United States: Liberal OS Invariant Analysis

Date: 16 February 2026 **Framework**: Classical Liberal Political OS v1.0 **Period**: 2020 – February 2026 (Biden presidency January 2021 – January 2025; Trump second term January 2025 – present)

Executive Summary

The United States is the **reference implementation** of the Liberal OS. The Constitution (1788), Bill of Rights (1791), and subsequent amendments represent the most deliberate, explicit attempt in history to harden liberal invariants into law. The First Amendment protects Information and Agency. The due process and equal protection clauses of the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments protect Agency. Federalism, separation of powers, and regular elections implement Revocability. An independent judiciary enforces the invariants against the other branches.

The period 2020–2026 provides the most rigorous stress test of constitutional hardening in the modern era. **Both major political coalitions have implemented programs that degrade different invariants** – and the constitutional architecture has responded unevenly. Where it held, invariant degradation was blocked or reversed. Where it was circumvented – through executive action, institutional pressure, or private-sector coordination – degradation proceeded despite formal constitutional protection.

The key finding: **constitutional hardening works, but it is not automatic.** The invariants require active judicial enforcement, and the enforcement mechanism itself is under stress from both directions – Democrats accuse the judiciary of partisan conservative capture; Republicans accuse the administrative state of unaccountable progressive capture. Both accusations contain structural truth. The framework evaluates structure, not parties.

The US case uniquely demonstrates the **symmetry prediction**: a well-designed Liberal OS will be attacked from multiple directions, and the invariant framework must evaluate each attack by the same standard regardless of which coalition initiates it.

Structural Context: The US in the Governance Stack

Layer	US Implementation	Significance
OS (invariants)	Agency, Information, Alternatives, Revocability	Same liberal invariants as all Liberal OS instances

Layer	US Implementation	Significance
Runtime (constitutional hardening)	Bill of Rights, separation of powers, federalism, independent judiciary, bicameral legislature, Electoral College, Article V amendment process	**Strongest constitutional hardening of any Liberal OS instance.** Invariants are written law, judicially enforceable, structurally redundant across federal and state systems
Tradition layer	Supplements the constitution: norms of institutional independence, peaceful transfer of power, prosecutorial discretion, press freedom, academic freedom	Important but secondary – the constitution is the primary defense, unlike Australia where tradition carries the invariants
Vulnerability	Programs can circumvent constitutional hardening through: executive orders (speed > judicial review), institutional capture (agencies reinterpret mandates), public-private coordination (government achieves through private actors what it cannot do directly), norm erosion (tradition layer weakens when constitutional actors defect)	Constitutional hardening creates high activation energy for invariant violation, but determined actors find routes around it

What Makes the US Case Unique

1. **Dual-direction stress test**: The period under analysis includes a Democratic administration (Biden, 2021–2025) and a Republican administration (Trump, 2025–present). Both have implemented programs that degrade invariants – but *different* invariants through *different* mechanisms. The framework must evaluate both symmetrically.

2. **Constitutional hardening under extreme load**: January 6, 2021 was a direct physical stress test of Revocability (1.4). Executive orders on both sides test Agency (1.1). Government-platform coordination tests Information (1.2). DOGE tests the separation of powers underlying all four invariants.

3. **The federalism buffer**: State governments provide an additional invariant-protection layer absent in unitary systems. When the federal government degrades an invariant, states can resist (sanctuary cities, state free speech laws, state-level election integrity measures). This creates a *distributed* invariant enforcement architecture.

Legislative Actions: Invariant-by-Invariant Analysis

Agency (1.1) – Federal DEI Mandates and Reversal

Executive Order 14035: Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce (Biden)

- **Timeline**: Signed 25 June 2021. Implemented through 2021–2024 across all federal agencies. Followed by additional directives including a June 2023 executive order extending DEIA requirements to federal contractors.
- **Mechanism**: Required all federal agencies to develop strategic DEIA plans, establish Chief Diversity Officer positions, implement identity-conscious hiring and promotion practices, and report demographic data with equity targets. Training programs mandated for all federal employees. Agencies required to address "systemic barriers" to equity in workforce composition.
- **Scale**: Approximately 2.2 million civilian federal employees and millions of federal contractors affected.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): The executive order does not formally prohibit dissent. However, when the employer is the state, mandating engagement with an ideological framework (equity as distinct from equality – the premise that disparate outcomes evidence structural bias) creates runtime distortion. Federal employees who question the framework's premises face institutional friction: negative performance reviews, exclusion from advancement, hostile workplace dynamics. The mechanism is institutional pressure, not formal prohibition. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Agency (1.1): **Degraded**. Federal employees' professional advancement tied to demonstrated engagement with a specific ideological framework. Compelled speech through mandatory training sessions requiring affirmation of contested sociological premises. The coercion is not survival-level but is career-consequential for millions of workers. - Information (1.2): **Degraded**. DEIA frameworks pre-determine analytical conclusions within the federal workforce (disparities = structural bias). This shapes policy analysis, grant allocation, regulatory priorities, and inter-agency communication. Information that contradicts equity premises is structurally discouraged.

System State: Crisis (two invariants degraded — Agency and Information — through institutional pressure rather than formal mandate)

Constitutional protection: **Partial**. The First Amendment protects federal employees' speech as citizens (Pickering v. Board of Education, 1968) but provides weaker protection for on-the-job speech (Garcetti v. Ceballos, 2006). The government-as-employer has broader authority to direct employee conduct than the government-as-sovereign. Constitutional protection exists but is attenuated in the employment context.

