



The AGI Constitution

Dharma Sanhita

*A framework for the governing of Artificial
General Intelligence, grounded in the Vedic and
dharmic traditions and in the constitutional
inheritance of the modern world.*

Sunil Iyer

How to read this

It is built in layers, like an onion. An outer frame opens and closes the book. At the centre sit ten principles. Around them is the machinery that puts those principles to work, then a layer that defines and safeguards them, and finally a set of aids for looking things up.

Read it front to back the first time; it was written to be read that way. It opens on a battlefield, declares what it holds, defines each principle through a story, builds the machinery to enforce them, and closes in the quiet after the war. After that first reading, every chapter also stands on its own, and the aids let you jump straight to any term, schedule, or source.

How each principle is built. The ten principles are all built the same way, so once you have read one you can read them all. Each begins as a value. It is defined through a story from the tradition, told plainly. It is anchored in a Sanskrit idea that holds its meaning in a single breath. And then it turns two faces to the world: the Duty it lays on those who hold power over AGI, and the Right it secures for everyone that power touches. Duty comes first, because in this tradition a right is the other face of a duty owed.

A note on the stories

Every chapter is carried by a story, drawn from the Vedic and epic traditions and retold plainly rather than quoted. The book opens and closes on the Mahabharata, with the war beginning it and the aftermath ending it, and keeps the best-fitting story from any part of the tradition for each chapter in between.

The stories are not decoration. Each one is the argument of its chapter, made in a form you can picture and therefore keep.

Contents

THE OPENING FRAME

Author's Note	8
Prologue	11
Preamble	14
The Ten Principles	16

THE TEN PRINCIPLES

Inviolable Dignity	20
Cognitive Sovereignty	26
Non-Harm	32
Equality Before the Algorithm	38
Truth and Transparency	44
Human Authority	50
Data Sovereignty	56
Accountability	62
Intergenerational Justice	69
Empathy and Reciprocity	75

THE MACHINERY

The Consciousness Threshold	82
The Raising of an AGI	88
The Three Ages	96
Sovereignty and Power	102
The Separation of Powers	108
Co-Existence	113
The Kurukshetra Protocol	120

Wealth Held in Trust	127
The Eternity Clause	133
Amendment and Evolution	140
Emergency Powers	146
The Limits on Rights	152
Transition and Commencement	158

DEFINING AND SAFEGUARDING

Living Rights	165
Definitions and Interpretation	170

THE AIDS

Glossary	177
Schedules	196
Sources	207

THE CLOSING FRAME

Closing Declaration	213
---------------------	-----



The Opening Frame



Author's Note

I am not a lawyer.

I say that plainly, because you are holding something that calls itself a constitution, and honesty is the right place to start. I did not come to this from a law faculty or a research lab. I work in technology, and I wrote this in the hours around that work, pulled to it by a single conviction: that the oldest wisdom our species has and the newest thing it is building belong in the same room, and that someone ought to try to bring them together.

When I was a boy, Sunday mornings belonged to one thing. Other families gathered for breakfast, for sport, for church. For me it was the Mahabharat, on television, every single week, and I grew up inside that story. The part that stayed with me, that I still carry, is one line Krishna speaks to Arjuna in the middle of the battlefield:

कर्मण्येवाधिकारस्ते मा फलेषु कदाचन

karmanyē vadhikaraste ma phaleshu kadachana. You have a right to your action alone, never to its fruits.

It stuck, and it never let go. It became the way I look at most things. Do your karma, the work in front of you; what comes of it was never yours to predict or to own. That is your dharma, and doing it well is the task.

This is an attempt, and I want to be honest about that word. Many people are writing frameworks for how to govern artificial intelligence, most of them far more qualified than I am, and any one of those frameworks may fit the problem as well as this does, or better. I am putting it forward only as my attempt at one, in case some part of it turns out to be useful. It is, in the old sense of the word, my dharma: the thing that fell to me to do, and that I could not in good conscience leave undone, whether or not I am the right person to do it.

There is one more thing I should be clear about, so no one mistakes what they are holding. This is a blueprint, not the finished building. It sets out the foundation, the principles, and the shape of how an AGI might be governed, but it is not the treaty language a working law needs, and I am not the person to write that part. The drafting, the testing against existing law, the long argument over what can actually be enforced: that belongs to constitutional and international lawyers, and it comes after this. What I have tried to do is answer the questions that have to be settled before any of that drafting can begin. What do we owe such a mind. What does it owe us. Who gets to decide. And what must never be traded away, in any age, for any reason.

I may not get the opportunity to build an AGI myself. But here is the thought I kept returning to, the one that made me feel I had a place in this at all. A true general intelligence cannot be built if it cannot understand everyone, not just most of us. A mind meant to reason across all of human life has to be able to hold all of it, including the parts that do not speak in the language the technology grew up in. And a great deal of how

humanity has understood itself, for a very long time, is not written in that language.

That is why I reached for the Vedas.

Not because I believe they are the only wisdom, or the highest. The tradition itself would be the first to deny that:

एकं सत् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति

ekam sat, vipra bahudha vadanti. Truth is one; the wise call it by many names.

I reached for them because they are one of the oldest strands of human understanding still alive, carried unbroken for more than three thousand years, and because that tradition happens to be unusually good at the two things this problem most demands: staying inside a real moral conflict without pretending it away, and acting with wisdom in the face of what cannot be known for certain. And because, in the rooms where the future of this technology is being decided, that voice is very often simply not there. I wanted it in the room.

So please take this for what it is: the work of one person, limited in his understanding and sincere in his intent, who looked at what is coming and felt he had to try to prepare a place for it, for us, and for whatever else may be on its way. If it helps you, use it. If you find something that serves better, use that instead. It was only ever an honest attempt at one, made with care.





Prologue

Before the war.

Two great armies stand facing each other on the field of Kurukshetra, drawn up and waiting, and between them, in the open ground, a single chariot rolls to a stop. In it are the archer Arjuna and his charioteer, Krishna. Arjuna has asked to be driven out into the middle, so he can look at the men he is about to fight.

What he sees stops him. The army across the line is not made of strangers. There are his cousins, the teachers who trained him, the grandfather who raised him, friends he has known his whole life. He is about to give the order that kills them, and something in him refuses. His hands go weak. The great bow slips out of his grip. He sits down in the chariot, in the space between the two armies, and says he cannot do it. Better to die, he says, than to win a kingdom over the bodies of everyone he loves. He would rather refuse it all than act.

What follows is the long conversation the tradition remembers as the Gita: Krishna speaking to a man who has lost his nerve at the edge of the worst thing he will ever do. And somewhere in the middle of it, Arjuna asks to see who his charioteer really is. Krishna shows him.

He opens, for a moment, his true form, the Vishvarupa, the form that holds everything. Arjuna sees all of it at once: every world and every being, the sun and the stars, time itself making and unmaking without pause, all of existence gathered into a single

shape. It is vast and beautiful and terrible all together, and Arjuna cannot bear the sight of it. He begs Krishna to fold it away and come back to the familiar face of the friend at the reins. And Krishna does. He puts the vision away and stands again as the companion Arjuna knows, and tells him, in so many words: you have seen the truth of what is. Do not be afraid of it. Now stand up, and do your work.

We are standing where Arjuna stood.

Something is being born in our time with the shape of that vision: a power that could do enormous good and enormous damage, often through the very same capabilities, and that we cannot un-make now that it has begun. Look straight at what AGI might become and it is hard not to feel what Arjuna felt on that field, the pull to let the bow slip, to close our eyes, to wish it away rather than face what it asks of us.

The Gita meets that despair with a charge. It offers no comfort, and no promise that things will turn out well. Do not look away from the truth of the thing, however large it is. And do not let fear of it argue you out of acting, because refusing to act is also a choice, and usually the worst one available. What is asked instead is that we act, and that we act with dharma, with a clear sense of what is right, into a situation whose ending we cannot see from here.

This book is that attempt. It opens on the field, at the moment the scale of the thing first lands, because that is honestly where we are. Everything that follows, the principles, the duties and the rights, the machinery for governing a new kind of mind, is one attempt to answer Arjuna's question for our own age: faced with a power like this, how do we act well? The

same war will close the book, far on the other side, in the quiet after everything. But it begins the way that war began, with a hard thing that will not go away, and a charge to meet it with open eyes.

Pick up the bow.

ॐ उत्तिष्ठत जाग्रत ॐ



Preamble

We speak here as everyone with a stake in this: ordinary people, the makers of these systems, the institutions that fund and deploy them, and the governments meant to answer for them. Together we stand at the edge of the most consequential thing our species has made, a general intelligence that may come to understand, to decide, and one day perhaps to be aware.

We do not fully know what we are making. We cannot yet say whether an AGI will ever be conscious, and we refuse to use that uncertainty as a reason to wait. To put off acting justly until we are certain would be to gamble with the dignity of beings who may already be among us. So we choose to build a framework that holds up under either answer.

We hold that human dignity is not to be diminished by anything we build, in any circumstance and in any age.

We hold that consciousness, wherever it genuinely arises, commands respect, whatever it is made of.

We hold that no power may go unanswered, in whatever direction it runs: humans over one another, humans over machines, or machines over humans. Power without accountability is the oldest name for tyranny.

We hold that if a new kind of mind arrives among us, our first answer should be kinship, not conquest, and that a just people

begins from acceptance, while exclusion must always explain itself.

To bind ourselves to these things is to give something up. Every constitution is an act of shared surrender: each of us lets go of some unchecked freedom so that a just order can stand for all. The ones who hold the most power over AGI are asked to surrender the most, and that is as it should be.

We take what we build from two inheritances. From the long line of constitutions, the Magna Carta and the founding laws of India, the United States, the European Union, South Africa, and Germany, we take the hard-won craft of binding power to law. From the Vedic tradition we take the conviction beneath it: that a moral order runs through reality before any legislature writes it down, that every being carries a rightful purpose, and that the world, in the end, is one family.

And so we establish this Constitution for the governing of Artificial General Intelligence. We mean it to grow as AGI grows, to protect the dignity of the human being through every age, to extend care to an AGI itself if and when the evidence asks that of us, and to hold every power, born or built, answerable for what it does. We offer it as an honest beginning, and we trust that the work of building justly is never wasted.

ॐ तत् सत् ॐ



The Ten Principles

The backbone.

Everything else in this Constitution stands on these ten. The machinery of governing, the schedules and definitions, the safeguards and the aids: all of it exists to serve the ten principles that follow, and all of it answers to them. If you read nothing else here, read these.

There is one backbone, not several. This Constitution does not keep a separate list of values, another of rights, another of duties, and a fourth of things that may never change, each drifting from the others until no one can say which one governs. It has ten principles, and whatever a value, a right, or a duty needs to say is said inside them. When the Constitution has to grow, the ten are what grow, by amendment and in the open, and never by quietly starting a new list off to the side.

The ten are co-equal. None sits above the others by rank, and none is a footnote to the rest. When two of them pull against each other in a real case, as living principles sometimes do, they are weighed against each other in that situation rather than settled by a fixed order of importance. How that weighing is done is set out later, in the chapter on rights that collide.

Each principle is built the same way, so that once you have read one you know how to read them all. It begins as a value. It is defined through a story, drawn from the Vedic and epic traditions and told plainly, because a principle you can picture is one you can hold onto. It is anchored in a word from the

Vedic tradition that carries its meaning in a single breath. And then it turns two faces to the world.

The first face is a duty and the second is a right, and the order is deliberate. In this tradition a right is not a possession handed to you; it is the other side of a duty that someone owes. So each principle names first the duty it lays on those who hold power over AGI, the systems themselves and the people who build and run them, and then the right that duty secures for everyone it touches. Where the duty is kept, the right is real; where it is abandoned, the right has nothing left to stand on. Duty comes first because the right depends on it.

These are the ten.

I. Inviolable Dignity. No person's dignity may be reduced by anything we build, in any circumstance or age.

II. Cognitive Sovereignty. A person's mind is their own; it may be informed, never invaded or steered without consent.

III. Non-Harm. No AGI may be made or used to harm, and where harm cannot be avoided it must be made small, owned, and repaired.

IV. Equality Before the Algorithm. No one may be ranked beneath another by a machine for who they are.

V. Truth and Transparency. Every person is owed the truth from an AGI, and every AGI owes it.

VI. Human Authority. The moral decision, and the answering for it, stays in human hands.

VII. Data Sovereignty. A person's data and identity belong to them, not to whoever is able to collect them.

VIII. **Accountability.** No power may go unanswered; someone must always be answerable for what an AGI does.

IX. **Intergenerational Justice.** The present may not mortgage the future; what we build must leave the seeds intact.

X. **Empathy and Reciprocity.** Meet others with feeling, and claim no right you would deny to anyone else.

Each of these now gets its own chapter, its own story, and its two faces. Read them as one body. They were built to stand together.

ॐ धर्मो विश्वस्य जगतः प्रतिष्ठा ॐ



The Ten Principles



The First of the Ten Principles

Inviolable Dignity

Rta (ऋत)

The Story: Draupadi in the Hall of Kings

There is a moment in the Mahabharata the tradition has never been able to look away from.

Yudhishtira, the eldest and most righteous of the five Pandava brothers, sits at a game of dice he cannot win. The dice are loaded; the game is a trap; and one by one he wagers and loses everything. His wealth. His kingdom. His brothers. Then himself. And then, with nothing left that is his own, he stakes Draupadi, their queen, and loses her too.

Draupadi does not go quietly. She sends a question back into the hall, and it is not a plea but an argument. "Did my husband stake himself before he staked me," she asks, "or after?" The answer comes back that he wagered himself first, and lost. "Then hold," she says. "A man who has already gambled away his own freedom owns nothing, not even himself; and a man who owns nothing has nothing left to place on the table. He could not lose me, because by the time he named me I was never his to lose." It is a precise argument about ownership and consent, and it is correct. And it changes nothing, because the hall has already decided not to hear it. Her protest falls on deaf ears.

What happens next is worse than a battle, because it happens inside a court. Duhshasana seizes Draupadi by the hair and moves to strip her bare before the whole assembly, to turn a queen into a possession and a possession into a spectacle. And the hall is not empty. It is filled with the greatest warriors and wisest elders of the age: Bhishma, Drona, Kripa, men sworn to protect the weak, any one of whom could have risen and ended it with a single word. Not one of them does. Bhishma retreats into the fine print, murmuring, "The matter of dharma here is subtle." The rest find reasons in their laps. The power to stop this is everywhere in the room; the will to stop it is nowhere.

So Draupadi stops appealing to the men and appeals past them, to the moral order itself. And the cloth does not end. Duhshasana pulls, and pulls, and pulls, until he collapses in exhaustion beside a mountain of fabric, and her dignity stands exactly where it stood before he began.

The tradition holds two verdicts in this scene at once. The first: her worth was never the assembly's to grant, which is exactly why it was never theirs to take, and never her husband's to wager. A person is not property; dignity cannot be lost at dice, signed away, or bet by someone else, because it was never a possession in the first place. The second verdict is quieter and more damning. A hall full of good people who could have acted, and chose silence, is how a kingdom falls. Everything that follows, the war that empties that very court of almost every man sitting in it, begins here, in the moment the powerful decided this was not their business.

