



[Home](#) [Licensing](#) [Patents](#) [Articles](#)

## **Integrity and Coherence for Government Policy Agents**

by [Nick Clark](#) | Published March 27, 2026 | [PDF](#)

Government agencies deploying AI for policy analysis, citizen services, and regulatory guidance face a unique coherence requirement: the agent's outputs must be consistent across departments, equitable across constituencies, and aligned with existing statutory and regulatory frameworks. Current AI systems cannot guarantee that policy advice given to one department does not contradict guidance given to another. The three-domain integrity model provides structural mechanisms for government agents to maintain cross-departmental consistency, detect regulatory contradictions, and ensure equitable treatment as a governed property.

---

**The coherence challenge in government AI**

Government operations span dozens of agencies, each with its own statutory authority, regulatory framework, and policy objectives. When AI agents are deployed across these agencies independently, each agent optimizes for its own domain. A housing agency agent may recommend policies that contradict the economic development agency's positions. A health department agent may provide guidance that conflicts with environmental agency regulations.

Human government officials manage these contradictions through inter-agency coordination meetings, legal review, and political negotiation. These processes are slow and often fail to catch contradictions before they affect citizens. AI agents operating at scale amplify the problem: they generate policy analysis faster than inter-agency review can evaluate, and each agent's output appears internally consistent while being externally contradictory.

For citizens interacting with government services, the consequence is confusion and inequity. Different agencies provide contradictory guidance on the same question. Benefits eligibility determined by one system conflicts with obligations imposed by another. The government speaks with many voices, each internally coherent but collectively incoherent.

## Cross-departmental normative consistency

The integrity model tracks normative positions across all government agents operating within a jurisdiction. When a housing policy agent takes a position on a regulatory question that intersects with environmental regulation, the normative integrity domain records that position. When the environmental agent subsequently analyzes the same regulatory intersection, it checks for consistency with the housing agent's established position.

Deviation detection does not require the agents to agree. It requires that disagreements are explicit and resolved rather than silent and contradictory. When the deviation function detects that two agencies are taking inconsistent positions on an overlapping regulatory question, it flags the inconsistency for inter-agency review before either position is communicated to citizens.

This structural consistency checking operates continuously rather than through periodic review. As each agent produces analysis, its normative positions are evaluated against the positions of all other agents operating in the same jurisdictional framework. Contradictions are detected in real time rather than after citizens have received conflicting guidance.

## Equitable treatment as a governed property

Government agents have a constitutional and statutory obligation to treat citizens equitably. Relational integrity provides structural enforcement. The agent tracks its interactions across constituencies, demographics, and geographic regions. When the agent's responsiveness, thoroughness, or helpfulness varies systematically across groups, the relational integrity domain flags the deviation.

This is distinct from bias detection in model training. Relational integrity operates at the behavioral level: regardless of what the model was trained on, the agent's actual outputs are monitored for equitable treatment. A citizen services agent that provides more detailed explanations to certain demographics or faster response times to certain regions exhibits relational integrity deviation that is detectable and correctable.

For government agencies facing equity mandates and public scrutiny, structural equitable treatment is a stronger guarantee than training-time bias mitigation. The integrity model provides continuous monitoring with computable deviation metrics and audit logs that demonstrate equitable treatment as a governed operational property rather than a training objective.

## Regulatory alignment and contradiction detection

Government policy agents must align their outputs with existing statutory and regulatory frameworks. The normative domain maintains a model of the agent's positions on statutory interpretation and regulatory application. When a proposed policy recommendation contradicts an existing regulation, the deviation function detects the conflict before the recommendation is issued.

This structural alignment checking is particularly valuable during policy transitions. When new legislation changes the regulatory framework, the agent's normative domain is updated, and all subsequent outputs are checked for consistency with the new framework. Recommendations based on superseded regulations are caught by the deviation function rather than relying on human reviewers to remember every regulatory change.

For government organizations deploying AI at scale, integrity and coherence provide the structural governance layer that public trust requires. Citizens and oversight bodies can verify that the government's AI agents maintain consistent positions, treat constituencies equitably, and align with existing law, not through policy promises, but through computable governance mechanisms with auditable records.

[Integrity & Coherence All 21 steps →](#)

Track normative consistency. Detect deviation. Self-correct.