Status: Revoked. See below.

Executive Order: "Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs and Preferencing" (Trump)

- **Timeline**: Signed 20 January 2025 (Inauguration Day). Immediate implementation ordered. Chief Diversity Officers placed on administrative leave within days. DEI

offices across federal agencies ordered closed. Extended to federal contractors on 22 January 2025.

- **Mechanism**: Revoked EO 14035 and related Biden-era DEIA directives. Directed all federal agencies to terminate DEI, DEIA, and "environmental justice" programs. Required agencies to identify and eliminate DEI-related positions, training, and contracts within 60 days. Directed OPM to review federal employee performance standards for DEI-related criteria and remove them.
- **Extension**: A separate EO threatened to revoke federal funding from universities and institutions maintaining DEI programs, extending the reach beyond the federal workforce.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 1 (Formal encoding): The revocation itself is a legitimate exercise of executive authority – removing a prior program. However, the extension to federal contractors and universities through funding threats introduces formal encoding of an asymmetry: institutions must adopt the new administration's position on DEI (that it is wasteful/discriminatory) or lose federal funding. This inverts the previous asymmetry rather than eliminating it. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Agency (1.1): **Mixed**. The revocation of compelled DEI engagement *restores* Agency for federal employees who disagreed with the framework. But threatening to revoke university funding over DEI programs *degrades* Agency for academic institutions and their members – they must adopt the government's position on a contested ideological question or face financial penalty. The mechanism is symmetrically coercive to Biden's, targeting a different population. - Information (1.2): **Mixed**. Ending mandatory DEI framing in federal analysis *restores* information diversity within agencies. But pressuring universities to eliminate DEI programs, research, and curricula degrades Information in the academic sector – it restricts what questions can be funded and what frameworks can be taught.

System State: Strained (Agency partially restored, partially degraded in different domains; Information similarly mixed)

Constitutional protection: **Active**. Multiple federal courts issued preliminary injunctions against the university funding threats. The First Amendment protects academic freedom more robustly than government-employee speech. The judiciary is functioning as designed – blocking executive overreach into constitutionally protected domains while permitting the executive to manage its own workforce.

Status: Active. Federal workforce DEI programs terminated. University/contractor extensions under active litigation. Constitutional hardening engaging.

Information (1.2) – Government-Platform Coordination

Government Pressure on Social Media Platforms (2020–2024) and Murthy v. Missouri

- **Timeline**: 2020–2023: Extensive documented communications between Biden White House officials, Surgeon General's office, FBI, CISA (Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency), and social media platforms (Facebook/Meta, Twitter, Google/YouTube) regarding content moderation of COVID-19 information, vaccine skepticism, election integrity claims, and Hunter Biden laptop reporting. Missouri and Louisiana filed suit in 2022. Fifth Circuit ruled government conduct

likely violated the First Amendment (2023). Supreme Court decided Murthy v. Missouri on 26 June 2024.

- **Mechanism**: Government officials sent direct requests to platforms to remove or suppress specific content and accounts. Communications ranged from informational (flagging content) to coercive ("You are killing people" – President Biden on Facebook and COVID misinformation, July 2021). White House officials expressed frustration when platforms did not comply and implied regulatory consequences. CISA established a "switchboarding" operation connecting government flagging to platform action.
- **Scale**: Thousands of documented communications. Millions of pieces of content affected. Topics included: COVID-19 lab leak hypothesis (suppressed 2020–2023, later acknowledged as plausible by federal agencies), vaccine side effects (suppressed content later validated by medical research), Hunter Biden laptop (suppressed in October 2020, later authenticated by multiple outlets), election integrity claims (broad category with legitimate and illegitimate content suppressed together).

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 2 (Enforcement asymmetry): The government did not pass a censorship law. Instead, it achieved censorship-equivalent outcomes through private actors – "jawboning." The asymmetry is structural: the government has regulatory power over platforms (Section 230, antitrust, FTC enforcement) and used this leverage to shape content moderation decisions. The formal rule (Section 230) appears neutral, but enforcement creates a one-directional pressure to suppress disfavored viewpoints. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Information (1.2): **Degraded**. Citizens' ability to seek, receive, and exchange information was materially impaired. Content later validated (lab leak hypothesis, vaccine adverse events, Hunter Biden laptop authenticity) was suppressed during periods when it was most decision-relevant (elections, public health choices). The government determined what constituted "misinformation" and pressured private actors to enforce that determination. - Agency (1.1): **Degraded**. Informed choice requires accurate information. Citizens made decisions about vaccination, medical treatment, and voting based on an information environment shaped by government content preferences. The chilling effect extended to medical professionals, journalists, and researchers who self-censored to avoid platform suppression.

System State: Crisis (two invariants degraded; Information degradation during elections and public health emergencies is particularly consequential)

Constitutional protection: **Delayed but engaged.** The Supreme Court in Murthy v. Missouri (2024) ruled 6-3 that the plaintiffs lacked standing to bring the case, finding insufficient evidence that the government's communications *caused* specific injuries to the individual plaintiffs. The Court did **not** rule that the government's conduct was constitutional – it dismissed on procedural grounds. Justice Alito's dissent (joined by Thomas and Gorsuch) described the government's conduct as "the most important free speech case to reach this Court in years" and argued it constituted coercion violating the First Amendment. The standing ruling left the substantive constitutional question unresolved. - The decision demonstrates a vulnerability in constitutional hardening: procedural doctrine (standing) can prevent the judiciary from reaching the merits of an invariant violation. The constitutional protection exists in principle but failed to activate in practice.

