

The Constitutional Fidelity Index

A Tool for Measuring Whether Government Actions Honor the Constitution

The CFI Project

February 2026 | Policy Brief

The Problem

Americans across the political spectrum believe the government is failing to honor the Constitution. Trust in Congress, the Supreme Court, and the executive branch has fallen to historic lows. Yet when any specific government action is taken—an executive order, a new law, a court ruling—there is no shared, transparent way to ask: *Does this action actually align with constitutional principles?*

Instead, every action is evaluated through competing partisan lenses. The same executive order is simultaneously praised as patriotic and condemned as tyrannical. There is no neutral referee—and existing institutions (media, think tanks, advocacy groups) have lost the public credibility to serve as one.

What the CFI Does

The Constitutional Fidelity Index is an open-source evaluation system that scores government actions against the actual text of the Constitution and its amendments. It answers a simple question: **How well does this action align with the principles America has ratified into law?**

Every evaluation produces four things:

1. **A pass/fail check** (the “Constitutional Floor”). Does this action seriously violate a core constitutional principle—like due process, or equal protection—in a way that can’t be offset by other good features?
 - **Clear:** No serious violations found.
 - **Caution:** Potential friction with a constitutional principle.
 - **Violation:** Serious conflict with a core principle.
2. **An alignment score** (0–100). How well does the action align with constitutional principles overall? This is not a political score—it doesn’t measure “liberal” or “conservative.” It measures alignment with the ratified text.

3. **A breakdown across seven constitutional principles.** Rather than collapsing everything into a single number, the CFI shows how the action performs on each principle separately: individual rights, equal protection, democratic legitimacy, separation of powers, due process, general welfare, and national security.
4. **The strongest possible defense.** Every evaluation includes the best constitutional argument *in favor* of the action. If the government can make a strong case for what it did, that case is presented. If it can't, that tells you something important.

How It Works

The CFI evaluates every action from six different perspectives, reflecting the major ways constitutional scholars have debated constitutional meaning for over 200 years:

- **The Textualist.** What does the Constitution's plain text say? If the text doesn't address the situation, this lens stays neutral.
- **The Originalist.** What did the text mean to the people who ratified it—including those who ratified later amendments like the 14th?
- **The Doctrinalist.** Is this action consistent with established court precedent and legal tradition?
- **The Living Constitutionalists.** Does this action continue or reverse the trajectory of expanding rights and protections?
- **The Pragmatist.** What actually happens when governments take actions like this? What does the evidence show?
- **The Steelman Advocate.** What is the strongest possible constitutional defense of this action?

Five of these perspectives contribute to the score. The sixth (the Steelman) serves as a fairness check—it ensures the best case for every action is always represented.

These perspectives often disagree, and **that disagreement is the point.** The CFI doesn't hide the fact that constitutional experts interpret the same text differently. It shows you exactly where they agree and where they don't, so you can make your own judgment.

What Makes It Different

It's completely open.

Every parameter, every scoring rule, every AI prompt is published. You can inspect exactly how any score was generated. No black boxes.

It's tested for fairness.

Every month, the system evaluates fifty pairs of similar actions from Democratic and Republican administrations. If it consistently scores one party differently, that finding is published and the

system is adjusted.

It uses multiple AI systems.

No single AI company controls the output. Every action is scored by at least three AI systems from different providers, including at least one open-source system whose inner workings are publicly auditable.

It's customizable.

Disagree with how the system weighs different principles? You can take the entire framework, adjust the parts you disagree with, and publish your own version. This turns criticism from an attack into a constructive alternative.

It's honest about limitations.

Current AI systems have documented political tendencies. The CFI measures these tendencies, publishes the results, and applies corrections. It does not pretend to be perfectly neutral. It aims to be transparently imperfect and getting better.

What It Evaluates

The initial version evaluates federal government actions that produce official documentation:

- Executive orders and presidential memoranda
- Signed legislation
- Supreme Court opinions
- Major federal regulations

The system can evaluate actions from any administration, past or present. It applies the same standard to every action regardless of which party is in power.

What It Doesn't Do

The CFI does not tell you whether a policy is good or bad. It tells you whether the policy aligns with the principles encoded in the Constitution.

A policy can score well on constitutional alignment and still be unwise. A policy can score poorly and still address a genuine problem. The CFI provides one important piece of the picture—constitutional fidelity—not the whole picture.

It also does not evaluate government actions that avoid documentation: informal directives, selective enforcement, or behind-the-scenes pressure. This is a known limitation. The system evaluates what is publicly documented.

How to Read a CFI Summary Card

When the CFI evaluates a government action, the most accessible output is the Summary Card. Here is how to read it:

- **The Floor indicator** (top left, color-coded) tells you whether any core constitutional principle was seriously violated. Green means clear. Red means a serious problem was found.
- **The Alignment Score** (top right, 0–100) gives the overall constitutional alignment. 50 is neutral. Above 50 means the action generally aligns with constitutional principles; below 50 means it generally creates tension.
- **The radar chart** (center) shows how the action scored on each of the seven constitutional principles. The wider the blue area, the stronger the alignment. Red areas show tension.
- **The consensus band** around the radar chart shows how much the different perspectives agreed. A narrow band means strong consensus. A wide band means the perspectives genuinely disagreed—which means the action touches contested constitutional ground.
- **The defense margin** (bottom) shows how much the best-case constitutional defense improved the score. A small margin means even the strongest defense couldn't substantially help. A large margin means the action is more defensible than the headline score suggests.

Who Can Modify the Framework

Anyone. Changes to the CFI follow a public proposal process called the CFI Enhancement Proposal (CEP) system. If you believe a scoring rule is wrong, a constitutional principle is poorly defined, or a lens is biased, you can submit a formal proposal. Every proposal is published, debated publicly, reviewed by an independent advisory board of constitutional scholars and AI researchers, and resolved with published reasoning.

Minor adjustments get a 14-day public comment period. Major structural changes get 30 days plus advisory board review. Emergency fixes (like a discovered mathematical error) can be implemented in 48 hours with a retroactive proposal.

The Bottom Line

The framers built a system designed for self-correction: amendments, separated powers, a Bill of Rights. The CFI is a new instrument in that tradition. It takes the principles America ratified into

law and asks, with algorithmic consistency and radical transparency, whether America is honoring them.

The algorithm is published. The reasoning is visible. The counterarguments are included. The data is downloadable. The framework is yours to improve.

For the complete technical specification, mathematical methodology, and academic references, see the CFI White Paper v2.0.