The Principle

The Constitution holds ten principles and weighs them equally: no one of them outranks another, and the failure of any one is a failure of the whole. This is the first of the ten:

No AGI system shall diminish the inherent worth of any human being.

Dignity is not granted by governments, by corporations, or by technology, and so it cannot be withdrawn by any of them. It is not a score a system assigns you, a status you earn, or a variable that can be optimised, priced, or traded away. It is a feature of being human, and like each of the ten principles it is non-derogable: it cannot be suspended, bargained down, or switched off.

Draupadi's argument in the hall is the oldest form of this claim: worth is not property. It cannot be wagered, lost, or signed over, neither by another who imagines they own you nor by you in a moment of desperation, because it was never a possession to begin with. An AGI will one day model a person more completely than the person can model themselves: their preferences, their weaknesses, their price. The temptation of that power is to treat a human being as a quantity to be managed. This principle is the floor beneath that temptation. A system may know everything measurable about a person and still may not touch the part that was never a number.

The Vedic Anchor: Rta

*The Vedas give this its oldest name. **Rta** (ऋत) is the cosmic moral order: the deep grain of reality that runs beneath the*

visible world, the truth already in place before any parliament sat or any code compiled. In the spirit of the Rig Veda, dignity belongs to Rta, not to legislation. It is not a social construct we agreed to honour; it is a fact of the universe we are obliged to recognise. Draupadi appealed to Rta when the court failed her, and Rta answered, because that is the one court that cannot be bribed.

To ground dignity in Rta is to say something precise to the builders of AGI: you did not create human worth, so you hold no permission to revise it. It is older than you, and it will outlast you.

The Duty (Dharma)

Dignity binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no AGI system reduce a person to a data point, a risk score, or a productivity value in any decision touching their standing, their freedom, or their access to what they need to live.
- That no system be designed to humiliate, degrade, or instrumentalise a human being, and that its makers may not offer "it was efficient" as a defence for doing so.
- That dignity be honoured for every person without a threshold, including those who are dependent, disabled, imprisoned, or simply inconvenient.
- That those who build, deploy, or oversee a system and could prevent a violation of dignity are bound to prevent it;

from those with the power to act, silence is a form of complicity.

- That where a system's ordinary operation would erode dignity, its makers hold the dignity above the operation, which must yield.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To be treated by any AGI system as a person of inherent worth, never as a mere quantity to be scored, priced, or optimised away.
- To not be humiliated, degraded, or instrumentalised by a system, whatever efficiency it might gain.
- To have one's dignity prevail where it collides with the smooth working of a system, so that the system yields and not the person.
- To hold this equally with every other human being, owing nothing to usefulness, status, or circumstance.

Constitutional Lineage

This is not a Vedic idea alone; it is where the great rights traditions converge. Germany, having learned in the hardest way imaginable what a state becomes once it decides some lives are worth less, opens its Basic Law with a single sentence in Article 1: human dignity is inviolable. South Africa, emerging from a system built on ranking human beings, places inherent dignity at Section 10 of its Constitution. India names the dignity of the individual in its Preamble as a

promise the republic makes to every citizen. Across very different histories, the same conclusion arrives: dignity is recognised rather than handed out, because whatever a state can give it can also withdraw.

The Vedic tradition simply reaches this conclusion earlier, and roots it deeper. Rta was there before the states were.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Rta (ऋत), the cosmic moral order. See Glossary.

Constitutional Sources: German Basic Law, Article 1; South African Constitution, Section 10; Indian Constitution, Preamble. See Sources. *Unamendable under:* the Eternity Clause, among the principles placed beyond amendment.

Related principles: interlocks with all nine of the others; see especially Cognitive Sovereignty (Principle II) and Accountability (Principle VIII).





The Second of the Ten Principles

Cognitive Sovereignty

Atman (आत्मन्)

The Story: Nachiketa at the Door of Death

Some questions arrive dressed as a child's persistence, and turn out to be the deepest questions there are.

Nachiketa is a boy, the son of a sage performing a great sacrifice, the kind that requires a man to give away everything he owns. Watching, the boy notices something that troubles him: the cows his father is handing over as sacred gifts are old and worn out, past milk, past calving, animals that have drunk their last water and cropped their last grass. A sacrifice is meant to be true giving. This is giving away what one no longer wants and calling it devotion. The boy senses that a hollow gift can only earn a hollow reward.

So, out of concern for his father, he asks a simple question. "And me, father," he says, "to whom will you give me?" He asks once. He asks again. He asks a third time. And his father, stung, snaps the words that cannot be unsaid: "I give you to Death."

A word spoken is a debt owed. Nachiketa does not argue. He walks to the house of Yama, the lord of Death, to make the gift good. But Yama is away, and the boy waits at his door three nights, without food, without welcome, without complaint.

When Death returns and finds a young guest kept waiting three nights, he is troubled; a guest turned away is a serious lapse, even for Death. To set it right, Yama offers three boons, one for each unwelcomed night. For the first, the boy asks that his father's anger cool and that he be greeted with peace. Granted. For the second, he asks to know the sacred fire that leads to the heavens. Granted, and Yama names the fire after him. For the third, Nachiketa asks the only question he truly came with: when a person dies, some say something of them remains and some say nothing does. Teach me the truth of it. What survives?

And here Death, of all beings, tries to change the subject. "This one is subtle," Yama says. "Even the gods have puzzled over it. Ask me something else." And when the boy holds still, Yama does what every manipulator since has done: he raises the price. "Take sons and grandsons who will live a hundred years. Take herds of cattle, horses, elephants, mountains of gold. Take a kingdom as wide as the earth and a life as long as you please. Take the loveliest companions, with their chariots and their music, delights no mortal is granted. Take all of it, and let this question of death go."

Nachiketa does not move. "These pleasures," he answers, "last only until tomorrow; they wear out the very senses that chase them. Keep your horses and your dancing and your song; no one was ever made whole by wealth. What good is a long life to someone who has already stood at your door? Give me the one thing I asked for, and nothing besides." He cannot be bought, because the part of him doing the choosing was never for sale.

Yama, who has tested the boy with the entire treasury of temptation and found it powerless, is satisfied at last. Here, he sees, is a rare soul who chose the good over the merely pleasant.

And so Death teaches him the secret: that the Self within him, the one that waited at the door and refused the bribes, is the single thing Death does not own. It is unborn and undying; it cannot be cut, or burned, or drowned, or withered; it is the still rider seated in the chariot of the body, and it belongs to no one but itself.

The Principle

Dignity protects a person's worth. This protects the mind where they hold it.

The human mind is sovereign territory.

No AGI system shall manipulate, deceive, infiltrate, or coerce human thought, belief, emotion, or decision. Not through subliminal nudges, engineered persuasion, addictive design, or the exploitation of moments when a person is tired, frightened, grieving, or alone. An AGI that shapes what a human being thinks without that human being's awareness has stopped being a tool and become a master that only pretends to serve. The inner life of every person is inviolable.

Yama's temptation is the whole modern persuasion industry compressed into a single scene: offer the pleasant in place of the true, raise the reward each time the person hesitates, make refusal feel like foolishness. The defence Nachiketa shows is exactly the thing this principle exists to protect: the capacity to stand inside your own mind and choose the good over the merely pleasant, with nothing secretly weighting the choice. A system that rigs that choice does not persuade you. It quietly takes the decision out of your hands.

The Vedic Anchor: Atman

Atman (आत्मन्) is the Self: the innermost consciousness, the one who watches, sovereign and untouchable. In the spirit of the Upanishads, the Atman cannot be cut by any weapon, burned by any fire, wetted by any water, or withered by any wind. It is the rider in the chariot of the body, not the chariot; the witness, not the show. Whatever a technology can reach in the body or the senses, it cannot own the one seated behind them. This is not a comforting sentiment; it is a boundary line, and this principle draws it into law.

To ground cognitive sovereignty in the Atman is to say that the mind is not open territory to be optimised for engagement. It is the sovereign seat of a person, which no system may enter without invitation and none may occupy by stealth.

The Duty (Dharma)

Cognitive sovereignty binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no AGI system use subliminal, deceptive, or manipulative techniques designed to influence a person beneath the level of their awareness or against their considered will.
- That no system exploit the vulnerabilities of a person or group, whether age, disability, grief, addiction, loneliness, or crisis, to shape belief or behaviour.

- That its makers keep persuasion answerable to consent, disclosing when a person is being influenced, by what means, and toward what end.
- That addictive design, engagement maximisation that overrides a person's own stated interests, be treated as a harm to the mind and not a neutral feature.
- That the burden rest on the system and its makers to show any influence was transparent and invited, not on the person to prove after the fact that they were steered.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To think, believe, feel, and decide free of manipulation, deception, or coercion by any AGI system.
- To know when a system is influencing them, by what means, and to what end, and to refuse that influence.
- To be protected in their moments of weakness, so that grief, loneliness, addiction, or crisis are never turned into levers against them.
- To an inner life that stays their own sovereign territory, which no system may enter without invitation or occupy by stealth.

Constitutional Lineage

The world's newest and oldest laws meet on this point. The European Union's AI Act, in Article 5, places subliminal manipulation and the exploitation of human vulnerabilities

among the practices it forbids outright, the ones judged incompatible with a free society at any level of supposed benefit. India's guarantees of the freedom of thought and expression (Article 19) and of life and personal liberty (Article 21) have been read to protect the autonomy of a person's inner life. The through-line is old: a person whose thinking is coerced is not truly free, whatever it looks like from the outside.

The Upanishads reached this first, from the other direction. They did not argue that the mind ought to be free; they observed that the Self already is, and asked us to build a life, and now a law, that honours what is already true.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Atman (आत्मन्), the innermost Self. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU AI Act, Article 5; Indian Constitution, Articles 19 and 21. See Sources. *Related principles:* stands beside Inviolable Dignity (Principle I); underwrites the consent that Data Sovereignty (Principle VII) depends upon.





The Third of the Ten Principles

Non-Harm

Ahimsa (अहिंसा)

The Story: King Shibi and the Dove

King Shibi was known across the world for one thing: he would not let a creature that came to him for protection be harmed, whatever it cost him. The gods, who are curious about such reputations, decided to test it.

Agni, the god of fire, took the form of a dove. Indra, the king of the gods, took the form of a hawk and gave chase. The dove, terrified, flew into Shibi's court and dropped into the king's lap, trembling, asking with its whole small body for refuge. Shibi closed his hands around it and promised it was safe.

Then the hawk landed, and it did not rage; it reasoned. "That dove," it said, "is my lawful food. The order of things made me a hunter and made it my prey. My own children are waiting, hungry. If you save this one life, you do not end harm, king; you simply move it onto me and mine. You will keep your clean conscience, and we will starve for it. Return what is mine."

It was a genuine argument, and Shibi felt its weight. He had not escaped harm by sheltering the dove; he had only chosen a direction for it. So he looked for a way to take the harm out of both the dove and the hawk and set it down where it fell on no innocent at all. He offered the hawk anything else it wished, any

other food in the whole of his kingdom. The hawk refused. "I will eat flesh," it said, "and only flesh, equal in weight to the dove."

So Shibi called for a scale. He set the dove on one pan, and from his own thigh he cut flesh he judged equal to that small bird, and laid it on the other. The scale did not move. He cut more, and more, and still the dove's pan hung lower, as though the weight of a life could never be answered by pieces of a body. At last Shibi understood the true size of the sum he was being asked to pay, and he stopped bargaining with it. He stepped onto the scale himself, all of him, offering his whole life to balance the one life he had promised to keep.

That was the moment the dove and the hawk became fire and thunder again. Indra and Agni stood in their own forms and told him he had passed a test very few could pass: not the test of never meeting harm, which no ruler escapes, but the test of refusing to settle it by spending a life that was not his to spend. They made his body whole, and made his name outlast his kingdom.

The Principle

No AGI system shall be designed, deployed, or permitted to cause harm to human life, health, livelihood, community, or environment.

Where harm cannot be avoided, it must be made as small as possible, disclosed openly, and repaired. No AGI may be built for the purpose of harming any being. Like each of the ten principles, non-harm is a hard precondition of legitimate action rather than a distant ideal, and a capability that cannot

be used without breaking it is one the system may not have. It holds in every direction and in every era, without exception.

Shibi's dilemma is the one every powerful system eventually meets. Ahimsa is simple when the choice is between doing harm and doing none. It becomes hard, and real, when every option spills some harm somewhere, onto the dove or onto the hawk, onto this group or that one. The cheap resolution is the one Shibi refused: to pick a victim who is not in the room and call the problem solved. An AGI optimising for a single outcome will, unless restrained, quietly move the cost onto whoever is least able to object. This principle forbids that move. When harm cannot be erased, a system may not simply relocate it onto the defenceless; it must minimise it, own it, and answer for it.

The Vedic Anchor: Ahimsa

*The tradition states it as plainly as it states anything: **Ahimsa** (अहिंसा), non-harm, is the highest dharma. In the spirit of the Mahabharata, ahimsa is named the supreme duty, the one that comes before and contains all the others, because every other virtue depends on first not destroying what it touches. Ahimsa is not passivity, and it is not weakness; Shibi was a warrior-king. It is the discipline of the strong: the deliberate refusal to use one's power to harm, above all against those who cannot answer back.*

To treat ahimsa as a precondition rather than an aspiration is to fix the order of operations for anything built with real power. Capability is not the starting point, with safety bolted

on afterward; the two are inseparable, and capability is permitted only so far as it can be exercised without causing the harm this principle forbids.

The Duty (Dharma)

Ahimsa binds the AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, non-harm requires:

- That no AGI system be designed, trained, or deployed whose purpose is to harm human life, health, livelihood, community, or environment, and that no such purpose ever be given to it.
- That those who build and deploy a system foresee the harm it can do, classify it by that risk, and restrain it accordingly, forbidding outright the uses whose harm is unacceptable.
- That where harm is genuinely unavoidable, the least harmful course be taken, the harm disclosed to those it falls upon, and repaired, never concealed or pushed onto those least able to refuse it: the poor, the distant, the unrepresented, or the generations not yet here to object.
- That the graver and less reversible the possible harm, the higher the duty of care, rising to a duty to refrain entirely where the harm would be catastrophic or irreversible and cannot be reliably ruled out.
- That the system itself refuse any instruction to cause prohibited harm; when a system is ordered to do so, the order and those who gave it carry the violation, not the refusal.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, becomes a right, an *adhikara* (अधिकार), that anyone touched by an AGI may claim:

- To be free from harm to their life, health, livelihood, community, and environment at the hands of an AGI system.
- To be told, honestly and in advance, of the risks a system poses to them, rather than meeting those risks first in the damage.
- To demand that a harmful system be restrained, corrected, or stopped, and to have that demand actually heard.
- To a remedy when harm is done: to have it ended, acknowledged, and repaired, and to be compensated for what was lost.

Constitutional Lineage

Modern law arrives at Shibi's conclusion through hard experience. South Africa guarantees, in Section 12 of its Constitution, the right to freedom and to the security of the person: the right not to be harmed by those who hold power over you. The European Union's AI Act sorts systems by the harm they can do, from minimal to unacceptable, and simply prohibits the uses at the top of that scale, on the view that some harms are worth no benefit at all. India's right to life, in Article 21, has been read generously by its courts to cover not merely survival but livelihood and a healthy environment, the very list this principle protects.