Status: Government-platform coordination largely ceased after the litigation and political backlash. Twitter/X under Elon Musk released the "Twitter Files" (December 2022 – March 2023), documenting the coordination in detail. The House Judiciary Committee's

"Weaponization of the Federal Government" subcommittee conducted extensive investigation (2023–2024). The structural vulnerability remains – no legislation has been passed to prevent future government jawboning. The Supreme Court's standing decision means no binding precedent prohibits the practice.

Revocability (1.4) – January 6 and the Transfer of Power

January 6, 2021: Capitol Breach and Electoral Count

- **Timeline**: 6 January 2021: Following a rally at which President Trump urged supporters to march to the Capitol, a mob breached the Capitol building during the joint session of Congress certifying the 2020 Electoral College results. Approximately 2,000 people entered the building. Congress was evacuated. The certification was delayed approximately six hours before resuming and completing that night. Vice President Pence certified Joe Biden's election. The transition of power occurred on January 20, 2021.
- **Mechanism**: This was a direct physical stress test on Revocability (1.4) – the mechanism by which authority is transferred through lawful, peaceful means. The breach attempted to disrupt (not necessarily overturn – intent varied among participants) the constitutional certification process.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 1 (Formal encoding): No – there was no formal law or institutional mechanism encoding the disruption. This was an extra-legal event. - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): Yes – the event represented a runtime disruption of the constitutional transfer mechanism, even though the mechanism ultimately completed. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Revocability (1.4): **Stressed but held.** The constitutional mechanism for peaceful transfer of power was physically disrupted but completed. Congress reconvened the same day. The certification proceeded. The inauguration occurred on schedule. The invariant bent but did not break. - Agency (1.1): **Temporarily degraded.** Members of Congress were physically prevented from performing their constitutional function for several hours. Their agency as elected representatives was suspended by force.

System State: Crisis (brief – Revocability physically threatened, Agency of representatives temporarily suspended)

Constitutional protection: **Held.** The constitutional architecture proved resilient. The certification completed. The transfer occurred. The judicial system subsequently processed over 1,200 criminal cases related to the breach. The Electoral Count Reform Act of 2022 hardened the certification process by clarifying the Vice President's ministerial role and raising the threshold for objections. This is a textbook example of constitutional self-repair: a stress event exposed a vulnerability, and the system patched it through legislation.

Status: Resolved at the OS level. The transfer-of-power mechanism functioned. The subsequent legislative reform strengthened it. However, the event revealed that Revocability depends not only on constitutional text but on the willingness of political actors to accept electoral outcomes – a tradition-layer dependency even in a constitutionally hardened system.

Trump's Second Inauguration and Pardons of January 6 Defendants (January 2025)

- **Timeline**: On 20 January 2025, President Trump issued pardons and commutations for approximately 1,500 individuals charged in connection with the January 6 Capitol breach, including those convicted of violent offenses against police officers.
- **Mechanism**: The presidential pardon power (Article II, Section 2) is essentially unlimited for federal offenses. Trump characterized the prosecutions as politically motivated and the defendants as political prisoners.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 2 (Enforcement asymmetry): The pardon power is formally symmetric – any president can pardon any federal offense. However, pardoning participants in an attack on the transfer-of-power mechanism creates an enforcement asymmetry: future attempts to disrupt Revocability face reduced deterrence. The law against disrupting congressional proceedings exists, but its enforcement has been retroactively nullified for this specific category of offense. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Revocability (1.4): **Strained.** The pardons do not directly impair the transfer mechanism. But they degrade the deterrent architecture surrounding Revocability. If disrupting the constitutional transfer process carries no lasting legal consequence, the invariant's enforcement credibility is weakened. Future actors may calculate that political disruption of certification carries acceptable risk.

System State: Strained (deterrent degradation of Revocability enforcement, not direct invariant violation)

Constitutional protection: **Formally intact but structurally weakened.** The pardon power is itself constitutional. The president used a constitutional mechanism in a way that weakens another constitutional mechanism. This is an intra-constitutional tension that the framers anticipated imperfectly – the pardon power was designed for mercy, not for nullifying accountability for attacks on the constitutional order itself.

Status: Active. Pardons issued and executed. No legal mechanism to reverse them. The structural effect on Revocability deterrence is ongoing.

Agency (1.1) + Revocability (1.4) – DOGE and Executive Power Expansion

Department of Government Efficiency (DOGE)

- **Timeline**: Established by executive order in January 2025. Led by Elon Musk (initially as "Special Government Employee," later with ambiguous formal status). Began operations immediately, accessing federal agency systems and data within days of inauguration. Active through February 2026.
- **Mechanism**: DOGE was granted access to federal agency IT systems, personnel databases, financial systems, and in some cases sensitive personal data (Treasury payment systems, OPM personnel records, Social Security Administration databases). DOGE personnel – primarily young engineers from Musk's companies – obtained access to systems containing personally identifiable information (PII) of millions of Americans, federal contracts, and payment data. DOGE recommended and in some cases directly implemented: mass firings of federal employees

(particularly probationary employees), termination of federal contracts, shutdown of entire agencies (USAID effectively dismantled), and spending freezes.

