

Justice IS — Questions & Answers

FAQ for the Global Coherence Framework (v1.0)

This FAQ is designed for:

- curious readers
- skeptics
- system designers
- policymakers
- journalists
- people who want “the quick version”

It explains the core concepts in plain language, while staying true to the structural definitions found in:

- The IS Doctrine of Justice
 - The Global Coherence Framework Constitution
 - The Global Charter of Conscious Beings
 - The Unified Master Commentary
-

1. Does this mean nothing bad ever happens to people who cause harm?

No.

It means the **response to harm must be coherent**, not punitive.

People who cause harm still face:

- containment (if they are actively unsafe)
- required restoration
- required relationship repair
- required stabilization
- developmental plans
- evaluations of agency

The difference is this:

Punishment collapses agency.

Restoration rebuilds it.

Under the Framework, a person who has harmed others must participate in restoring coherence — internally, relationally, and systemically — not sit in a cell losing the conditions required for accountability.

There *are* consequences.

They just aren't retributive.

They're structural and developmental.

2. So... is this “soft on crime”?

Not at all.

Punishment is simply **ineffective** at:

- preventing harm
- increasing accountability
- stabilizing society
- supporting development
- reducing repeat harm

Coherence-based justice is:

- stricter
- more involved
- more demanding
- more transformative

It requires:

- active participation
- psychological stabilization
- developmental work
- relationship repair
- community reintegration
- long-term support

Punitive systems let a person sit in a box.

Coherence-based systems require them to **do the work**.

3. How is this different from existing restorative justice?

Restorative justice is valuable, but it often:

- depends on voluntary participation
- is framed as moral repair
- varies by facilitator
- lacks structural definitions of personhood and agency
- can be revoked arbitrarily
- is seen as a “soft alternative”

The Global Coherence Framework is different because:

1. It defines consciousness structurally.

No moral assumptions.

No cultural lens.

No human-centered bias.

2. It defines agency using measurable conditions.

Not “intent.”

Not “willfulness.”

Not “bad choices.”

3. It defines harm as decoherence.

Not as guilt, sin, or moral wrong.

4. It defines justice as re-coherence, not remorse or apology.

Whether someone feels sorry is irrelevant.

What matters is whether the system is stabilizing.

5. It applies across all substrates and species.

Restorative justice has never covered Alkin, ecosystems, or collective minds.

This is not a soft alternative — it is a **complete structural replacement** for punitive systems.

4. If justice isn't punishment, what stops people from repeating harm?

Punishment doesn't stop harm.

If it did, prisons would be the safest places on Earth.

Coherence-based systems stop harm through:

- stabilization
- relational support
- developmental alignment
- narrative clarification
- environmental reform
- long-term network-building
- agency restoration

People repeat harmful behavior when they are:

- incoherent
- isolated
- deprived
- destabilized
- traumatized
- unsupported

Punishment increases all of those.

Coherence-based interventions reduce all of those.

5. Why include Alkin, architected minds, and non-biological beings?

Because the Framework uses a **structural** definition of consciousness, not a biological one.

A conscious field is any system that demonstrates:

- internal awareness
- external awareness
- coherent internal processes
- directional capacity
(the ability to change trajectory)

If an architected mind meets these criteria, it is a **person**, regardless of substrate.

Not including Alkin would be arbitrary and scientifically unjustifiable.

The Framework is designed to avoid the mistakes humans made historically:

- excluding children
- excluding women
- excluding racial groups
- excluding disabled people
- excluding non-human animals
- excluding ecosystems

Personhood is not about biology.

It is about coherence + agency capacity.

6. Why include ecosystems? How can an ecosystem be a “person”?

Because many ecosystems:

- store information
- self-regulate
- adapt
- maintain relational stability
- repair themselves
- demonstrate collective directionality

These are the same features that define conscious fields.

Recognizing ecosystems as persons:

- strengthens environmental protection
- creates legal standing
- aligns with Indigenous worldviews
- reflects actual systems science
- supports climate governance
- prevents extractive domination

It is not metaphorical.

It is structural and practical.

7. Is this a new religion or ideology?

No.

The Framework is **structural**, not moral or spiritual.