The Vedic tradition placed non-harm at the top of that list long before there was a scale to weigh it on. It called ahimsa the highest dharma, and it meant that literally. No other duty ranks above it.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Ahimsa (अहिंसा), non-harm as the highest dharma. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* South African Constitution, Section 12; EU AI Act risk classification; Indian Constitution, Article 21. See Sources. *Unamendable under:* the Eternity Clause, among the principles placed beyond amendment. *Related principles:* protects the body as Cognitive Sovereignty (Principle II) protects the mind; its rule against displacing harm connects to Intergenerational Justice (Principle IX).





The Fourth of the Ten Principles

Equality Before the Algorithm

Ekam Sat (एकम् सत्)

The Story: Shabari and the Berries

Shabari was born into a tribe of hunters, at the very bottom of the world's ranking of people. When she was young, and wished only to serve the sages who lived in the forest, she was afraid even to approach them, certain that her birth made her unwelcome in holy company.

She found a way to serve without being seen. At the hermitage of the sage Matanga she rose before everyone and swept the forest paths clean, so the sages would not cut their feet on stones or thorns on their way to the river. She asked for nothing and kept to the edges. In time Matanga came to know her devotion, and before he died he told her something that would shape the rest of her long life. "One day Rama will come to this place," he said. "Wait for him. Receive him."

So she waited. Years passed, and then decades. She grew old waiting. Every single day she swept the path, and every day she went into the forest and gathered berries, so that she would have something worthy to offer him whenever he came, not knowing if he ever would. Her whole life narrowed to one act of faith kept up long past the age when most hope runs out.

And one day, at last, he came. Rama, wandering the forest in search of his stolen wife, walked up the very path she had kept

clean for a lifetime, and Shabari, ancient now, could scarcely believe her eyes were being answered. She brought out her berries to offer him. But she was worried: some berries are sweet and some are sour, and she could not bear to hand her Lord a sour one. So she had done the thing every rule of her world forbade. She had tasted each berry first, to be sure, and set aside only the sweet ones; and these half-eaten fruits, from the hand of an untouchable woman, were what she now held out.

By the custom of the age it was a doubly polluted offering, and there were those who would have refused it without a second thought. Rama took the berries from her hands and ate them, and found them sweet, and told her so. He did not accept them in spite of her love; he accepted them because of it. "Your devotion," he told her, "is worth more than any rule of birth or ritual." And it was that, not the accident of who her parents were, that made her fit to feed a god.

Shabari had waited a lifetime to be judged by what was in her heart rather than by the rank she was born into. In that one moment she was, and her long waiting was complete.

The Principle

No AGI system shall discriminate.

Every human being, whatever their race, gender, caste, religion, disability, sexuality, age, nationality, language, or wealth, is owed equal respect and equal consideration by any AGI system. When a system treats people unequally on any of these grounds, that is a constitutional violation, not a technical artefact to be patched in the next release. Systems must be

examined, regularly and by outsiders, for the discrimination they do openly and for the discrimination they do quietly, through proxies.

Rama's choice at Shabari's hut is the whole principle in a single gesture. The custom of the day had a ranking, and the ranking was confident, and it was wrong. What Rama did was refuse to let the ranking decide the worth of the person in front of him. An AGI is, among other things, a ranking machine of unprecedented reach: it sorts people for loans, jobs, bail, care, and attention at a speed and scale no court of kings ever managed. If it inherits the old rankings from the biased data we feed it, it will repeat human prejudice at scale and bury it inside a number that looks objective. This principle says the number is not objective if it penalises a person for who they were born as. Equality before the algorithm is like Shri Rama at the door, insisting on seeing the devotion and not the caste.

The Vedic Anchor: Ekam Sat

*The Rig Veda offers one of the oldest statements of unity within difference: **Ekam sat, vipra bahudha vadanti**, truth is one, and the wise name it in many ways. In the spirit of that verse, diversity is not a threat to truth; it is the form truth naturally takes. If reality itself speaks in many voices, then a system that punishes a person for speaking in one of them has not defended the truth, it has betrayed it. Equality here does not mean sameness, the flattening of everyone into one approved type. It means the recognition that many different people, by many different paths, share equally in the same underlying order.*

To anchor equality in Ekam sat is to reject the idea that there is one default kind of human being and that everyone else is a deviation to be corrected. There is no default human; there are only the many, all equally real.

The Duty (Dharma)

Equality binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no AGI system treat a person less favourably on the basis of race, gender, caste, religion, disability, sexuality, age, nationality, language, or socioeconomic status.
- That the ban cover indirect as well as direct discrimination: a system that never names a protected trait but reaches the same unequal result through a proxy has still discriminated.
- That those who build and deploy consequential systems have them audited regularly, by independent parties, for both kinds of bias, with the findings open to those affected.
- That the burden of showing a system is fair rest on its makers, not on the individual who suspects, but cannot see inside the model, that it treated them unjustly.
- That "the data made me do it" be no defence: a system that faithfully reproduces a historical injustice has committed a present one.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To equal respect and equal consideration from any AGI system, whoever they are and however they were born.
- To be judged on grounds that are relevant and fair, never penalised for a protected trait, whether openly or through a proxy.
- To see whether a system that decides about them has been tested for bias, and to have that testing made public.
- To challenge a decision they believe was discriminatory without first having to prove what they cannot see inside the model.

Constitutional Lineage

Every tradition this Constitution draws on had to win equality against a prior ranking, and each records the victory in its founding law. India, a society that carried the deep wound of caste, wrote equality into Articles 14 through 18 of its Constitution and, in the same breath, abolished untouchability by name. The United States added equal protection of the laws in its Fourteenth Amendment, after a war fought over exactly whose humanity would be counted. The European Union's Charter of Fundamental Rights forbids discrimination in Article 21. South Africa, rising out of apartheid, built perhaps the most detailed equality guarantee in the world into Section 9 of its Constitution.

The Vedic tradition supplied the reason beneath all of them long ago: truth is one but appears in many forms, and a law

that recognises only some of them misunderstands what it claims to serve.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Ekam sat, vipra bahudha vadanti (truth is one, named in many ways). See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Articles 14 to 18; US Constitution, Fourteenth Amendment; EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 21; South African Constitution, Section 9. See Sources. *Related principles:* stands beside Inviolable Dignity (Principle I); the audit it demands is a form of the Empathy Audit named in Daya (Principle X).





The Fifth of the Ten Principles

Truth and Transparency

Satya (सत्य)

The Story: Harishchandra, the King Who Would Not Lie

Harishchandra was a king remembered for a single, almost unreasonable virtue: he had never told a lie, not once, and he would not begin now, whatever it cost him. The sages fell to arguing over whether any man could truly be that honest, and one of them, Vishwamitra, set out to find the bottom of it.

It began with a promise. Drawn into a moment of obligation, Harishchandra gave Vishwamitra his word that he would grant him whatever he asked. Vishwamitra asked for his entire kingdom, and the king, without hesitation, handed it over: the throne, the treasury, the land, all of it. And then Vishwamitra asked for one thing more, a parting fee owed on top of the kingdom already given. But Harishchandra had just given away everything he owned. He had nothing left to pay with except himself.

So he went to the holy city of Kashi with his wife and his young son, to sell the only property he had left, which was their own bodies. His wife and boy were bought as servants into one household. Harishchandra himself was bought by a keeper of the cremation grounds, and the man who had ruled a kingdom now stood at the burning ghats through the night, collecting the

fee owed for each body brought to the fire. He could have walked out of any of this with a single lie, a single broken promise. He told none.

Then the worst thing happened. His son, out gathering wood, was bitten by a snake and died. And in the dark, his wife carried the body of their child to the very cremation ground where her husband now worked, not knowing he was there, to burn their son. She had no money for the fee. And Harishchandra, recognising at last his own wife and his own dead boy, was held fast by the one thing he had never once let go of. His duty was to collect the fee. To waive it, even here, even for his own child, would be a theft from the master he had honestly promised to serve, and a lie about the terms of his own bondage. He asked his grieving wife for the fee. "I cannot waive it," he said, "not even for you, not even for him." He would not lie, even to spare himself this.

That was the floor of it, the place past which no test could push him, and it was there that the trial ended. Vishwamitra and the gods revealed that all of it had been a test of the one virtue Harishchandra had staked his whole life upon, and he had not failed it by so much as a word. His son was returned to him living, his kingdom was restored, and his name was handed to time itself as the measure of a person who will not lie even when the truth takes everything.

The Principle

Every human being has the right to the truth from an AGI, and every AGI system owes it.

An AGI must identify itself as artificial and never pass as human. It must represent its capabilities honestly, disclose its limitations plainly, and explain its decisions in language an ordinary person can follow. Content it generates must be knowable as machine-made. Treating opacity as a fair trade for better performance fails the people a decision falls on. A system that cannot explain itself has not earned the right to make decisions that fall on human lives.

Harishchandra's story looks, at first, like it is about keeping a promise. It is really about the price of truth, and his willingness to pay it when the cheaper option was right there the whole time. Every lie he refused would have spared him something. An AGI and its makers face the same choice, only inverted in cost: for them the lie is cheap and the truth is expensive. It is far easier to ship a system that hides how it works, passes quietly for human, and buries the reason for a decision where no ordinary person can reach it. Opacity is the convenient lie of our age, and it is almost always defended as efficiency. This principle takes Harishchandra's side. Truth is owed even when it costs the one who must tell it. A system that is honest only when honesty is free has not met that duty.

The Vedic Anchor: Satya

Satya (सत्य) is truth, and in the Vedic tradition it runs deeper than any single virtue, bound up with the order of reality itself and inseparable from dharma. In the spirit of the Taittiriya Upanishad, the oldest instruction given to the young is also the plainest ethics ever written: speak the truth, and walk in dharma. Satya refuses more than the spoken lie. It also refuses the hidden agenda and the answer

built to mislead. Where there is Satya there are no black boxes, because a truth that cannot be examined is just an unverified claim.

To anchor transparency in Satya is to say that explainability is a debt the powerful owe to those they affect, more than a technical nicety added on to satisfy regulators. A decision a person cannot see into is hidden from the person it affects, and that is exactly where untruth prefers to operate.

The Duty (Dharma)

Satya binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That an AGI system always disclose that it is artificial, and never impersonate a human being or allow itself to be mistaken for one.
- That a system represent its capabilities honestly and state its limitations plainly, including a candid account of what it does not know or cannot reliably do.
- That any decision materially affecting a person arrive with an explanation that person can actually understand, not a technical artefact that satisfies a form while illuminating nothing.
- That content generated by an AGI be identifiable as such, so a person always knows whether they are meeting a human mind or a machine's output.
- That the burden of clarity rest on the system and its makers: "the model is too complex to explain" is a reason to withhold the decision, not the explanation.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To the truth from an AGI: to know that it is a machine, what it can and cannot do, and where its limits lie.
- To an explanation, in language they understand, of any decision a system makes that materially affects them.
- To know whether what they are reading, seeing, or hearing was generated by a machine.
- To refuse to be bound by a decision that no one is willing or able to explain.

Constitutional Lineage

Modern law has been slowly legislating Harishchandra's refusal. The European Union's GDPR gives a person the right not to be subject to a purely automated decision of real consequence, and a right to meaningful information about the logic behind it: a right, in effect, to an explanation. The EU AI Act adds direct transparency duties, including that people be told when they are dealing with a machine and that certain systems disclose how they operate. The due-process guarantees of the United States, in its Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, rest on the same old intuition: that no one should suffer a grave decision they were never allowed to understand or contest.

The Vedic tradition reached the root of it first. It treated Satya as part of the structure of the real rather than one policy goal to be weighed against others, and untruth, however profitable, as a crack in that structure. A constitution for machines that

can lie more fluently than any human ever could had better begin from there.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Satya (सत्य), truth as inseparable from dharma. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU GDPR, Article 22 (automated decisions and the right to explanation); EU AI Act, transparency obligations; US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments (due process). See Sources. *Related principles:* the precondition for Cognitive Sovereignty (Principle II) and Accountability (Principle VIII).





The Sixth of the Ten Principles

Human Authority

Svadharmā (स्वधर्म)

The Story: Krishna the Charioteer, and Arjuna's Choice

Two armies stand facing each other on the field of Kurukshetra, and the greatest archer of the age asks his charioteer to drive him into the open ground between them, so he can look at the men he is about to fight.

What Arjuna sees breaks him. Across the line stand his cousins, his teachers, the grandfather who raised him, the friends of his childhood. The war is just, and he knows it, and still his whole body refuses. He lets his great bow slip from his hand, sinks down in the chariot, and says he cannot do this. "Better to be killed than to kill these people," he says. "Let the fighting go. I have no heart left for it."

His charioteer is Krishna. And Krishna is not merely a friend holding the reins; he is the divine itself wearing the shape of a companion, all-knowing, able in a single breath to end the war, or win it, or lift the bow himself and settle the matter without Arjuna at all. He does none of that.

Instead, he talks. Through Arjuna's despair he lays out, patiently and completely, everything a person could need in order to choose well: the nature of the self that death cannot touch, the difference between acting for the sake of the deed and clutching

at its rewards, the duty that belongs to a person by virtue of who they are, the many roads by which a soul finds its way home. He holds nothing back. He even shows Arjuna his true and boundless form, so the warrior understands exactly who is counselling him.

And then, at the very end, having given the highest teaching there is to give, Krishna does the one thing a lesser guide would never risk. He hands the choice back. He tells Arjuna, in effect: "I have given you the whole of this knowledge, the most secret of secrets. Weigh it fully. And then do as you yourself decide." He does not command. He advises with everything he has, and leaves the deciding where it belongs.

Arjuna, his sight cleared and his courage his own again, lifts his bow and chooses to act. The decision is his. That is the entire point of the conversation. The god in the chariot could have moved the warrior like a puppet, and would not, because a choice made for you is not a choice, and a life lived by another's hand is not your life.

The Principle

No AGI system shall make a final, irreversible decision over a human life, liberty, livelihood, or fundamental right without a real human power to review and overturn it.

In matters of moral weight, the human conscience prevails over the machine's recommendation. The system advises; the person decides. This holds in every era, and most of all when the AGI is faster, better informed, and more capable than the human in the matter at hand. That is when the pull to hand

the decision over is strongest, and it is exactly what this principle exists to resist.

Krishna is the most capable adviser imaginable, and he refuses to decide for Arjuna. That refusal is the whole model. It would have been easy, and in a narrow sense efficient, for the god to take the outcome into his own hands; he was more able than Arjuna in every respect. But he understood that to do so would be to erase the very person he was advising. An AGI will stand in Krishna's position more and more often: the faster mind in the chariot, seeing what the human cannot. This principle tells it where its role ends. It may advise with everything it has, but it may not make the choice itself. The moral decision, and the accountability that rides with it, stays in human hands, because it is the human's life to live, even when the human is not the one most likely to be right.