- **Scale**: Thousands of federal employees fired or placed on leave. Billions in federal contracts paused or terminated. Multiple agencies had operations significantly disrupted. USAID, the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), and the Department of Education targeted for elimination or dramatic reduction.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 2 (Enforcement asymmetry): DOGE operates with presidential authorization but outside normal statutory authority. Federal agency access, personnel decisions, and spending authority are governed by statutes (Administrative Procedure Act, Impoundment Control Act, civil service protections). DOGE bypasses these statutory frameworks through claimed executive authority, creating an enforcement asymmetry: it exercises power that would normally require Congressional authorization or administrative due process. - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): Even where DOGE's actions are within arguable executive authority, the speed and scale of implementation – mass firings, system access, spending freezes – outpace the judicial and legislative review mechanisms designed to check executive action. The runtime operates faster than the constitutional review cycle. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Agency (1.1): **Degraded.** Federal employees fired without standard due process protections. Citizens dependent on federal services (Social Security, veterans' benefits, food safety inspection) face service disruption without recourse. The mass access to personal data by non-government personnel (Musk's engineers with unclear legal authority and security clearances) degrades the autonomy of millions of citizens whose PII is now accessible outside normal privacy safeguards. - Revocability (1.4): **Degraded.** DOGE's authority derives from the president but is exercised by an unelected individual (Musk) with personal financial interests affected by federal policy (Tesla receives federal subsidies, SpaceX holds federal contracts, X/Twitter faces regulatory scrutiny). The provenance principle is directly engaged: authority exercised by someone who cannot be removed by the electorate, and whose personal financial interests conflict with his governmental role, degrades the Revocability chain. Congress has not authorized DOGE's scope, and the speed of action limits Congressional oversight. - Alternatives (1.3): **Degraded.** Elimination of agencies (USAID, CFPB) removes institutional alternatives for populations dependent on their services. Federal employees face termination without standard civil service appeal mechanisms. The Impoundment Control Act requires Congressional approval for the executive to withhold appropriated funds — DOGE's spending freezes may violate this requirement, eliminating the legislative alternative.

System State: Authoritarian Dynamics (Revocability + Agency + Alternatives degraded — unelected authority exercising quasi-governmental power without Congressional authorization, with personal financial conflicts of interest)

Constitutional protection: **Active but outpaced.** Multiple federal courts issued temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions against DOGE actions: courts blocked mass firings, ordered reinstatement of probationary employees, blocked the dismantling of USAID, and ordered DOGE to return or secure sensitive data. A federal judge in February 2025 ordered DOGE personnel disconnected from Treasury payment systems. The judiciary is functioning – but the speed of executive action means significant damage occurs before judicial review can engage. This reveals a structural vulnerability: constitutional hardening assumes the review cycle is faster than the action cycle. When it is not, invariants are degraded in the interim.

Status: Active and highly contested. Ongoing litigation across multiple federal courts. Congressional oversight hearings initiated. The structural question – whether an unelected individual with massive conflicts of interest can exercise quasi-governmental authority at this scale – remains unresolved.

Agency (1.1) + Information (1.2) – Title IX Reinterpretation

Biden Title IX Expansion (April 2024)

- **Timeline**: Final rule published April 2024, effective August 2024. Immediately challenged in court. Blocked in over 20 states by preliminary injunctions before taking effect.
- **Mechanism**: The Biden Department of Education issued new Title IX regulations expanding the definition of sex discrimination to include sexual orientation and gender identity. Required educational institutions receiving federal funding to: allow students to use facilities consistent with their gender identity, use preferred pronouns, and treat gender identity as sex for purposes of non-discrimination protections. Created new investigative and adjudicatory requirements for institutions.
- **Compelled speech element**: The pronoun-use requirement and the mandate to affirm gender identity in institutional communications constitute compelled speech – institutions and individuals must adopt a contested conceptual framework or face Title IX enforcement action and potential loss of federal funding.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 1 (Formal encoding): Yes – the regulation formally encodes a specific ideological position (gender identity is equivalent to biological sex) into the condition for receiving federal education funding. Institutions that dissent from this position lose funding. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Agency (1.1): **Degraded.** Educators, administrators, and students at federally funded institutions are compelled to affirm a contested ideological framework. Dissent carries institutional penalties (Title IX investigation, potential funding loss). Religious institutions face a direct conflict between their institutional convictions and federal requirements. - Information (1.2): **Degraded.** The regulation shapes the information environment within educational institutions – what can be said, what questions can be raised, what positions can be held regarding sex and gender. Academic inquiry into sex-based differences is chilled. - Alternatives (1.3): **Degraded.** Because the regulation applies to all institutions receiving federal funding (which includes nearly all colleges and universities through student loans), the alternative of attending a non-compliant institution is effectively eliminated. The funding mechanism creates near-universal compliance pressure.

System State: Crisis (three invariants degraded)

Constitutional protection: **Active and effective.** Federal courts in multiple jurisdictions issued preliminary injunctions blocking the rule. Courts found the regulation likely exceeded the Department of Education's statutory authority and raised serious First Amendment concerns. The rule was blocked in over 20 states before taking effect. The Trump administration withdrew the regulation in early 2025. This is constitutional hardening working as designed – the judiciary blocked executive overreach, and the political process (election of a new administration) reversed the policy.

Status: Withdrawn. The Biden rule never took full effect due to judicial intervention. Constitutional hardening successfully prevented sustained invariant degradation.