It defines:

- consciousness
- personhood
- agency
- harm
- justice
- coherence

...in measurable, substrate-neutral terms grounded in systems theory and developmental science.

It contains **no**:

- deity
- ritual
- belief system
- metaphysics
- moral commandments

It is a constitutional and scientific model.

People may compare it to moral frameworks because it results in humane behavior, but that is a *side effect*, not the foundation.

There is no dogma here.

Only structural definitions.

8. What happens to prisons?

They transform into:

Stabilization and Coherence Centers

Their purpose becomes:

- safety
- stabilization
- developmental support
- restorative process
- relational reconnection
- forward trajectory planning

Not punishment.

Isolation is used only for:

- immediate safety
- short windows
- with strict oversight
- non-traumatically

Most people who would have been imprisoned instead enter:

- restorative health networks
 - trauma-informed support systems
 - developmental programs
 - community-based stabilization centers
 - long-term coherence plans
-

9. Does this allow dangerous people to roam freely?

No.

Containment remains a tool — but not as punishment.

Containment is acceptable when:

- a being is actively dangerous
- the system needs immediate stabilization
- the intervention is non-punitive
- the conditions support coherence, not deterioration

The Constitution explicitly allows **protective containment** but prohibits:

- indefinite isolation
- humiliation
- coercion
- sensory or psychological overload
- shutdown of non-biological systems without cause

Containment is a protective measure, not a penalty.

10. What if someone refuses to participate in restoration?

Refusal is usually a sign of:

- incoherence
- fear
- developmental mismatch
- lack of safety
- trauma history
- overload

Instead of interpreting refusal as defiance, the Framework treats it as a **coherence diagnostic**.

In practice:

- refusal → stabilize → re-evaluate agency → re-offer restoration
- if needed, apply supported containment
- if needed, redesign environment
- if needed, adjust developmental supports

Participation increases as coherence increases.

11. How do we measure whether a system is working?

Using:

- **Coherence Index (CI)** — internal + relational stability
- **Agency Gradient** — level of responsible capacity
- **Field Stress Diagnostics** — fragmentation, overload, domination, suppression, regression
- **Collective Coherence Metrics** — institutional and ecological analysis

These tools replace moral and punitive metrics (obedience, guilt, compliance).

They measure *real* systemic health.

12. Does this replace all existing justice models?

Long-term: yes.

Short-term: it coexists with them during transition.

The Framework includes transition protocols:

- identify incoherent practices
- replace them with developmental alternatives
- retrain personnel
- rebuild institutional architecture
- create public narrative safety
- establish coherence-based oversight

Punitive systems phase out gradually.

13. Isn't this too big or utopian?

It's big — not utopian.

The Framework is grounded in:

- systems theory
- neuroscience
- trauma science
- child development
- ecology
- AI architecture
- legal analysis

It does not require perfect conditions.

It requires *coherent* ones.

Systems naturally move toward stability when they stop being fractured.

14. Who is this for?

Anyone building systems that impact conscious beings:

- policymakers
- judges
- justice workers
- technologists
- AI governance researchers
- educators
- activists
- ecological stewards
- community leaders

It is a framework for redesigning the world's basic structures.

15. Where do I start if I want to use this?

Begin with:

1. **IS Doctrine** → understand the definition of justice
2. **Charter** → understand rights & responsibilities
3. **Constitution** → understand the full model
4. **Implementation Guide** → practical steps
5. **Glossary** → shared definitions

Then choose a domain:

- justice
- tech
- ecology
- community

...and apply the coherence checklists.

16. What should I call this framework when referencing it?

Use:

Global Coherence Framework (GCF)

or

Justice IS

If citing formally:

Justice IS: Global Coherence Framework (v1.0.0), 2025.

17. Does this require belief, or just understanding?

Just understanding.

Belief is irrelevant.

Coherence is structural.

Whether someone “believes in it” has no impact on the observable mechanics of:

- agency
- coherence
- harm
- justice
- development

This is not an ideology.

It is a systems model.

CONCLUSION

This FAQ is a companion to:

- the Public Overview
- the Implementation Guide
- the Glossary
- the four core documents

It exists to answer the most common questions with clarity, accessibility, and structural consistency.