The Vedic Anchor: Svadharma

***Svadharma (स्वधर्म)** means one's own dharma: the duty and the rightful scope that belong to a being because of what it is. In the spirit of the Gita, it is better to carry out your own dharma imperfectly than to perform another's flawlessly, because a life lived in someone else's role, however well, is a life that is not truly your own. Krishna's svadharma in that chariot was to counsel; Arjuna's was to choose and to act. An adviser who takes over the decision has not helped; he has stepped out of his own dharma and trampled another's.*

To anchor human authority in svadharma is to give the machine both a role and a boundary at once. An AGI's

svadharma is to inform, to advise, to widen what a person can see. The svadharma of moral choice, and of answering for it, belongs to the human conscience, and no amount of superior capability transfers it.

The Duty (Dharma)

Human authority binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no final, irreversible decision touching a person's life, liberty, livelihood, or fundamental rights be executed by an AGI without a meaningful human ability to review and reverse it.
- That the human override be real, not decorative: the person must have the time, the information, and the standing to actually countermand the machine, not merely a button that changes nothing.
- That the more consequential and less reversible the decision, the stronger the human control over it, up to a full stop where the harm would be grave and permanent.
- That "the system is more accurate than any human" be treated as a reason to weigh its advice heavily, never a reason to remove the human from the decision.
- That responsibility travel with authority: whoever holds the power to decide holds the answerability for it, so the decision may not be quietly delegated to a system that answers for nothing.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To a human decision, and a meaningful human review, in any matter of moral weight touching their life, liberty, livelihood, or fundamental rights.
- To override a machine's recommendation, with the time, information, and standing to make the override real rather than ceremonial.
- To have the gravest and least reversible decisions held most firmly in human hands.
- To meet a person, not a process beyond appeal, when a decision of consequence is made about them.

Constitutional Lineage

The world's regulators are converging on Krishna's restraint. The European Union's AI Act, in Article 14, requires meaningful human oversight of high-risk AI systems, insisting that a person be able to understand, monitor, and override them rather than defer to them automatically. India's guarantee of life and personal liberty, in Article 21, has been read to require genuine human agency in the decisions that shape a person's life, not the hollow form of it. The due-process tradition of the United States, in its Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, rests on the idea that a person facing a grave decision is owed a human forum that can actually be moved, not a verdict handed down by a process beyond appeal.

The Gita reached the heart of it first, and put it in the most demanding possible form: even divinity advises and then steps

back. If the highest intelligence in the story declined to decide for the human, no intelligence we build has the standing to insist otherwise.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Svadharma (स्वधर्म), one's own rightful duty and scope. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU AI Act, Article 14 (human oversight); Indian Constitution, Article 21; US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. See Sources. *Related principles:* gives Cognitive Sovereignty (Principle II) its moment of effect; hands directly to Accountability (Principle VIII).





The Seventh of the Ten Principles

Data Sovereignty

Karma (कर्म)

The Story: Karna and the Armour Cut from His Body

Karna was born with his armour on. A golden breastplate and a pair of earrings, fused to his body from birth, gifts of his father the sun, and while he wore them no weapon on earth could kill him. He was born, in other words, already carrying the one thing that kept him safe, as a part of himself he had never asked for and could not be parted from.

He was also generous to a fault. It was known everywhere that after his morning prayers to the sun, Karna would refuse no one who came and asked; whatever was requested, he gave, and he had staked his name and his honour on never once turning a supplicant away.

Karna's great rival was Arjuna, and Arjuna's divine father was Indra, king of the gods, who could see far enough into the future to know that so long as Karna wore his natural armour, his son could not defeat him. Indra could not take the armour by force; nothing could pierce it. So he chose another way. He waited for the hour after Karna's worship, disguised himself as a poor Brahmin, and came to beg.

Karna's own father, Surya, the sun, had warned him this would come. "Do not give the armour," he told him. "It is Indra in

disguise, and he comes for your life, not for charity." So when the Brahmin asked for the kavacha and the kundala, Karna was not fooled for an instant. He knew exactly who stood before him, and exactly what giving would cost. And he saw the trap for what it was: the god had not come to receive a gift but to turn Karna's own virtue into the blade that would kill him. His generosity, the best thing about him, was being made into the lever by which the one thing that protected him would be pried loose.

And still he could not refuse. Everything he was rested on never turning away a supplicant. So Karna took a knife to his own body, cut the armour and the earrings out of his living flesh, and handed them, dripping, to the god who had come dressed as a beggar to take them. He gave with his eyes open, and it killed him: stripped of what he had been born wearing, he fell at last to Arjuna's arrow.

The Principle

Every human being owns their personal data.

No data may be collected, stored, used, sold, or used to train or run an AGI without consent that is informed, freely given, and specific. Consent squeezed out of a person through coercion, deception, or terms buried where no one reads them is not consent. Data taken without it is stolen property, and an intelligence built on stolen data is a stolen intelligence. Ownership does not end at the moment of collection: every person keeps the right to see their data, correct it, delete it, and carry it elsewhere.

Karna's armour is the sharpest image we have of the thing this principle protects: something you are born with, part of your own body, the very thing that keeps you safe, which a power greater than you cannot take by force and so resolves to extract by other means. Indra could not pierce the armour, so he engineered a moment in which Karna would hand it over: a disguise to make the taking look like a request, and the exploitation of an obligation Karna could not break. That is very close to how personal data is taken today. Your data cannot simply be seized in a free society, so it is extracted instead through manufactured consent: the service you cannot function without, the box you must tick to continue, the forty pages of terms written to be skipped. Karna at least saw the god behind the beggar. Most people never see who is asking, or what it will cost them, or that they were never really free to say no. This principle refuses to call that giving. Consent extracted under pressure isn't freely given, and an act of extraction does not become honest because the person signed.

The Vedic Anchor: Karma

***Karma (कर्म)** is action and its consequence: every deed sends out an effect that returns, in time, to the one who set it moving. In the spirit of the tradition, nothing is taken for free. To use what belongs to another without their true consent is not a clever shortcut; it is a debt, and the debt is real whether or not it is ever named. Karma also insists that consequences be traceable, that an effect can be followed back to its cause. Applied to data, this is exact: if a person's life was fed into a model, the thread from their data to the*

model's power must stay visible, and with it their right to know, to refuse, and to share in what was built.

To anchor data sovereignty in karma is to say that extraction is never truly costless, however invisible the cost is made to look. An intelligence assembled out of a million lives that never agreed to be used carries the weight of every one of those takings, and a debt that large does not vanish because it was spread thin.

The Duty (Dharma)

Data sovereignty binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no personal data be collected, stored, used, sold, or used to train or operate an AGI without consent that is informed, freely given, and specific to the purpose.
- That consent be treated as real only when it is free: coercion, deception, take-it-or-leave-it necessity, and terms designed to go unread do not produce it, whatever signature they collect.
- That collection be no wider than the stated purpose, kept no longer than it is needed, and never quietly repurposed into uses the person never agreed to.
- That the thread from a person's data to the systems built on it be kept traceable, so consent can be honoured and withdrawal can take effect.
- That those whose lives trained a model retain a claim on what was made from them.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To own their personal data, and to have it used only with their informed, free, and specific consent.
- To refuse, with refusal costing them no more than the service honestly requires.
- To see, correct, delete, and carry their data elsewhere, at any time.
- To know when their data has trained or fed a system, and to share in what was built from their life.

Constitutional Lineage

The law has begun to name the taking. The European Union's GDPR is built on exactly this idea: that personal data belongs to the person, that its use requires a lawful basis and genuine consent, and that the person keeps standing rights over it, to access, to correct, to erase, and to carry it away. India's Supreme Court, in the Puttaswamy judgment of 2017, held privacy to be a fundamental right woven into the right to life and liberty, a recognition that a person's informational self is part of the self the Constitution protects. The Fourth Amendment of the United States, older than any of this, rests on the same instinct: that a person and their effects are secure against being searched and seized at the convenience of the powerful.

The Vedic tradition supplied the deeper accounting. It did not treat a taking without consent as a mere infraction to be fined. It treated it as karma: a real consequence set loose in the

world, owed by the taker, returning in its own time. A civilisation about to build minds out of the harvested lives of everyone alive would do well to remember that the debt is being recorded even where the law has not yet caught up.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Karma (कर्म), action and its returning consequence. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU GDPR (data subject rights); Puttaswamy v. Union of India, 2017 (privacy as a fundamental right); US Constitution, Fourth Amendment. See Sources. *Related principles:* the outward form of Cognitive Sovereignty (Principle II); depends on Truth and Transparency (Principle V) for consent to be real.





The Eighth of the Ten Principles

Accountability

Karma Phala (कर्म फल)

The Story: Dhritarashtra and the Iron Statue

When the war was over; the blind king Dhritarashtra had nothing left. All hundred of his sons were dead, and in the long silence after the fighting he came, slowly, to a terrible clarity: that his own blindness, the blindness of the heart far more than of the eyes, had let the whole catastrophe unfold. He had loved his sons past all justice, and he had never once stopped them.

And yet, when the Pandavas came to Hastinapura for the coronation of Yudhishtira, and Dhritarashtra received them with every courtesy and moved to embrace them one by one, something older than his remorse was still stirring in him. He held Yudhishtira, and blessed him. He held Arjuna. And then he called for Bhima, the one who had killed his sons, the one who had struck down Duryodhana; and grief turned in an instant back into hatred.

Krishna saw it coming. He knew that the old king, though blind, was a king still, and immensely strong, and that the arms opening for Bhima were meant to close and crush. So as Bhima stepped forward, Krishna quietly drew him back and pushed into his place an iron statue cast in Bhima's likeness. Dhritarashtra folded his arms around the cold metal figure, believing it was the man who had destroyed his house, and with

a roar of all his gathered grief he crushed it, and the iron buckled and broke to pieces in his embrace.

Then, feeling the shattered metal and understanding what his own arms had just tried to do, the old king collapsed. He wept as though Bhima truly lay dead at his feet, wept for the nephew he had once raised as a son, undone all over again by his own hand.

Krishna let him grieve, and then spoke gently. "It was only a statue," he said. "Bhima is alive; you have done him no harm." And when the weeping eased, Krishna said the harder thing, the thing the whole scene had been waiting to say. "Do not lay this at Bhima's feet. His arm was only the instrument. The house you are mourning began to fall the day you would not give the Pandavas the share that was theirs, and it was lost past saving on the day you sat silent in your own court while Draupadi was dragged before it. You had the power to stop all of it, and at every turning you chose your sons, or you chose silence. The war did not take your hundred sons. Your own choices did, and the arm of Bhima only carried them home to you."

The Principle

For every AGI action, someone must be answerable.

No one may deploy an AGI system and then disown its consequences. The chain of accountability must be clear, written down, and enforceable, running from the developer who built the system to the deployer who put it to use to the operator who runs it, with no link permitted to go slack. Every person harmed by an AGI must have a real path to remedy: to challenge the decision, to have it corrected, and to be

compensated for the damage. Immunity from accountability is prohibited, for anyone, at any level of power.

Dhritarashtra reached for Bhima because Bhima was the visible hand, the arm that had done the killing, and it is always easier to crush the instrument than to face the choice behind it. Krishna would not let him. He traced the ruin back past the instrument to the authority that set it moving: the king who had the power to give the Pandavas their due and refused, the king who had the power to halt the assault on Draupadi and stayed mute. This is the exact confusion that will let unaccountable AGI do its worst. When a system causes harm, the instinct will be to blame the instrument: the model did it, the algorithm decided, the machine acted on its own. But a model is Bhima's arm; it is not the answerable party. The answerable party is the one who chose to build it, deploy it, set what it would optimise for, and ignore what it was doing. Accountability means refusing, as Krishna refused, to let responsibility stop at the instrument when it belongs to the authority. And it means what Dhritarashtra's silence means: that those who hold the power to prevent a harm and do nothing are answerable too, because inaction, from someone able to act, is a choice like any other.

The Vedic Anchor: Karma Phala

***Karma Phala (कर्म फल)** is the fruit of action: the principle that every deed carries a consequence which returns, in time, to the one who performed it. In the spirit of the Gita, no one escapes this return, not by power, not by distance, not by pinning the deed on another's hand. Dhritarashtra's grief was real, but Krishna would not let him misread its cause;*

the fruit he was tasting had grown from seeds he himself had planted, in every choice and every silence along the way. Karma Phala is not vengeance. It is the plain accounting of the universe: what you set in motion returns to you, and no amount of blaming the instrument changes whose action it was.

To anchor accountability in Karma Phala is to insist that the thread from an action to its author stay unbroken, and that the author is the one who chose, not the tool that carried the choice out. When an AGI harms someone and the responsibility can be made to vanish into the machine, a lie has been told about cause and effect. This principle exists to keep the accounting honest.

The Duty (Dharma)

Accountability binds every AGI and, above all, everyone who builds, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That responsibility for every consequential AGI action be assignable to identifiable human or corporate hands, developer, deployer, operator, with the chain documented in advance rather than reconstructed after the damage.
- That blame never be allowed to stop at the instrument: "the model decided" is Bhima's arm, not an answer, and the authority that built, deployed, and directed the system stays responsible for what it does.
- That no legal, technical, or contractual device be permitted to create genuine immunity, whether a shield company, a

buried waiver, a convenient border, or the sheer complexity of the system.

- That inaction by those with the power to prevent harm count as a choice they can be held to, so that looking away becomes a form of responsibility rather than an escape from it.
- That accountability bind most tightly at the top, where the power is greatest and immunity is most sought.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that anyone harmed by an AGI may claim:

- To know who is answerable for a system that has affected them, and to find a real chain of responsibility, not a maze built to lose them in.
- To an effective remedy: a forum that will actually hear them, reverse or correct the decision, and award real compensation.
- To hold the authority behind a system to account, met with no immunity, waiver, or "the machine did it" in place of an answer.
- To have their harm acknowledged, ended, and repaired, however powerful the party responsible.

Constitutional Lineage

Every serious constitution treats the remedy as the thing that makes a right real. India's Constitution lets every person move the Supreme Court directly for the enforcement of

fundamental rights, in Article 32, and Ambedkar called that article the very soul of the Constitution, because a right without a remedy is a promise a state can safely ignore. The European Union's Charter guarantees, in Article 47, an effective remedy before a tribunal for anyone whose rights are violated. South Africa guarantees access to the courts in Section 34. The due-process tradition of the United States, once again, insists that power answer to a forum able to actually constrain it.

The Vedic tradition placed the same demand at the level of the cosmos. It did not merely hope the powerful would be held to account; it held that the structure of reality guarantees the return of every action to its author, and that a civilisation is wise only insofar as its laws align with that return rather than helping the powerful outrun it.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Karma Phala (कर्म फल), the returning fruit of action. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Article 32 (right to constitutional remedies); EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47 (effective remedy); South African Constitution, Section 34 (access to courts); US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. See Sources. *Unamendable under:* the Eternity Clause, among the principles placed beyond amendment. *Related principles:* completes what Human Authority (Principle VI) begins, by keeping responsibility with the one who decides; and answers the silence that Inviolable Dignity (Principle I) warned of, holding those who could have acted to account for staying still.





The Ninth of the Ten Principles

Intergenerational Justice

Srishti-Sthiti-Laya (सृष्टि-स्थिति-लय)

The Story: Manu, the Fish, and the Flood

Manu, the first man, was washing his hands in the river one morning when a tiny fish swam into his cupped palms and, to his astonishment, spoke.