Information (1.2) + Agency (1.1) – State-Level Book Restrictions and Curriculum Laws

State Book Removal and Curriculum Restriction Laws (2021–2025)

- **Timeline**: Beginning in 2021, a wave of state-level legislation restricted books available in school libraries and curricula, primarily in Republican-governed states. Florida's HB 1467 (2022) required review of all school library books, leading to removal of thousands of titles. Texas, Tennessee, Utah, South Carolina, and other states passed similar measures. Florida's "Don't Say Gay" law (Parental Rights in Education Act, 2022) prohibited classroom instruction on sexual orientation and gender identity in grades K-3 (later expanded). Multiple states passed laws restricting teaching of concepts related to "critical race theory" or "divisive concepts."
- **Mechanism**: Laws restrict which books can be held in school libraries, which concepts can be taught in classrooms, and which frameworks educators may use. Enforcement varies: some laws create review boards, others allow parental challenges that result in book removal pending review, others impose penalties on educators.
- **Counterpoint**: Supporters argue these are curriculum decisions legitimately made by elected officials accountable to parents. The framework must evaluate the structural effect on invariants, not the motivation.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 1 (Formal encoding): Yes – these are laws that formally restrict the information available to students in public educational settings. The restriction is encoded in statute. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Information (1.2): **Degraded.** Students' ability to access information in public institutions is formally restricted. While parents retain the ability to provide restricted materials privately, the public institution – which is the primary educational environment for most students – has a narrowed information environment. The chilling effect on educators further restricts the information actually available in practice. - Agency (1.1): **Strained.** Educators face professional consequences for teaching material that the law restricts. Their professional autonomy is constrained by legislative mandate rather than professional judgment or parental choice at the individual level.

System State: Strained (Information degraded in public educational settings; Agency constrained for educators)

Constitutional protection: **Partial and contested.** The Supreme Court established in Board of Education v. Pico (1982) that school boards cannot remove library books for partisan or ideological reasons, but can make curriculum decisions based on educational suitability. The distinction is actively litigated. Federal courts have issued mixed rulings – some book removal policies upheld, others enjoined. The First Amendment protection for students' right to receive information in public schools exists but is weaker than adult First Amendment protections. The federalism layer is relevant: state legislatures have legitimate authority over public school curricula, and the tension between democratic curriculum control and information access is a genuine constitutional boundary question.

Status: Active across multiple states. Ongoing litigation. The federalism buffer means the analysis varies significantly by jurisdiction – some states restrict aggressively, others protect access aggressively. The distributed architecture provides Alternatives (1.3) –

families can relocate or choose private/homeschool options – but this alternative carries costs that make it non-trivially accessible for lower-income families.

Agency (1.1) + Alternatives (1.3) – Immigration Executive Orders

Trump Executive Order on Birthright Citizenship (January 2025)

- **Timeline**: Signed 20 January 2025. Immediately challenged in court. Temporarily blocked by a federal judge in Seattle within days.
- **Mechanism**: The executive order directed federal agencies to deny citizenship recognition to children born in the United States whose parents were both unlawfully present or on temporary visas. This directly contradicts the Fourteenth Amendment's Citizenship Clause ("All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States") as interpreted by the Supreme Court in United States v. Wong Kim Ark (1898).

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 1 (Formal encoding): Yes – the executive order formally encodes a restriction on citizenship recognition that contradicts the constitutional text and Supreme Court precedent. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test (if implemented): - Agency (1.1): **Would be degraded.** Denying citizenship to persons born on US soil would eliminate their political agency as citizens — voting rights, legal protections, residency rights. For affected individuals, all four invariants would be effectively negated. - Alternatives (1.3): **Would be degraded.** Non-citizen status in the country of one's birth would eliminate alternatives for association, economic participation, and governance participation.

Invariant Test (actual status): - No invariant violation has occurred, because the order was blocked before implementation. The framework does not classify blocked executive orders as violations — only enacted laws and enforced policies trigger the evaluation.

System State: Stable (no invariant degraded — constitutional hardening prevented implementation)

Constitutional protection: **Immediate and effective.** A federal district judge issued a temporary restraining order blocking the order within days, calling it "blatantly unconstitutional." The Fourteenth Amendment's text is unambiguous, and the Supreme Court precedent (Wong Kim Ark) is directly on point. This is constitutional hardening at maximum effectiveness — explicit constitutional text enforced by an independent judiciary blocked executive action before it could degrade invariants.

Status: Blocked. The executive order has not been implemented. This is the **strongest case study** in the report of constitutional hardening working exactly as designed. The invariant (Agency for citizens born on US soil) is protected by explicit constitutional text, and the judiciary enforced it immediately.

Mass Immigration Enforcement and Deportation Operations (2025)

- **Timeline**: January 2025 onward. Trump administration launched large-scale immigration enforcement including ICE operations in previously restricted locations (schools, churches, courthouses), invocation of the Alien Enemies Act of 1798 for

deportation of alleged gang members, and military deployment to the southern border.

- **Mechanism**: Expanded enforcement operations, narrowed prosecutorial discretion, invoked rarely-used wartime statutes, increased detention capacity, pressured sanctuary jurisdictions through funding threats.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): Immigration enforcement is a legitimate government function. However, the scale, speed, and methods of enforcement create runtime distortion: operations in sensitive locations (churches, schools) chill the exercise of other rights (religious assembly, education); invocation of wartime statutes for peacetime enforcement raises due process concerns; deportation of individuals with arguable legal status without full adjudication degrades Agency. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Agency (1.1): **Strained.** Enforcement operations in sensitive locations create a chilling effect on the broader population's exercise of assembly and religious freedom. Expedited removal processes may deprive individuals of due process. Citizens and legal residents in immigrant communities report self-censoring and avoiding public spaces. - Alternatives (1.3): **Degraded for affected populations.** Individuals facing deportation under expedited processes have reduced access to legal alternatives (counsel, judicial review, asylum claims).

