroactive changes are made to scores calculated under previous versions.

08 — STATEMENT OF NON-PARTISANSHIP

Our Commitment to Political Neutrality

VoteClarity evaluates every politician — Republican, Democrat, Independent, or otherwise — against an identical set of criteria. The Charter's principles are derived from legal documents that all elected officials swore to uphold, regardless of party affiliation. No principle in this Charter is inherently partisan.

VoteClarity acknowledges that the application of constitutional principles to specific political behaviour may produce results that, in any given moment, appear to favour one party over another. This is a reflection of the documented behaviour of politicians evaluated, not of bias in the methodology. The same behaviour in a politician of any party would produce the same score.

To protect this neutrality, VoteClarity commits to:

- Never accepting funding from political parties, campaigns, or politically-affiliated organisations.
- Maintaining an Ethics Board with balanced representation across political perspectives.
- Applying all scoring criteria symmetrically across all parties and political positions.
- Publishing all scores regardless of their political implications.
- Submitting methodology to independent academic audit annually.

09 — VERSIONING & LEGAL NOTICE

Document Information

Document Title	VoteClarity Civic Integrity Charter
Version	1.0 (Initial Release)
Publication Date	April 24, 2026
Published By	VoteClarity — voteclarity.org
Jurisdiction	United States of America
Language	English
Copyright	© 2026 VoteClarity. All rights reserved.
Licence	This Charter may be freely reproduced for non-commercial civic purposes with attribution. Commercial use is prohibited.
Archive	All versions permanently archived at voteclarity.org/charter
Contact	charter@voteclarity.org

This Charter constitutes the complete ethical and methodological foundation of the VoteClarity platform as of the date of publication. It supersedes all prior drafts and internal documents. In the event of conflict between this Charter and any other VoteClarity publication, this Charter governs.

VoteClarity is a non-partisan, non-profit civic intelligence initiative. It is not affiliated with any political party, government body, or commercial entity.