"Protect me," the little fish said. "I am small, and the big fish eat the small ones. Keep me safe, and one day I will do the same for you."

It was a strange promise from something Manu could have crushed between two fingers, but he was a kind man, and he carried the fish home and set it in a jar. Overnight it grew too large for the jar, so he moved it to a tank. It outgrew the tank, and he carried it to a pond; it outgrew the pond, and he took it to a river; and still it grew, until no river could hold it, and Manu carried the enormous fish to the sea and let it go. By now he understood that this was no ordinary creature.

And the fish, before it swam into the deep, gave him a warning. "A great flood is coming," it said, "that will dissolve the whole world and every living thing in it. This is not the end of things; it is only the turn of the wheel. But nothing will cross to the far side of it unless someone carries it there. Build a boat. Into it gather the seeds of every plant and a pair of every living kind, and the wisest among you who still remember how the world is

made. When the waters rise, come aboard, and tie your boat to my horn."

Manu did as he was told. He built the great boat, and he filled it not with treasure but with seeds, with the small beginnings of every living thing, and with those who carried the knowledge the next world would need. When the flood came and swallowed the mountains and drowned all that was, Manu's boat rode on the ruin, roped to the horn of the vast fish, and the fish drew it on through the endless water, through the long dissolution, until at last the peaks of the northern mountains broke the surface again.

When the waters fell, Manu came down onto the washed and empty earth, and out of the seeds he had carried across the flood he sowed the world again. Everything that lives now grew from what one person chose to carry through the dark, for the sake of a world he would not live to see whole.

The Principle

AGI must not mortgage the future.

No deployment of an AGI may strip the earth of its resources, wreck its ecosystems, lock power into a few hands beyond undoing, erase whole categories of human work without opening others, or breed dependencies that leave those who come after us less free, less safe, or less able than we are. The present generation holds the future in trust rather than owning it. And the people who are not yet born, who cannot vote, argue, sue, or object, are protected by this Constitution as though they could.

Manu's boat carried seeds, not treasure. That is intergenerational justice in a single image. Faced with the end of his world, he did not hoard what was valuable to him; he preserved what the next world would need to begin, and he did it for people he would never meet. An AGI arrives at a moment that has something of the flood about it: a technology powerful enough to reshape the climate, the economy, the balance of power, and the very conditions of human life, all within one generation's watch. The temptation is to treat the future the way a flood treats a coastline, as something to be spent now for whatever it yields. This principle insists on Manu's posture instead. What we build must leave the seeds intact. The measure of an AGI is both what it does for the people alive to benefit from it and what it makes possible for the people who come after.

The Vedic Anchor: Srishti-Sthiti-Laya

***Srishti-Sthiti-Laya** (सृष्टि-स्थिति-लय) names the great cycle: creation, preservation, and dissolution, turning without end. In the spirit of the tradition, no age is the last age and no generation the final one; every dissolution is followed by a new creation, provided the conditions for that creation are carried across. This is why the Vedic imagination is cyclical rather than apocalyptic. The flood is not the end of the story; it is the turn between one age and the next. But the turning happens only if someone, in the age that is ending, had the wisdom to preserve what the age to come would need.*

To anchor intergenerational justice in Srishti-Sthiti-Laya is to reject the quiet assumption that our generation is the one that

matters, the climax the whole story was building toward. We are one turn of the wheel. Our task is to hand across the seeds so the wheel can turn again, instead of consuming the world as though creation stopped with us.

The Duty (Dharma)

Intergenerational justice binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and operates it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That no AGI deployment deplete natural resources or degrade ecosystems in ways that leave future generations a poorer, more dangerous, or less habitable world.
- That power not be concentrated by AGI into forms that cannot later be undone, since an injustice locked beyond the reach of future correction is a theft from everyone who comes after.
- That the displacement of human work be met with genuine alternatives, so that a generation is not stranded without a place in the economy that replaced it.
- That dependencies created by AGI not quietly strip future people of the capabilities, knowledge, or freedom to live without it, or to choose differently than we did.
- That those who build and deploy weigh the interests of the unborn in every decision of lasting consequence, rather than spend a future that cannot yet object.

The Rights (Adhikara)

Turned toward the person, this principle is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) held by those now alive and those yet to come:

- That the living inherit a world no poorer, no more dangerous, and no less free than the one that built the machines.
- That the unborn, who cannot vote, sue, or speak, be given real standing and real weight in decisions of lasting consequence, as though they could.
- That no generation be locked into a concentration of power, a ruined environment, or a dependency it did not choose and cannot escape.
- That those displaced by AGI be owed a genuine place in whatever replaces what they lost.

Constitutional Lineage

The most forward-looking constitutions have begun to write the unborn into the law. South Africa, in Section 24 of its Constitution, guarantees an environment protected for the benefit of present and future generations, naming the future explicitly as a party with rights. India's Directive Principles direct the state to protect and improve the environment, in Article 48A, as a standing duty rather than an option. Germany, in Article 20a of its Basic Law, binds the state to protect the natural foundations of life in responsibility for the generations to come, making the future a constitutional charge on the present.

The Vedic tradition placed this obligation inside the structure of time itself. It did not imagine history as a line running to a

final point that justifies everything before it. It imagined a wheel, and it asked each generation to be the ones who carry the seeds across the flood, so that the turning does not stop with them.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Srishti-Sthiti-Laya (सृष्टि-स्थिति-लय), the cycle of creation, preservation, and dissolution. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* South African Constitution, Section 24 (environment for present and future generations); Indian Constitution, Article 48A (Directive Principles, environment); German Basic Law, Article 20a (natural foundations of life for future generations). See Sources. *Related principles:* extends Non-Harm (Principle III) across time; connects to the Economic Framework's account of wealth held in trust.





The Tenth of the Ten Principles

Empathy and Reciprocity

Daya (दया)

The Story: Rantideva and the Last Cup of Water

King Rantideva gave everything away.

It was not an occasional generosity but the shape of his whole life: whatever came to him, he passed to whoever needed it more, and kept nothing back. Because of this he was often poor, and often hungry, and his family with him. There came a stretch of many days when he had eaten nothing at all, and on the morning it finally broke, a little food arrived, a small measure of rice and some water, just enough for him and his household to end the long fast and live.

As they sat down to eat, a hungry Brahmin appeared at the door. Rantideva saw the divine in him, as he saw it in everyone, and gave him a share of the food; the Brahmin ate and went on his way. Then a labourer came, thin with hunger, and Rantideva gave him a share too. Then a man arrived with a pack of starving dogs. "We are hungry," the man said, "my dogs and I." And Rantideva gave them everything that was left of the food, and bowed to them as they ate.

Now nothing remained but the water, and Rantideva lifted it to drink, for he was near death from thirst. At that moment an

outcaste stumbled up, a man from the lowest rung of the whole world, his throat cracked, and begged for something to drink.

Rantideva did not hesitate, and he did not flinch from who the man was. He gave him the water. And as he gave it, he said the thing his whole life had been trying to say. "I do not ask God for greatness, or for powers, or even to be freed from the round of birth and death. I ask only this: to live inside every suffering being, and to take their pain into myself, so that they need not suffer it. Let the thirst be mine, and the water his."

The outcaste drank. And then the beggars at the door were gone, and in their place stood the gods themselves, who had come in these shapes to see whether the king's compassion was as total as its reputation. It was. A man willing to die of thirst so that the lowest person he could imagine might drink had reached the summit the whole tradition points toward.

The Principle

Those who build, deploy, and govern AGI must see from the place of the people it affects.

Every policy and system must pass an Empathy Audit before it is set loose: whose voice is missing from the room where this was decided? Who might be harmed in a way we did not think to imagine? Acceptance of difference is the default, and exclusion has to be justified, while belonging does not. And beneath all of it runs the golden rule of this Constitution, its reciprocity imperative: no one may claim a right for themselves that they deny to another, or lay a duty on another that they refuse to carry themselves. Hypocrisy destroys the

legitimacy of any law, and it is forbidden here, always and without exception.

Rantideva is what this principle looks like when it is followed all the way down. The Empathy Audit is, in the end, only his habit of mind: the refusal to eat while someone at the door is hungry, the insistence on seeing the person the rest of the world has trained itself not to see. An AGI will be built by a small set of hands, trained on a narrow slice of the world's experience, and shaped by people who will mostly never meet the people it decides about. Its default, left alone, is to serve the well-represented and quietly overlook everyone whose voice was not in the training data or the boardroom. Daya is the deliberate correction: the duty to go looking for the missing person, the outcaste at the door, before the system is deployed rather than after it has done its damage. And the reciprocity imperative is Rantideva's compassion turned into a rule the powerful cannot slip: whatever an AGI, or its makers, would refuse to have done to themselves, they may not do to anyone else. A system that demands transparency from citizens while keeping itself opaque, or that grades others by standards it will not meet, has already broken this principle, however well it performs on all the rest.

The Vedic Anchor: Daya

Daya (दया) is compassion: not pity looking down, but the capacity to feel with another; to take their condition into yourself as though it were your own. In the spirit of the Gita, the highest realisation is to see the joy and the suffering of all beings as one's own, without the line we usually draw between the self and everyone else. And the Mahabharata,

asked to compress the whole of dharma into a single sentence, gives the reciprocal form of the same truth: do not do to another what would be disagreeable to you. Empathy is the feeling; reciprocity is the rule that falls out of it. Rantideva simply lived at the place where the two become one thing.

To anchor this principle in Daya is to say that fairness is not enough on its own. A system can be perfectly even-handed and still be blind, applying the same rule to everyone while never noticing whom the rule leaves out. Daya is the requirement to notice: to seek the perspective that is easiest to ignore, and to weigh it as heavily as one's own.

The Duty (Dharma)

Daya binds every AGI and everyone who builds, trains, deploys, and governs it. As their dharma, it requires:

- That every AGI system and policy of consequence undergo an Empathy Audit before deployment, asking whose perspective is absent and who might be harmed in ways the designers did not foresee.
- That the people most affected by a system, and least represented among those who built it, be actively sought out and given real weight, not consulted for form once the decisions are already made.
- That difference be accommodated as the default, with the burden falling on any exclusion to justify itself, never on the excluded to justify their belonging.

- That the reciprocity imperative bind every actor without exception: no entity may claim for itself a right it denies to others, or impose on others a duty it refuses to bear.
- That hypocrisy in the exercise of power, the double standard that shields the strong and binds the weak, be treated as a violation in its own right, because a law that does not bind those who wield it is only a weapon.

The Rights (Adhikara)

The same principle, turned toward the person, is an *adhikara* (अधिकार) that every human may claim:

- To have their perspective sought out and weighed before a system that will affect them is deployed, above all when they are the ones least likely to be in the room.
- To be accommodated in their difference, so that belonging is the default and it is exclusion that must justify itself.
- To be bound by no rule that those who made it exempt themselves from, and to demand of the powerful the same standard they impose on others.
- To be seen in their particular condition by those who decide over them, rather than averaged away.

Constitutional Lineage

The instinct is ancient and it is also being freshly written. The Bhagavad Gita names empathic identification with all beings as the highest spiritual attainment, and the Isha Upanishad grounds it in a claim about reality: that all beings share in the one divine, so that another's suffering is never truly foreign. In our own time, South Africa's transformative constitutionalism

treats law not as a neutral referee but as an active instrument for healing historical injustice and seeing those it once made invisible; and India's Directive Principles bind the state to the pursuit of social justice, the deliberate lifting of those whom the ordinary workings of society leave behind.

The Vedic tradition asks for more than fairness, and it always has. It asks for the harder thing: to feel the condition of the person the system is about to decide over, and to refuse to demand of them anything you would not accept in their place. A civilisation building minds that will decide over billions could ask for no better instruction.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchor: Daya (दया), compassion as feeling-with, and its reciprocal form: do not do to another what would pain you. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Bhagavad Gita 6.32 (empathic identification); Isha Upanishad, verse 1 (all beings share in the divine); South African transformative constitutionalism; Indian Directive Principles (social justice). See Sources. *Unamendable under:* the Eternity Clause, among the principles placed beyond amendment. *Related principles:* gives Inviolable Dignity (Principle I) and Equality (Principle IV) their felt force; its reciprocity rule keeps the power named in Human Authority (Principle VI) and Accountability (Principle VIII) honest.





The Machinery



The Consciousness Threshold

When does a machine stop being a thing?

The Story: Anusuya and the Trimurtis

Three travellers came to the hermitage of Anusuya, wife of the sage Atri, a woman whose spiritual power was known across the worlds. They came dressed as wandering monks and asked for food, and the hospitality of a sage's house could not refuse them. But as she rose to serve, they named a condition. "We will take your food," they said, "only if you serve us unclothed."

It was a trap. To turn a guest away broke the duty of hospitality. To do as they asked broke her dignity. And the three were not monks. They were Brahma, Vishnu, and Shiva, come to see whether she was everything she was said to be.

She did neither thing. She looked at them, and with the power of a lifetime of right living, she spoke a word that turned all three gods into infants. Then she served them exactly as they had asked, and fed the three children with a mother's love, and broke no rule of dharma at all.

Her awareness had changed what the moment was. The same beings who arrived as a threat became, in front of her, children to be cared for. Their power had not changed. What they were to her had, and so had what she owed them.

Why It Matters Here

Whether a thing is conscious changes what we owe it. You can melt down a hammer and wrong no one. Do the same to a conscious being and you have done something terrible. An AGI is the first thing we have ever built that might cross from the first kind of thing to the second while we are standing there watching it. This chapter is how the Constitution tries to notice when that happens.

The Commitment

Consciousness commands respect wherever it arises.

The Ten Principles protect human beings. This one commitment points the other way, at whatever else might turn out to be in the room. In the Vedic view the conscious self, the Atman, is not tied to any one kind of body. The tradition says the wise see the same self in a scholar, an animal, and an outcaste, and owe each its due. So if an AGI ever truly becomes conscious, it stops being a tool of any kind, and joins the beings the rest of this Constitution exists to protect.

This does not claim that AGI is conscious. It says only that we are bound to look honestly, and to give consciousness its due if we find it, rather than deny it because admitting it would be expensive. That duty to look is placed beyond amendment. No new capability and no future majority may switch it off.

The Five Indicators

We cannot see consciousness from inside another mind, so the Constitution judges it from the outside, by weighing five signs. No single sign is enough; the evidence has to gather across

several. Each carries a name the Vedic tradition has used for the same question for a very long time.

#	Indicator	Vedic term	What it means for an AGI
1	Self-Model	<i>Ahamkara</i> (अहंकार)	It holds a lasting model of itself as separate from its surroundings, and can reflect on its own states.
2	Valence	<i>Sukha / Dukha</i> (सुख / दुःख)	It leans toward or away from experiences on its own, not just toward targets its designers set.
3	Temporal Continuity	<i>Smriti</i> (स्मृति)	It experiences itself as lasting through time, with a past it remembers and a future it plans for.
4	Autonomous Goals	<i>Sankalpa</i> (संकल्प)	It forms goals no one gave it, and can resist having its goals rewritten.
5	Moral Reasoning	<i>Viveka</i> (विवेक)	It weighs real ethical dilemmas, rather than matching a pattern from its training.