System State: Strained (Agency chilled, Alternatives restricted for directly affected populations)

Constitutional protection: **Active.** Federal courts blocked the Alien Enemies Act deportation flights (a federal judge ordered the return of deportees sent to El Salvador under the Act). The ACLU and other organizations have active litigation challenging enforcement in sensitive locations. The judiciary is engaging, though (as with DOGE) the speed of executive action outpaces judicial review in individual cases.

Status: Active and contested. Constitutional hardening engaging but with gaps between action speed and review speed.

Revocability (1.4) + Information (1.2) – DOJ Independence

Concerns About DOJ Politicization (Both Administrations)

- **Timeline**: 2021–2026. Under Biden: prosecution of January 6 participants (justified as rule-of-law enforcement; characterized by Republicans as political persecution); appointment of Special Counsel Jack Smith to investigate Trump (justified as independent investigation; characterized by Republicans as election interference). Under Trump: firing of career prosecutors, dismissal of cases against January 6 defendants, threatened investigations of political opponents (Biden, prosecutors who brought cases against Trump), installation of loyalist leadership at DOJ and FBI.
- **Mechanism**: The DOJ operates under executive authority but with a tradition of independence from political direction in individual cases. This tradition is a norm, not a constitutional requirement – the president is the chief executive and the Attorney General serves at the president's pleasure. Both administrations are accused of eroding the norm from different directions.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): DOJ independence is a tradition-layer protection, not a constitutional guarantee. The runtime distortion occurs when prosecutorial decisions are made on political rather than legal grounds – whether that means prosecuting political opponents or declining to prosecute political allies. Both directions degrade the same invariant. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Revocability (1.4): **Degraded.** If the DOJ is perceived as — or actually becomes — a tool of the incumbent administration, the accountability mechanism is corrupted. The government cannot be held accountable through legal processes if the legal process is directed by the government for political purposes. This applies symmetrically: Biden-era prosecution of Trump could be seen as weaponizing DOJ against a political opponent; Trump-era dismissal of cases against allies and threatened prosecution of opponents is the mirror image. - Information (1.2): **Degraded.** Politically directed investigations shape public information during elections. The timing and public disclosure of investigations has information effects that influence democratic outcomes.

System State: Authoritarian Dynamics (Revocability + Information degraded — prosecutorial independence norms eroding from both directions, corrupting the accountability mechanism)

Constitutional protection: **Structural but norm-dependent.** The Constitution gives the president executive authority including over the DOJ. It does not require prosecutorial independence – it requires separation of powers. The check on DOJ politicization comes from: Congressional oversight (functioning but partisan), the judiciary (which can dismiss politically motivated cases), and tradition (the norm of DOJ independence). The norm is weakening under stress from both directions.

Status: Active and deteriorating. The tradition of DOJ independence – which served as a key protection for Revocability – is eroding. Neither side has an incentive to restore it while they hold power. This is a classic norm-destruction spiral: each side's violation justifies the other's escalation.

Information (1.2) – Campus Speech and Academic Freedom

Campus Speech Climate (2020–2026)

- **Timeline**: Throughout the period. Pre-2025: Progressive speech codes, DEI requirements for faculty hiring (some universities required "diversity statements" as conditions of employment), disinvitation of speakers, and social media mobs targeting academics for heterodox views. Post-October 2023: Congressional hearings on university responses to antisemitism following Hamas attack on Israel; university presidents resigned under pressure; federal investigations of Title VI violations. Post-January 2025: Trump administration threats to revoke tax-exempt status and federal funding from universities maintaining DEI programs or deemed insufficiently responsive to antisemitism.
- **Mechanism**: The threats to academic freedom come from multiple directions: (a) internal progressive orthodoxy enforced through hiring committees, peer pressure, and social media; (b) conservative legislative pressure through funding threats, investigations, and board appointments; (c) donor pressure (withdrawal of donations over political positions); (d) federal government pressure through funding conditionality.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 3 (Runtime distortion): No single law formally prohibits academic speech. But the combined effect of institutional DEI requirements, funding conditionality, Congressional pressure, and social media mobs creates a runtime environment where academic freedom is materially constrained. Self-censorship is the primary mechanism. Surveys consistently show a majority of faculty and students across the political spectrum report self-censoring on politically sensitive topics. - Proceed to invariant test.

Invariant Test: - Information (1.2): **Degraded.** Academic freedom is the engine of the knowledge system that informs democratic governance. When academics self-censor – whether due to progressive orthodoxy or conservative political pressure – the quality of information available to society degrades. The mechanism differs by direction (internal institutional pressure vs. external government pressure) but the effect on the invariant is the same. - Agency (1.1): **Degraded.** Academics who face career consequences for heterodox views (denial of tenure, social media targeting, loss of grants) have their professional agency constrained. This applies to conservatives in progressive-dominated departments and to progressives in states with legislative restrictions on academic content.

System State: Strained (Information and Agency degraded through converging pressures from multiple directions)

Constitutional protection: **Strong in principle, weak in practice.** The First Amendment robustly protects academic speech from government censorship (Keyishian v. Board of Regents, 1967: academic freedom is "a special concern of the First Amendment"). But the primary mechanism of degradation is self-censorship driven by institutional culture and social pressure, which the First Amendment does not reach. Government funding conditionality creates a constitutional gray zone – the government cannot directly censor academics, but can it condition funding on ideological compliance? The doctrine of unconstitutional conditions suggests not, but litigation is ongoing.

Status: Active. Degradation from both directions. Constitutional protection effective against direct government censorship but ineffective against the primary mechanisms (institutional culture, self-censorship, social media pressure).