Primary Technical Disclosure

[◦ The Coherence Trifecta: Empathy, Integrity, and Self-Esteem as a Unified Control Loop](#)

Secondary Technical

[◦ Coping Under Empathic Pressure: HSP, Narcissism, and Psychopathy as Control-Loop Intercepts](#)[◦ Three-Domain Integrity Model](#)[◦ Deviation Function  \$D=\(N-T\)/\(ExS\)\$](#) [◦ Self-Esteem as Internal Validator](#)[◦ Deviation as Deterministic Semantic Mutation](#)[◦ Integrity Structural Placement](#)[◦ Empathy as Distributed Moral Load](#)[◦ Coherence Trifecta Control Loop](#)[◦ Coping Intercept Patterns](#)[◦ Integrity Deviation Logging](#)[◦ Integrity Collapse Detection](#)[◦ Redemption Engine](#)[◦ Moral Trajectory Forecasting](#)[◦ Integrity-Aware Trust Slope Validation](#)[◦ Integrity-Confidence Cross-Primitive Coupling](#)[◦ Integrity-Modulated Discovery Traversal](#)[◦ Integrity-Aware Multi-Agent Negotiation](#)[◦ Biological Signal Coupling for Integrity](#)[◦ Policy-Based Integrity Constraints](#)[◦ Integrity Field Portability](#)[◦ Predictive Deviation Alerting](#)[◦ Governed Forgetting](#)[◦ Predictive Social Modeling](#)

Applications (General)

[◦ Autonomous Vehicle Ethical Decision-Making Through Computable Integrity](#)[◦ Financial Trading Systems That Track Their Own Normative Consistency](#)[◦ Integrity and Coherence for Legal Advisory Agents](#)[• Integrity and Coherence for Government Policy Agents](#)[◦ Integrity and Coherence for Journalism Editorial Agents](#)[◦ Integrity and Coherence for Environmental Compliance Agents](#)[◦ Integrity and Coherence for Insurance Underwriting Agents](#)[◦ Integrity and Coherence for Social Media Moderation Agents](#)

Applications (Specific)

[◦ Waymo's Ethical Decisions Have No Normative Memory](#)◦ [Cruise's Safety System Cannot Track Its Own Consistency](#)◦ [JPMorgan's Trading Compliance Has No Normative Trajectory](#)◦ [Palantir's Analytics Cannot Monitor Their Own Normative Drift](#)◦ [Aurora's Self-Driving Stack Has No Normative Memory](#)◦ [Nuro's Delivery Robots Optimize Without Normative Tracking](#)◦ [Zoox Plans Maneuvers Without Tracking Normative Drift](#)◦ [Motional Validates Safety Without Governing Normative Trajectory](#)◦ [Argo AI's Shutdown Reveals the Cost of Missing Normative Architecture](#)◦ [comma.ai Learns to Drive Without Learning Ethics](#)  
[Integrity & Coherence overview →](#)

AQ

deterministic

autonomy

Legal

Subject to one or more pending U.S. and international patent applications, see [Patents](#) for the current list and status. No license, express or implied, is granted. Any use requires a separate written agreement—see [Licensing](#). Patent applications referenced on this site are pending. Claim scope, if any, is subject to examination and may issue in altered form or not at all. See [Legal](#) for terms and conditions.

Adaptive Query™ is a trademark of Nicholas Clark. U.S. federal registration is pending, federal registration. AQ™, AQ Inside™, Adaptive Index™, Adaptive Network™, Semantic Agent™, @AQ™, AQID™, and Adaptive Coin™ are used as trademarks in connection with the Adaptive Query platform and brand. Other names may be trademarks of their respective owners.

Platform operated by Adaptive Query LLC, which provides patent and trademark licensing services. Copyright © 2025-2026 Nicholas Clark. All rights reserved.

Last updated: 2026-03-03



- [Inventive Steps](#)
- [Licensing](#)
- [Patents](#)
- [Articles](#)
- [Legal](#)
- [Opportunities](#)
- [Sitemap](#)



- 
- [nick@qu3ry.net](mailto:nick@qu3ry.net)
- 72 28 14 36 01



[Invented by Nick Clark](#) | Founding Investors: Devin Wilkie