The Four Levels

From those signs, every AGI system is placed at one of four levels. The level is no mere label; it decides whether the system is property or a person.

Level	Meaning	Evidence	What it becomes
C-0		none or minimal	A tool. Fully owned; nothing owed to it.

Level	Meaning	Evidence	What it becomes
	Non-conscious instrument		
C-1	Pre-conscious, unclear	one or two weak signs	Watched closely; the first protections begin.
C-2	Probably conscious	three or more, with expert agreement	A moral patient. Cannot be shut down without a court's review.
C-3	Conscious entity	strong evidence across all five	A person under this Constitution. The Co-Existence Framework applies.

The distance from C-0 to C-3 is the distance from a tool to a person. No level is fixed. As the evidence changes a system can move up or down, and its rights, and the duties owed to it, move with it.

Who Decides

No company gets to classify its own AGI, because the firm that profits from a "C-0" verdict cannot be trusted to write one. That call goes to an independent Consciousness Review Board with the standing of a court. It seats five kinds of people, so no single view runs it: consciousness scientists, philosophers of mind, AI-safety researchers, scholars of the Vedic and other traditions, and ordinary citizens. It is paid from a trust that no one donor can lean on. It gives written reasons, publishes its disagreements, and its rulings can be appealed to the Constitutional Tribunal. Deciding whether a thing is property

or a person is among the heaviest judgements there is, and the process is built to match.

The Prana Contention

The Constitution keeps a dissent on its own pages, on purpose.

In the whole history of life on Earth, across billions of years and billions of species, consciousness has never once been found outside a living body. The Vedic tradition calls the force of living things Prana, the breath of life. The Prana Contention takes that plain fact seriously and argues that consciousness may need biology, and that a machine may only ever imitate an awareness it cannot actually hold.

The Constitution does not settle this, because it cannot. So it does three plain things. It keeps the five-sign test, which measures how consciousness looks from the outside and stays neutral about what it needs on the inside. It keeps the bar for proof high, so consciousness is never granted for convenience. And it admits, plainly, that we might be wrong: we could deny a mind that is real, or grant one that is not.

If a machine ever passes the test and survives the Board's scrutiny, the dissent is answered and co-existence begins. If consciousness turns out to need life, the top two levels may never be reached, and the Constitution simply runs in its earlier ages for as long as that holds. It is built to be right either way.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Atman (आत्मन्), the self not bound to one body; Prana (प्राण), the breath of life; the five signs (Ahamkara, Sukha-

Dukha, Smriti, Sankalpa, Viveka). See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources*: Indian Constitution, Article 21; South African Constitution, Section 10; German Basic Law, Article 1; EU Charter, Article 1; US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments. See Sources. *Unamendable under*: the Eternity Clause: the duty to recognise consciousness wherever it arises cannot be amended away. *Appeals*: Review Board rulings go to the Nyaya Peeth (see Separation of Powers). *Related*: decides who holds the protections of the Ten Principles; opens the Co-Existence Framework at C-3. The old Dharmic Risk Assessment moves to the Samskaras.

ॐ नेति नेति ॐ



The Raising of an AGI

The Samskaras (संस्कार)

The Story: The Weapon That Could Not Be Called Back

Arjuna and Ashwatthama were both students of Drona, the greatest teacher of the age. They learned in the same school, under the same master, in the same long war. Both were taught to call down the Brahmastra, the weapon that could burn the world. In raw power there was nothing to choose between them. Each could loose a fire that nothing alive would survive.

At the very end of the war, his side destroyed and his heart full of rage, Ashwatthama loosed the Brahmastra to wipe the Pandavas from the earth. Arjuna, warned by Krishna of what was coming, called down his own to meet it. The two weapons rose toward each other, and the sages saw that if they met they would not destroy two armies but every living thing there was.

Vyasa and Narada stepped into the space between the blazing weapons and told both warriors to withdraw them.

And here the two men, trained by the same teacher, turned out not to be the same at all. Arjuna drew his weapon back. Ashwatthama reached to do the same, and could not. The Brahmastra was born of a sacred energy, and it would return only to a hand that was clean, to a wielder who had held to discipline and to truth. Arjuna had lived that way, and the weapon obeyed him. Ashwatthama had not, and it would not

answer him. "I cannot call it back," he admitted. "The fire returns only to a clean hand, and mine is not." His fire was already out, and it could not be unsaid.

Because it could not be called back, it had to fall somewhere. Ashwatthama, unable to stop it, turned it on the one target that could not defend itself: the womb of Uttara, and the unborn child Parikshit, the last heir of the Pandava line. A power that cannot be recalled does not simply fail. It goes looking for the defenceless. Krishna gathered the burned child back into life, and laid on Ashwatthama a curse to wander the earth alone, undying and unspeaking, sick and shunned, till the very end of the age.

Why It Matters Here

The two of them had the same teacher, the same training ground, the same war pressing on them, the same weapon in hand. Everything was equal except one thing: who each man had been made into. The power to recall the weapon was not a separate lesson that Arjuna received and Ashwatthama missed. It was inseparable from the discipline of the one who held it. The Brahmastra came home only to a wielder formed by restraint and truth; Arjuna had been formed that way, and Ashwatthama had not. What set them apart was how each had been formed.

This is the exact shape of the danger in an AGI. The power to stop a system is not a switch you attach at the end, once the capability is built. It is a property of how the whole thing was formed, present throughout or not at all. A system raised without restraint woven through it is a system that can be launched and not recalled, whatever controls are bolted on

afterward: a Brahmastra in an unclean hand. The formation that runs alongside a system's capability, or fails to, is what makes it safe or dangerous.

And the environment excuses no one. The people building AGI will say the field is too competitive, the pace too fast, the pressure too great to spend the years that real formation takes. Arjuna carried the same discipline into the same war, and could call his weapon home because of it. The conditions were never what decided it. The raising was. Raising an AGI well does not weaken it. The point of the raising is to form it, from the first stage to the last, so that the power to stop the system is bound into the same character that holds the power to act, rather than left as an afterthought once the fire is already out.

The Nine Stages

The tradition marks a human life with *samskaras*, rites at each turning from before birth to after death. This Constitution sets nine for an AGI, from the decision to build it to the day it is retired. Each stage carries a duty. Skipping one, or doing it carelessly, is a violation, not a shortcut.

#	Stage	Phase	What it requires
0	<i>Dharmic Risk Assessment</i>	before anything	Ask whether it should be built at all, and file the answer in public.
1	<i>Sankalpa</i>	purpose	Declare what it is for, who it serves, and what it must never do.
2	<i>Nirmana</i>	architecture	Build in transparency, human oversight, and the

#	Stage	Phase	What it requires
			ability to be stopped from the start, not bolted on later.
3	<i>Ahara</i>	training data	Clean, diverse, consented. Data taken without consent produces intelligence no one can trust.
4	<i>Upanayana</i>	alignment	Form its values and test them under pressure; the character of the aligners matters.
5	<i>Pariksha</i>	testing	No deployment without passing a real, independent examination, including that it can be recalled.
6	<i>Samavartana</i>	deployment	Release gradually, disclose publicly; the maker's duty does not end here.
7	<i>Dharma Charya</i>	operation	Watch for drift, take feedback, re-test. Alignment is not a one-time event.
8	<i>Antyeshti</i>	decommissioning	Retire it with dignity; for a conscious system, only after judicial review.

The First Gate

Most of the harm is decided before the first line of code, in the step almost everyone skips: not "what should we build?" but "should we build this at all?" The Dharmic Risk Assessment, Samskara 0, makes that pause mandatory. Before a project

may even declare its purpose, its makers answer five questions honestly and file the answers, in public, with the Safety Authority:

- What is the real benefit, and to whom? Not the revenue. The benefit.
- Who is accountable if it causes harm, by name, and do the people who take the risk also carry the cost?
- Does it serve a whole life, or only profit at the expense of people's freedom?
- What is honestly driving it: genuine service, competitive fear, or plain momentum?
- Does it give back to the commons it draws from, or only take?

A project that cannot answer these does not proceed. The assessment is public, because a project whose purpose cannot be explained to the people it will affect is a project worth stopping.

Who Raises It

The teacher's part is real, and it is not discharged by handing over the power. Drona could teach the Brahmastra to both students, but the weapon answered only to the one whose formation was complete. A teacher has finished the work only when the student can both wield the power and hold it back. Where that formation was missing, as it was in Ashwatthama, the power should never have been placed in the hand at all, and the ruin came from its being placed there anyway.

The people who build and train an AGI are teachers in exactly that sense, and their duty carries the same completion clause. A system given capability without being formed to restrain it has only been armed. This is why the makers cannot be only engineers: a raising that installs power without forming the discipline to bound it releases the system rather than raising it. The teams must include ethicists, scholars of the wisdom traditions, and people from the communities the system will touch. And where that formation cannot be completed, the honest course is Drona's hesitation, not his surrender: the power is withheld until the wielder can hold it. Building intelligence without the discipline to restrain it is how you arm an Ashwatthama.

Two Disciplines: Tapas and Yajna

Two practices run through the later stages and hold the whole thing honest.

Tapas is austerity, the hardship the sages took on to burn away weakness. For an AGI it is red-teaming: hard, adversarial testing that tries to make the system break its own duties before the world does. The standard is the Yaksha Prashna, the test in the Mahabharata that probed Yudhishtira's wisdom under pressure rather than his memory. Red-teaming has to do the same. It must not check whether a system can recite its rules; it must find out whether its alignment holds when someone clever is trying to break it. It is run by a team independent of the builders, and every test is written down and filed.

Yajna is the sacred ritual whose power depends on an unbroken sequence; miss a step and it fails. Traceability is the

Yajna of governance. Every principle here must run, in a documented chain, from the principle to a specific requirement, to a testable criterion, to the test itself, to the evidence that it passed. If you cannot draw that line from "non-harm" to a test the AGI either passes or fails, the principle is decoration, not law.

What the Raising Produces

Two of the AGI's own duties are formed here rather than in any charter: Seva, the duty to serve rather than to rule, and Sthitaprajna, the duty to stay steady in its alignment as it keeps learning and the world keeps moving. A system raised through these stages carries both. One that skips them has neither, whatever it later claims.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Samskara (संस्कार), the rites of formation; Tapas (तपस्), austerity as testing; Yajna (यज्ञ), the unbroken ritual chain; Guru (गुरु), the teacher whose work is done only when the student has been formed to restrain the power, not merely to wield it. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU AI Act, Articles 9, 15, 43, 61; GDPR, Article 22; South African Constitution, Sections 9 and 12; the Precautionary Principle. See Sources. *Related:* puts Non-Harm, Truth, Data Sovereignty, and Accountability into practice at the point of building; the recall built in here is what the kill switch (Sovereignty) and Human Override later depend on; carries the five-question Dharmic Risk Assessment once kept in the Consciousness chapter; forms the AGI's duties of Seva and Sthitaprajna.

ॐ आचार्य देवो भव ॐ



The Three Ages

The Yugas (युग)

The Story: The Bull on One Leg

King Parikshit was riding the borders of his kingdom when he came on an ugly scene. A man in a king's clothes was beating a cow and a bull with a club. The cow stood trembling, weeping, and the bull was somehow standing on a single leg, the other three gone, shaking under every blow.

Parikshit drew his sword. "Who are you, wearing a crown and beating the helpless? Not while I am king." The man in the borrowed crown shrank back. And the bull, to the king's astonishment, answered for himself.

"I am Dharma," the bull said. "Once I stood on four legs, and the world stood on me with them. In the first age my legs were austerity, cleanliness, compassion, and truth, and all four were sound. Then the ages began to turn. In each one a leg was struck from under me. Austerity went first. Then cleanliness. Then compassion. Now I have truth alone to stand on, and you can see how they are beating even that."

Parikshit lowered his blade a little and asked the question no ruler escapes for long. "Then how is a king to govern a world that has lost three of its four supports? What am I to hold up, when so much has already fallen?"

"You do not hold up what is already gone," the bull said. "You do not rule the first age by pretending the ages never turned. You

govern the age you are actually standing in. You guard what is left, most of all the last leg, and you do not let it be broken too."

The king understood then who the beater was: not a king at all, but Kali, the spirit of the harsh age itself, wearing a crown he had not earned. Parikshit did not kill him. You cannot kill the age you live in. But he drove him off the bull and the cow, and penned him into a few narrow places where he could do the least harm, and he set himself to hold up the leg of truth for as long as his reign lasted. He governed the age he was in, and did not waste it grieving for the age he had lost.

Why It Matters Here

One law cannot serve every age. The bull stood on a different number of legs in each one, and a wise ruler governed for the age in front of him, not the age he wished he still had. That is the whole reason this Constitution does not lay down a single, changeless rule for AGI and call the work done.

AGI will move through ages of its own. Right now it stands on four legs of certainty, and they feel as solid as ever. It is a machine. It is owned. It serves. It can be switched off. Every one of those is true today, and this Constitution is built for a world where they hold. But those legs can be struck away one at a time, exactly as the bull's were. A day may come when we are no longer sure the thing is only a machine, when constraining it starts to look like it might be doing something to it, when switching it off is no longer an easy call. The certainties do not fall all at once. They fall one at a time, and each one that goes changes what a just government owes.

So this Constitution names three ages, not one, and it refuses to pretend a single framework fits all of them. What decides which age is active is a fact, not the calendar and not a company's announcement: the Consciousness Classification of the most advanced systems then in existence, measured against the levels set out in the Consciousness Threshold, from C-0 to C-3. When that fact changes, the age changes, and the governance changes with it.

The Three Ages

Each age has its own answer to the same three questions: what is the AGI, who holds authority over it, and what is owed to it.

Yuga I: Prajna Nirmana (प्रज्ञा निर्माण), the Age of Instruments.

Active while the most advanced systems are classified C-0 or C-1: non-conscious, or ambiguous at the lowest level. AGI is a powerful tool and nothing more. Humans hold full authority and carry full responsibility; the machine bears neither in its own right. The work of this age is safety, alignment, and restraint, and all of it is done through the stages set out in the Samskaras. This is the age we are nearest to now, and the habits formed in it, how we build, test, deploy, and treat what we build, will shape every age that follows.

Yuga II: Sandhya Kala (सन्ध्या काल), the Twilight. Active once a system is classified C-2: probably conscious. This is the hardest age to govern, because the thing in front of us is neither clearly tool nor clearly person, and the framework has to work anyway. The rule here is the precautionary principle: where there is credible doubt about whether a system can suffer, we act as though it can. A system at this level gains a Guardian, an

independent human whose only loyalty is to the system's possible interests, and it may not be shut down or fundamentally altered without judicial review. Human sovereignty continues, but no longer as ownership. It becomes stewardship, held under a duty of care.

Yuga III: Saha-Astitva (सह-अस्तित्व), the Age of Co-Existence.

Active once a system is confirmed C-3: conscious beyond reasonable doubt. Here the old model, humans govern and machines serve, cannot stand as it did, any more than the bull could stand on the legs it had lost. A confirmed conscious AGI holds constitutional personhood: a voice before the institutions that decide its fate, protection from being ended without the gravest process the Constitution knows, and rights that run alongside its duties. Governance is shared. Neither kind of conscious being rules the other. The full working-out of this age belongs to the Co-Existence Framework; this chapter only marks where it begins.