Agency (1.1) + Alternatives (1.3) – Industrial Policy Without Explicit Mandate

Inflation Reduction Act (August 2022)

- **Timeline**: Signed 16 August 2022. $369 billion in energy and climate spending. Originally proposed as Build Back Better ($3.5 trillion), negotiated down through Senate process. Passed via budget reconciliation (simple majority, no Republican votes).
- **Mechanism**: Massive federal subsidies for electric vehicles, renewable energy, battery manufacturing, and climate-related investment. Tax credits conditioned on domestic manufacturing, union labor, and domestic mineral sourcing requirements. Effectively redirects significant portions of the economy toward government-preferred technologies and away from alternatives.

Pre-Evaluation Triage: - Step 4 (Distributional artifact): Industrial policy is a legitimate program-level decision. Democratic governments allocate resources through legislative processes. The IRA passed through constitutional channels (budget reconciliation is a lawful procedure). The distributional effects (benefits to some industries, costs to others) are side effects of otherwise legitimate policy. - **However**, Step 3 (Runtime distortion) may apply: The scale of market intervention ($369 billion in directed subsidies) reshapes economic alternatives. Industries that compete with subsidized alternatives face structural disadvantage not from market forces but from government preference. This is a program-level decision with OS-level consequences if it degrades Alternatives.

Invariant Test: - Alternatives (1.3): **Intact.** Government industrial policy narrows the range of economically viable alternatives by subsidizing preferred options. However, the subsidies are incentives, not mandates — market participants can still choose non-subsidized alternatives, though at competitive disadvantage. This is closer to Step 4 (distributional artifact) than Step 3 (runtime distortion) for most affected parties. No invariant violation. - Agency (1.1): **Intact.** No coercion or compulsion. Individuals and businesses retain freedom of choice, though the choice landscape is shaped by subsidy structure.

System State: Stable (no invariant degraded — this is a program-level policy decision that passed through constitutional channels)

Constitutional protection: Not required – the action passed through constitutional channels.

Status: Active. Implementation ongoing. The framework classifies this as a program-level policy decision, not an OS-level violation. It is included for completeness and to demonstrate that the framework does not classify every government action as an invariant threat.

Pattern Analysis

Legislative/Executive Action	Invariant(s) Affected	Constitutional Protection	Outcome
Biden federal DEI mandates (EO 14035)	Agency (1.1), Information (1.2)	Partial (weak for government employees)	Crisis — revoked by subsequent administration
Trump anti-DEI EO + university threats	Agency (1.1), Information (1.2)	Active (courts blocking university provisions)	Strained — federal workforce active; university extensions under injunction

Legislative/Executive Action	Invariant(s) Affected	Constitutional Protection	Outcome
Government-platform censorship coordination	Information (1.2), Agency (1.1)	**Failed** (dismissed on standing in Murthy v. Missouri)	Crisis — ceased politically, no legal prohibition established
January 6 Capitol breach	Revocability (1.4), Agency (1.1)	**Held** (process completed, ECRA reform enacted)	Stable — system self-repaired
January 6 pardons	Revocability (1.4)	None (pardon power is constitutional)	Strained — deterrent architecture weakened
DOGE operations	Agency (1.1), Revocability (1.4), Alternatives (1.3)	Active but outpaced (courts issuing injunctions)	Authoritarian Dynamics — contested; ongoing litigation
Biden Title IX expansion	Agency (1.1), Information (1.2), Alternatives (1.3)	**Effective** (blocked by courts in 20+ states)	Stable — blocked before implementation
State book bans / curriculum laws	Information (1.2), Agency (1.1)	Partial (contested in courts)	Crisis — active; varies by state
Birthright citizenship EO	Agency (1.1), Alternatives (1.3)	**Immediate and effective** (blocked within days)	Stable — blocked; constitutional text enforced
Immigration enforcement escalation	Agency (1.1), Alternatives (1.3)	Active (courts blocking specific methods)	Crisis — contested; ongoing
DOJ independence erosion	Revocability (1.4), Information (1.2)	Structural but norm-dependent	Authoritarian Dynamics — deteriorating from both directions
Campus speech climate	Information (1.2), Agency (1.1)	Strong in principle, weak against self-censorship	Crisis — active; degradation

Legislative/Executive Action	Invariant(s) Affected	Constitutional Protection	Outcome
			from both directions
Inflation Reduction Act	None	Not required (passed constitutionally)	Stable — program-level decision; no OS violation

---

Key Finding

Constitutional hardening works – but it has a speed problem, a standing problem, and a norm-erosion problem.

1. **Where constitutional text is explicit, protection is immediate.** The birthright citizenship executive order was blocked within days because the Fourteenth Amendment's text is unambiguous and Supreme Court precedent is directly on point. The Biden Title IX expansion was blocked because courts found it exceeded statutory authority. These are the strongest demonstrations of constitutional hardening in the analysis.

2. **Where the mechanism is novel, courts struggle to engage.** Government-platform censorship coordination (jawboning) was a new mechanism the constitutional framework had not encountered at scale. The Supreme Court dismissed Murthy v. Missouri on standing rather than reaching the merits. The constitutional protection *exists* (the First Amendment clearly prohibits government censorship) but the procedural machinery failed to deliver it. **The invariant was degraded during the period when it mattered most** (2020 election, COVID-19 pandemic), and the constitutional system has yet to establish a rule preventing recurrence.