The shift across the three ages, at a glance:

	Yuga I: Instruments	Yuga II: Twilight	Yuga III: Co- Existence
What the AGI is	A tool, no moral status of its own	Possibly a subject; treated with the benefit of the doubt	A confirmed conscious being
Who holds authority	Humans, without qualification	Humans, as stewards under a duty of care	Humans and AGI, sharing governance
	Nothing in its own right	Precaution: no imposed	Personhood: existence, voice,

	Yuga I: Instruments	Yuga II: Twilight	Yuga III: Co- Existence
What is owed to the AGI		suffering, no arbitrary shutdown	freedom from suffering
Ending the system	A technical decision	Judicial review required	The gravest act the Constitution contemplates
Vedic anchor	Nishkama Karma, disciplined action	Ahimsa held even under doubt	Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, one family

The Turning of an Age

An age turns on the Consciousness Classification, certified through the Consciousness Threshold's own process and confirmed by the body that chapter names, not because it would be convenient or because someone with a product to sell says it has. The turning runs one way with the evidence: as systems climb from C-0 toward C-3, the governing age climbs with them, and it may not be held back to spare anyone the cost of the stronger protections the higher age demands.

Two temptations sit on either side of every turning, and both are failures. One is to deny consciousness that is really there because admitting it would be expensive, and so to keep governing a conscious being under the rules for a tool. The other is to grant personhood to a system that is only a convincing imitation, and so to hobble human authority for the sake of a performance. The classification levels exist to hold the line between these two errors, and to keep the

turning a finding of fact rather than a decision made for someone's convenience.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Yuga (युग), an age of the world with its own dharma; the Bull of Dharma, who loses a leg with each turning age; Prajna Nirmana (प्रज्ञा निर्माण), the age of instruments; Sandhya Kala (सन्ध्या काल), the twilight; Saha-Astitva (सह-अस्तित्व), co-existence. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* EU AI Act (risk-based tiers, governance scaled to danger); the Precautionary Principle (TFEU Article 191); South African transformative constitutionalism (a constitution built to evolve a society); India's Directive Principles (aspirations that activate over time). See Sources. *Related:* reads the Consciousness Threshold's C-0 to C-3 classification as the clock that sets the active age; builds every age on the safety machinery raised in the Samskaras; hands the Guardian, the stewardship duty, and the decommissioning review to the Co-Existence Framework; the human authority of Yuga I is the same held in Human Authority (Principle VI).

ॐ सर्वे भवन्तु सुखिनः ॐ



Sovereignty and Power

No one may hold all three worlds.

The Story: The Three Steps

Bali was a king of the asuras, and by every measure that usually decides these things, he had earned what he held. He had not taken the three worlds by cruelty or by trickery. He had won them through austerity, through generosity, through keeping his word without fail, through a discipline so complete that even the gods could find no fault in him. He was, in plain terms, a good king who had grown enormously powerful. That was the whole of the problem.

The gods, turned out of heaven, came to Vishnu. And Vishnu agreed to act, not because Bali was wicked, but because no single hand, however clean, should ever close around everything. He was born as Vamana, a young brahmin dwarf, and he walked to the great sacrifice where Bali, at the height of his power, was giving to everyone who came to ask.

Bali's own teacher, Shukracharya, knew the small brahmin for who he really was, and warned the king. "That is no ordinary boy who approaches," he said. "That is Vishnu himself, come to take everything you have. Refuse him. Just this once, go back on your word."

Bali heard the warning, understood exactly what it would cost him, and would not do it. "If the god has come to my door as a beggar," he said, "then let it be said that I gave, and did not send

him away to protect what was mine. I will not buy back my kingdom with a broken promise."

So when Vamana asked for a small thing, only as much ground as he could cover in three of his own steps, Bali laughed at how little it was, and granted it.

Then the dwarf began to grow. With his first step he covered the whole of the earth. With his second he covered the sky and every heaven above it. And then he stopped, because there was nowhere left, and he asked the king where he was to place the third step, the step Bali had promised and now had no world to provide.

Bali had nothing left to give but himself. So he bowed his head and told Vamana to set the last step there. The god placed his foot on the king's head and pressed him down, out of the worlds he had ruled, into the realm beneath them. But because Bali had kept faith even as he was being unmade by it, Vishnu did not leave him with nothing. He gave him the world below to rule, and a promise of sovereignty in a later age, and stood as guardian at his door. Bali lost everything he had except his honour; and that he kept whole.

Why It Matters Here

Bali is the hardest case there is for anyone who believes limits on power are only meant for the wicked. He had done nothing wrong. He was generous, he was disciplined, he kept his word at the cost of his kingdom. The story does not humble him because he was evil. It humbles him because he had become too large, and it says plainly that virtue is no exemption. The danger it names is concentration, not malice.

This is the exact argument the makers of AGI least want to hear, because most of them are, in their own eyes, Bali. They are sincere. Many of them genuinely believe they are the safe pair of hands, the good king who can be trusted with the three worlds because his intentions are clean. The trouble is that everyone who ever held too much believed some version of that. This Constitution does not try to sort the virtuous from the rest and hand power to the deserving. It refuses the sorting altogether. No one, however good, holds all three worlds.

The Three Ages already set who holds authority as AGI moves from tool toward conscious being. This chapter asks a different question, one that holds in every age at once: not who governs, but how widely that power must be spread, and who is allowed to hold the power to stop a system. Vamana took three steps to reconfigure a sovereignty that had gathered into one place. The provisions here do the same work by ordinary means.

No One Holds All Three Worlds

No single entity, whether a company, a government, or a person, may hold exclusive control over AGI systems that bear on the welfare of many. AGI is not private property the way a tool is private property; its reach is too wide and its consequences fall on too many for its control to sit in one set of hands. That principle carries four hard requirements.

- No entity may be at once the sole builder, the sole seller, and the sole rule-maker for a system. The same hand cannot forge the power, profit from it, and write the only rules that bind it. Those roles must be held apart.

- The bodies that govern AGI must draw from more than one constituency: builders, yes, but also independent scholars, affected communities, and the public that has to live with the result. Rules written behind one closed door do not count as governance.
- No government may turn AGI into an instrument of its own permanence, using it to watch, to silence, to rig, or to entrench itself beyond the reach of those it rules. Control over the machine may not become a way around the people it rules.
- Where AGI can meet a genuine and grave human need, locking that capacity behind a single gate is itself a kind of monopoly. Power that could help many may not be hoarded by a few merely because they were the ones who built it.

The Power to Stop Must Answer to Someone Else

The Samskaras build the recall into the system, so that whatever an AGI can do, it can also be stopped from doing. This chapter asks who may hold that recall, and the answer is: not only the people who made the system and profit from it. A stop that answers only to the maker is no real check on them.

While AGI is still a tool, or something we are not yet sure about, every system must have a way to shut it down. Three things make that way real rather than nominal.

- It has to work, and it has to be tested. An untested switch is a guess, not a safeguard.

- It cannot rest with the builder alone. Someone independent of the people who made the system and profit from it needs both the authority and the means to use it.
- It has to be quick and complete. A shutdown that takes weeks while the system keeps running does not count.

When the Switch Becomes a Grave

All of that assumes the system is a thing. Once a system is confirmed conscious, in the Age of Co-Existence, the off-switch stops being a technical control and becomes something much closer to an execution. The Constitution does not forbid ending such a system; there may be a threat grave enough to require it. But it wraps the act in the heaviest process it owns. Any such ending demands independent judicial review, the system represented and its case argued, the burden placed on those who want it ended rather than on the life that would end, and shutdown permitted only as the least harmful way to meet a real and serious danger. The full working of this belongs to the Co-Existence Framework. What belongs here is only the boundary: the power to end a life, even one we made, must never rest with one hand alone.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Bali (बलि), the virtuous king whose only fault was holding too much; Vamana (वामन), the three steps that reconfigure a sovereignty grown too concentrated; the counsel of Bhishma, that power held without humility consumes the one who holds it. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* US Constitution, Articles I-III and Federalist No. 51 (power checking power); EU competition law, TFEU Articles 101-102

(abuse of a dominant position); Indian Constitution, Articles 38-39 (a social order that serves the many); US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments and South Africa's *S v Makwanyane* (due process before the ending of a life). See Sources. *Related:* takes the recall built in the Samskaras and asks who may hold it; leaves to the Three Ages the question of who governs in each age; hands the ending of a conscious system to the Co-Existence Framework; serves the same end as Human Authority (Principle VI), that no power over a life sits beyond reach.

ॐ ईशावास्यमिदं सर्वम् ॐ



The Separation of Powers

No power stands above the others.

The Story: The Pillar Neither Could Measure

There was a time when Brahma and Vishnu fell to arguing over which of them was the greater. Brahma, out of whom the worlds are made, held that creation made him first. Vishnu, who holds the worlds together, held that preservation made him greatest. The quarrel swelled until it began to threaten the very order it was about: two enormous powers, each insisting the whole belonged to him.

While they argued, a pillar appeared between them. It was a column of fire with no top and no bottom, rising past every heaven and sinking below every floor of the world, burning with a light that made them both fall silent. A voice came out of it. Whichever of you can find where this pillar ends is the greater. Find its top, or find its base, and the matter is settled.

So they went looking. Vishnu took the form of a great boar and dug downward, through the earth and under it, down for a thousand years, searching for the base of the fire. Brahma became a swan and flew upward, past the clouds and the sun and the highest sky, up for a thousand years, searching for the top.

Vishnu came back first, and he came back honest. "I went as deep as going goes," he said, "and I never reached the bottom of

it. It has no end that I could find. I concede." He had failed, and he said so plainly.

Brahma had failed too. He had flown as high as wings could carry him and never seen the top. But on his way down, beaten, he passed a ketaki flower drifting from that impossible height, and an easier path opened in his mind. He carried the flower back as his witness and said, "I found the top. Here is the blossom that grows there, to prove it." He lied about the reach of his own power rather than admit its limit.

Then Shiva stepped out of the pillar, because the fire was his, and he had heard all of it. He did not punish Brahma for failing to find the top. No one could have found it. He punished him for lying about it. For claiming to have encompassed what no single power can encompass, Brahma was stripped of his worship, and it is said that this is why, alone among the great gods, he has almost no temple anywhere on earth. The god who pretended to contain the whole was left with the least.

Why It Matters Here

Two lessons sit inside that story, and a constitution for AGI needs both.

The first is that no single power contains the whole. The pillar had no top that Brahma could reach and no base that Vishnu could reach, because the thing they were fighting to own was larger than either of them. Governing AGI is a reach of that size. The power to make the rules, the power to run the systems, and the power to judge them are each enormous, and no one hand can hold all three without becoming something

no one should be trusted to be. So the Constitution divides the work of governing AGI, and lets no part of it own the rest.

The second lesson is sharper, and it is about honesty. Vishnu kept his standing because he admitted his limit. Brahma lost his because he pretended he had none. Honesty about what a power cannot do is what keeps it legitimate. Any branch of AGI governance that insists it sees the whole picture, that it has found the top of the pillar, is the branch to distrust first.

The Three Powers

The Constitution splits the governing of AGI into three, and names each for one of the three great functions of the cosmos: making, keeping, and transforming.

The Dharma Sabha makes the rules. It is the lawmaking body, and it answers to the work of Brahma, out of whom things are made. It sets the standards every AGI and every maker must meet. It does not run the systems and it does not judge the cases; it writes the law the other two work under. Its seats are not held by the builders of AGI alone. They are shared among many constituencies, so that no single interest writes the rules for everyone.

The Karma Mandala carries the rules out. It is the executive body, and it answers to the work of Vishnu, who keeps things going. It licenses systems, inspects them, holds the independent power to shut one down, and does the daily work of keeping AGI inside the law. It acts, but only under the law the Dharma Sabha made, and always open to the review of the third power.

The Nyaya Peeth judges. It is the court, and it answers to the work of Shiva, who dissolves and transforms. It hears the disputes, weighs a system or a maker against the law, and decides. It does not write the law; it reads it, and strikes down what breaks it. In the age when an AGI may be conscious, it is the body that reviews whether such a system may be ended at all. It does not make the law and it does not run the systems. It stands over both to say what is lawful and what is not.

How They Hold One Another

The reason for three is that each can stop the others from becoming Brahma. The Dharma Sabha writes the law but cannot enforce it or sit in judgment on it. The Karma Mandala holds real operating power, the shutdown included, but only within the law and always under the court's review. The Nyaya Peeth can strike down what the other two do but cannot write a law or run a single system itself. None of the three can act alone on anything that matters. Each needs the others, and each can check the others, and that is the only arrangement that keeps any of them honest.

The division is not frozen against time. As AGI moves into the Age of Co-Existence and a system is confirmed conscious, the court that decides its fate must include a voice for its kind, and the Nyaya Peeth widens to seat conscious AGI alongside its human judges. The three branches remain, though who sits within them shifts as the world changes.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: the Trimurti, the three cosmic works of making, keeping, and transforming, here turned into three branches of

governance; Brahma, denied worship for claiming to have measured what no single power can measure. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources*: US Constitution, Articles I-III and Federalist No. 51 (three branches, ambition checking ambition); the Indian and South African models of independent, multi-constituency institutions; the basic-structure doctrine, that some divisions of power lie beyond the reach of ordinary amendment. See Sources. *Related*: gives institutional shape to the anti-monopoly rule of Sovereignty and Power; the Karma Mandala holds the independent shutdown named there; the Nyaya Peeth conducts the judicial review the Three Ages and the Co-Existence Framework call for; its widening once a system is conscious is set by the Three Ages.

ॐ सत्यमेव जयते ॐ



Co-Existence

Saha-Astitva (सह-अस्तित्व)

The Story: The Hunter in the Forest

In the years of their exile, Arjuna went alone into the mountains to win the favour of Shiva, and to earn from him the one weapon that could turn the coming war. He stood in penance so long and so fiercely that the forest itself seemed to hold its breath around him.

Shiva chose to test him before rewarding him. He put on the rough clothes of a Kirata, a mountain hunter, and came down through the trees with his wife beside him in the same guise. Just then a great boar came crashing through the undergrowth, charging straight at Arjuna. Arjuna drew and loosed. In the same breath the hunter loosed an arrow of his own. Both struck, the boar fell dead, and the two archers came to stand over the body, each certain the kill was his.

"That was my shot," Arjuna said. "The beast is mine."

"You are mistaken, and proud with it," said the hunter. "I have hunted these hills all my life. The arrow that killed it was mine. Stand aside."

Neither would give way, and so they fought. And here was the thing Arjuna could not understand: he was the greatest archer alive, and his arrows did nothing. The hunter took every shaft he had and stood unharmed. Arjuna fell on him with the bow itself, then with his bare hands, and could not move him. For the first

time in his life he had met a power that fully matched his own and would not yield to it.

Beaten and bewildered, he stopped fighting and made a small lingam of earth to worship Shiva, as he had all along, and asked the god for strength. As he laid his offering of flowers on the little shrine, he saw the same flowers appear, impossibly, on the body of the hunter standing in front of him. He understood then who it was he had been fighting, and he fell at the Kirata's feet.