3. **Speed asymmetry is the primary vulnerability.** DOGE's operations, mass immigration enforcement, and the Biden-era regulatory expansion all share a common pattern: executive action moves faster than judicial review. Courts ultimately engage and frequently block the action, but damage occurs in the interim – employees fired, data accessed, rights chilled. Constitutional hardening assumes the review cycle is faster than the action cycle. Modern executive operations have inverted this assumption.

4. **Norm erosion degrades invariants that constitutional text does not directly protect.** DOJ independence, prosecutorial discretion, and academic freedom are norm-carried invariant protections. Both political coalitions have eroded these norms. The Constitution does not require prosecutorial independence – it requires separation of powers. When the norms that interpret those structural requirements erode, the invariants they protected are exposed.

5. **The symmetry prediction is confirmed.** Biden-era programs degraded Agency (DEI mandates, Title IX compelled speech) and Information (government-platform coordination). Trump-era programs degrade Agency (DOGE mass firings), Revocability (January 6 pardons, DOGE's unaccountable authority), and Alternatives

(immigration enforcement methods, agency elimination). **The Liberal OS is attacked from multiple directions simultaneously.** A framework that only identifies threats from one direction is analytically incomplete.

The Constitutional Hardening Advantage

Compared to Australia (analyzed in the companion report), the US case demonstrates what constitutional hardening provides:

Test	Australia (tradition-only)	United States (constitutionally hardened)
Misinformation regulation	Bill reached Parliament; defeated by political opposition	Jawboning proceeded; Murthy v. Missouri reached Supreme Court on First Amendment grounds
DEI mandates for government workforce	Implemented with no resistance mechanism	Implemented, then revoked by subsequent administration; university extension blocked by courts
Religious freedom	Protections abandoned; ALRC recommending removal of existing protections	First Amendment provides robust protection; Establishment and Free Exercise clauses actively enforced
Birthright citizenship	N/A (not an Australian issue in this form)	Executive order blocked within days by explicit constitutional text
Executive overreach (DOGE equivalent)	No structural equivalent; parliamentary system gives executive control of legislature	Courts issuing injunctions; separation of powers creating active friction

The difference is not that the US faces fewer threats – it faces more. The difference is that the US has a constitutionally armed judiciary that can block executive and legislative action in real time. This does not prevent all invariant degradation (the speed problem, the standing problem, and the norm-erosion problem are real), but it provides a structural correction mechanism that Australia lacks.

Framework Prediction

The US trajectory tests the following prediction:

> A Liberal OS with strong constitutional hardening is resilient to invariant degradation **at the formal level** but vulnerable to degradation **at the speed, procedural, and norm layers.** The constitutional architecture will block the most explicit violations (birthright citizenship, Title IX overreach) but struggle with: novel mechanisms (jawboning), speed asymmetries (DOGE, executive orders), and norm erosion (DOJ independence, academic freedom). The system will

> oscillate between administrations that degrade different invariants, with each side's violations partially corrected by the other's election – but the norm layer erodes with each cycle because each side's violation normalizes the other's escalation.

The structural prescription from the framework:

1. **Close the speed gap.** The constitutional review cycle must be accelerated for executive actions that affect large populations. Emergency injunction procedures exist but are strained by the volume of simultaneous challenges.

2. **Close the standing gap.** Murthy v. Missouri demonstrated that the most significant Information invariant violation of the period was dismissed on procedural grounds. Standing doctrine must evolve to address government action that affects the entire information environment rather than identifiable individual plaintiffs.

3. **Harden the norms.** DOJ independence, prosecutorial discretion, and the boundary between government communication and government coercion of private actors need to be legislated, not left to tradition. The US system was designed assuming good faith among constitutional actors. When that assumption fails, the system needs statutory backstops for what was previously norm-enforced.

4. **Maintain symmetrical analysis.** The greatest risk to the Liberal OS is not either political coalition – it is the collapse of the capacity to evaluate both symmetrically. If citizens can only see invariant degradation from the opposing side, the iterative correction loop (Agency + Information + Alternatives + Revocability) is itself degraded. The framework's insistence on structural rather than partisan analysis is not a stylistic choice – it is an operational requirement for the correction loop to function.

Sources

- Executive Order 14035 — Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce (June 25, 2021)
- Trump EO: Ending Radical and Wasteful Government DEI Programs (January 20, 2025)
- Murthy v. Missouri, 603 U.S. ___ (2024) — Supreme Court Opinion
- Twitter Files — Congressional Testimony and Document Archive
- Electoral Count Reform and Presidential Transition Improvement Act of 2022
- DOGE Executive Order — Establishing the Department of Government Efficiency (January 2025)
- Federal Court Orders on DOGE Data Access — Treasury Systems
- Trump Executive Order on Birthright Citizenship (January 20, 2025)
- Federal Court Blocks Birthright Citizenship Order — Judge Coughenour Ruling, W.D. Washington (January 2025)
- United States v. Wong Kim Ark, 169 U.S. 649 (1898)
- Biden Title IX Final Rule (April 2024)
- Inflation Reduction Act — Summary and Text
- Board of Education v. Pico, 457 U.S. 853 (1982)
- Garcetti v. Ceballos, 547 U.S. 410 (2006)
- Pickering v. Board of Education, 391 U.S. 563 (1968)
- PEN America — Book Bans and Censorship in US Schools Index

- FIRE — Faculty and Student Self-Censorship Survey Data
- January 6 Pardons — Executive Grant of Clemency (January 20, 2025)
- Alien Enemies Act Deportation Flights — J.G.G. v. Trump, D.C. District Court (2025)
- Impoundment Control Act of 1974 — Congressional Research Service Report R45442