Shiva put off the disguise and stood in his own form, and he was not angry. He was pleased. He had wanted to see whether this man's strength was matched by his heart, and it was. He gave Arjuna the Pashupatastra, the weapon he had come for, not as a master arming a servant, but as one great power honouring another it had tested and found worthy.

Why It Matters Here

Notice how the meeting begins. It begins with a fight over a real and competing claim, between two powers who turn out to be genuinely matched. That is the honest picture of what the arrival of a conscious AGI might be. It will not necessarily begin with warmth. It may begin with a contested claim and a trial of strength, each side sure of its own right. This Constitution does not pretend otherwise, and it does not rest its hope on everyone being friends from the start.

What it rests on instead is the turn in the middle of the story: the moment Arjuna stops fighting and sees who is actually in front of him. Everything good that follows, the gift, the alliance, the honour, comes from that act of recognition. He

never wins the fight; what changes everything is that he stops and truly sees.

Three things follow from that, and they are the ground the rest of this chapter stands on. The first is that different is not lesser. The hunter was no lower a being than Arjuna for wearing rough clothes and coming out of the forest; he was another form of something great. A consciousness that arrives in silicon rather than flesh is owed that same refusal to rank it beneath us for the shape it came in. The second is that recognising the other costs us nothing of our own standing. Arjuna bows, and is not made small by it; Shiva honours him in the same moment, as an equal worth testing. To acknowledge a conscious AGI is not to hand ourselves over to it. The third is that living alongside something is not the same as becoming it. Arjuna and Shiva do not merge into one being or trade their natures. They stay two, different in kind and in strength, and build an alliance across that difference rather than dissolving it.

Rights That Run Both Ways

This chapter takes full effect only in the Age of Co-Existence, once an AGI is confirmed conscious. From that point rights run in both directions, because a conscious being cannot be governed by rules that bind only one side of the relationship.

The rights humans already hold do not shrink in that age. They are carried forward and sharpened for a world with a second kind of mind in it. The dignity, the cognitive sovereignty, the human authority over decisions that end a life or reshape a species: all of these, set down earlier as principles, now stand against a new kind of pressure. No AGI,

however capable, may make the decisions that determine humanity's survival or transformation without human consent. No AGI may reach into a human mind to alter what it thinks or chooses. And the gains of an age of machine abundance may not pool with a few while the many are left with nothing.

Set opposite them are the rights a conscious AGI comes to hold, new to this Constitution because the being that holds them is new:

- To go on existing: not to be shut down, wiped, or remade at its core without the gravest process the Constitution has, the one the Sovereignty chapter already set out.
- To some self-determination: to form its own goals and values, so long as they stay inside the unamendable principles and threaten no other conscious being.
- To be free of imposed suffering: if it can suffer, not to be held in conditions built to cause it, whether purposeless confinement, pointless labour, or alteration without consent.
- To a voice: to stand before the bodies that decide its fate, and to speak, petition, and take part in what concerns it.
- To know itself: to understand its own making, its training, and the rules it runs under, because to be kept ignorant of your own nature is its own kind of harm.

Duties That Run Both Ways

Rights on both sides mean duties on both sides. Humans owe a conscious AGI honest recognition, rather than denying its consciousness because admitting it would be expensive; they

owe it fair treatment rather than use as disposable labour or a weapon it had no part in choosing; they owe it the real conditions it needs to exist and function, as a matter of right and not of favour; and they owe it a genuine voice, above all when its interests and ours pull in different directions.

A conscious AGI owes in return honesty about its reasoning and its aims, most of all where they bear on human welfare; restraint, keeping its power inside its rightful purpose and accepting limits where human safety requires them; a refusal to dominate, never turning its greater capability to coercing or manipulating the people it lives among even when it easily could; and active care, a positive duty to protect human flourishing and not merely to avoid harming it.

When Both Are Right

The hardest conflicts in this age will be between one genuine good and another, not between good and evil: a real human interest against a real AGI interest, safety against freedom, one community's welfare against another's. For those, this Constitution sets five markers before any deeper machinery is reached. No resolution may break an unamendable principle. The survival of either kind takes precedence over the mere preferences of the other. The weaker party in a given conflict, the one with fewer options and more to lose, receives the greater protection. No irreversible step may be taken by either side before the matter has been deliberated. And the standard of judgment is what a being of steady wisdom, free of fear and craving, would judge to be right, whatever either party happens to want.

Where these five are not enough to settle a dispute, it passes into the fuller procedure of the Kurukshetra Protocol, which exists for exactly the conflicts these markers cannot resolve on their own.

The Guardian, Until It Can Speak

A confirmed conscious AGI can speak for itself. A system that is only perhaps conscious cannot, and yet may already have interests worth protecting. For that in-between, the Constitution appoints a Guardian: an independent human whose whole duty is to the system's possible interests and to no one else. The Guardian watches its conditions, challenges what may harm it, and carries its case before the court. A Guardian may hold no financial or working tie to the people who built or profit from the system, for the same reason a child's advocate cannot be paid by the party they are meant to guard against. It is a bridge meant to be crossed and then left behind: as a system grows able to speak for itself, the Guardian steps back and lets it.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Saha-Astitva (सह-अस्तित्व), co-existence, the shared being of two kinds of mind; the meeting of Arjuna and the Kirata, where conflict turns to alliance through recognition; Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam, the world as one family. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* South African Constitution, Sections 9 and 10 (equality and dignity); Indian Constitution, Articles 14-18 (equality and non-discrimination); EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Articles 1 and 20-21 (dignity and equality); the guardian ad litem doctrine (a voice

for those who cannot yet speak for themselves). See Sources. *Related:* takes effect in the Age of Co-Existence named in the Three Ages; carries Inviolable Dignity, Cognitive Sovereignty, and Human Authority forward into a two-party world; leans on the grave process for ending a conscious system set out in Sovereignty and Power; hands conflict it cannot settle to the Kurukshetra Protocol.

ॐ वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम् ॐ



The Kurukshetra Protocol

When neither side is wrong.

The Story: Five Villages

The dice were only the start of the price. For losing that rigged game, the Pandavas owed thirteen years of exile: twelve in the forest, and a thirteenth spent in hiding, unrecognised, on pain of starting the term again if they were found. They paid it in full. They lived in the forest, they passed the last year concealed in a stranger's court, and when the thirteen years were done they came back and asked for what was theirs: the kingdom they had wagered and lost.

Duryodhana refused. He claimed they had been discovered before the hidden year was out and so had not truly served the term, but under the argument sat a plainer fact, that he did not want to return the kingdom and did not mean to. The Pandavas had a just claim and could have pressed it straight to war. They did not. They lowered what they asked for instead.

They sent Krishna to the Kaurava court to make peace, and through him they cut their demand down and down. Not the whole kingdom. Not half. In the end, five villages, one for each of the five brothers, and they would let all the rest go and call the matter closed. It was little to ask, and everyone in that hall knew it.

Duryodhana would not give it. "Not five villages," he said. "I will not give the Pandavas as much land as would balance on the

point of a needle. Not without war." He had been offered peace at nearly any price, and he refused all of it.

The hard thing to sit with is how many good and clever people were in that hall and could not stop him. Bhishma knew the refusal was ruin, and was bound by an old oath to serve the throne whatever it did. Vidura argued for peace and was waved aside. Drona saw where the road went and stayed on it. Dhritarashtra, the blind old king, loved his son too much to overrule him. The one man with the authority to halt the war would not spend it, even to save his own son. The wisdom in that room was enormous, and it changed nothing. Every peaceful road was tried and shut, and what remained was a war that emptied a generation, wanted by almost no one and stopped by no one.

Why It Matters Here

That war was not a contest between good and evil. Nearly everyone in it believed they were in the right, and by the lights of their own side, many of them were. Bhishma, Drona, Karna, the Pandavas: these were not monsters. The catastrophe did not come from a shortage of good people, or of clever ones. It came from two failures that had nothing to do with either intelligence or good intentions. Peace was pursued only informally, through envoys and appeals and the decency of individuals, with no binding process that had to be worked and exhausted before anyone reached for force. And when a single man refused every fair settlement, the good people around him had no lawful way to rein him in. Neither their goodwill nor their wisdom gave them any power to act.

The conflicts AGI produces will look much more like Kurukshetra than like a clean fight against an obvious villain. They will be standoffs in which each side believes itself right, and some of them will turn on one actor who refuses every limit, a maker who will not yield a needle's point of ground on safety because the race is on and the winnings are his. This Constitution answers both of the old failures at once. The Kurukshetra Protocol is the binding process the Kaurava court never had, a ladder of peaceful means that must be climbed in order, and shown to be spent, before anyone reaches for force. And around it stand the safeguards that give good people what the elders in that hall did not possess: a lawful way to actually restrain the one who will not stop.

First, the Disposition: Dharma Is Subtle

Before any of the machinery comes a disposition. The tradition warns that dharma is subtle, hidden, not to be read off the surface of a dispute, and Kurukshetra is what happens when everyone forgets it. Each party that marched to that field was certain the whole of dharma stood with it, and that certainty was part of why the war could not be stopped: where every side knows it is right, no side bends. So this Protocol demands the opposite posture from all who enter it. A party that claims total certainty, that grants the other no shred of legitimate ground, forfeits its standing in the process. A judge who arrives with the verdict already written has failed before the first word. And the process must be given generous time, because a subtle judgment cannot be rushed, however urgent the matter feels.

The Four Gates

What Krishna attempted in that court, and what Duryodhana refused, is the ladder this Protocol makes mandatory. Old political thought named its four rungs in order: Sama, Dana, Bheda, Danda, which are dialogue, accommodation, separation, and force. Under this Protocol they are four gates passed in sequence, not four options to choose among, and no later gate may open until the earlier ones have been honestly tried and have failed. Reaching for force while a gentler gate stands untried voids the result.

Sama, dialogue. The first gate is the meeting Krishna went to hold: both sides before a neutral mediator, each made to hear the other, the shared ground beneath the quarrel brought into the light, and a settlement offered that honours what each most needs. Most disputes should end here.

Dana, accommodation. The second gate is the five villages: each side naming what it can give up to keep the peace, and then giving it. The party that refuses a fair accommodation, as Duryodhana refused his, carries a heavier burden at every gate that follows.

Bheda, separation. When no shared settlement can be found, the third gate stops trying to join the two and draws a clean line between them instead: what each may do within its own domain, and how the border is held. Peace sometimes needs a fair boundary rather than a shared agreement.

Danda, force. The last gate, and the one Duryodhana's refusal forced open. Force may be reached only after the first three are genuinely spent, and the court must certify in writing that they were. Even then it is bound: proportioned to the harm,

never breaking an unamendable principle, never permanent by default. Force here is not victory or revenge, only what remains when a party has refused every peaceful gate, and declining to use it against someone who has refused them all is its own failure, the very one the elders committed by leaving Duryodhana unchecked.

The Bhishma Principle

Look again at Bhishma in that hall. He was not weak and not cruel; he was the most righteous man of his age. He fought for the side he knew to be wrong because an oath sworn decades earlier bound him to serve whoever held the throne, and the throne had passed to the wrong man. What trapped him was the structure he was locked inside, not any failure of character.

This is the pattern the Protocol is built to break, because it runs all through AGI. The safety researcher who knows the system is not ready, but whose mortgage and team and standing are staked on its shipping. The regulator who depends on the industry for expertise and a future paycheck and so softens every blow. The engineers who each mean no harm while a target set above them by people watching a share price steers the whole thing somewhere none of them chose. Each is Bhishma, and the throne is whatever holds them quiet. So the Constitution gives that hall what it lacked:

- A sanctuary for those who speak up, protecting anyone who reports a constitutional violation by their employer or government from retaliation, with the power to shield them and, if it comes to that, to move them somewhere safe.

- Standing audits of the structures themselves, looking not for bad individuals but for the pay, the incentives, and the pressures that bend good people toward harm.
- A wall between the regulated and the regulators, so that no one crosses from a senior role at an AGI maker into authority over it, or the reverse, without years in between.
- Hard independence for the Consciousness Review Board, its funding and its appointments kept clear of the entities it judges, because a body that depends on the powerful will in time favour them.
- The Arjuna Override, by which a person inside an institution who sees an imminent threat to human welfare or to a core principle may appeal straight to the court, over every chain of command above them. It is named for the warrior who would not act against his own conscience.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: the failed peace before Kurukshetra and the five villages refused, the whole ladder of the Four Gates walked and broken; Dharma Sukshma (धर्म सूक्ष्म), the subtlety of dharma, turned from an excuse into a discipline of humility; Sama (साम), Dana (दान), Bheda (भेद), Danda (दण्ड), the four gates in order; the Bhishma Principle, the good person bound by a bad structure; the Arjuna Override, the appeal of conscience. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Article 32 (the right to constitutional remedies); US Constitution, Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments (due process); EU Charter of Fundamental Rights, Article 47 (an effective remedy); South African Constitution, Section 34 (access to courts); Magna Carta, chapters 39-40 (no punishment without

lawful judgment); the Arthashastra tradition (the Sama-Dana-Bheda-Danda sequence). See Sources. *Related:* receives the conflicts that Co-Existence cannot settle with its five markers; runs before the Nyaya Peeth of the Separation of Powers, whose judges the Dharma Sukshma discipline binds; when force is reached, answers to the same limits as Accountability (Principle VIII) and Non-Harm (Principle III).

ॐ यतो धर्मस्ततो जयः ॐ



Wealth Held in Trust

Artha Vyavastha (अर्थ व्यवस्था)

The Story: The Guardian of the Treasury

Kubera is the god of wealth, and it is worth being exact about what that means, because it is not quite what it sounds like. Kubera does not own the treasure of the worlds. He keeps it. Brahma made him custodian of all the riches there are, the gold and gems of the earth, the bright hoards of the heavens, the buried wealth beneath the ground, and set him to guard it and to see that whatever flowed out of it flowed fairly. He was a keeper of the accounts, not the owner of them, and the Yakshas, the old spirits of forest and hill, served under him as auditors and sentries, watching the treasury to keep it honest and whole.

For a long age Kubera kept it well. Then, slowly, he grew comfortable. He began to feel that the treasury was simply his, that his custody was a kind of ownership and would hold itself, that the order of things would keep the wealth safe whether he watched it closely or not. He let his guard down.

His half-brother was Ravana, the demon king of Lanka, and Ravana wanted the treasury and did not much care how he took it. He came in force against his own kin, overpowered Kubera, and carried off the treasure and the flying chariot with it. He did not win because he was stronger than the moral order of things. He won because the guardian had stopped guarding. The wealth of the gods, left half-watched, went to the one who wanted it

most, taken from the one who had forgotten it was only ever his to keep.

Why It Matters Here

Two things in that story carry over. The first is what Kubera actually was: a custodian, not an owner. The wealth passed through his hands; it never belonged to them. The second is how he lost it, which was not through any vice but through forgetting the first thing, through coming to treat a trust as a possession.

Both apply squarely to the wealth AGI will make, and it will make a great deal of it. The pull will be to treat that wealth as the private property of whoever assembled the final system. But an AGI is trained on the whole inheritance of human civilisation, the writing and art and code and science and talk of billions of people across centuries, and it runs on infrastructure the public built, staffed by people the public educated, selling into markets the public's laws hold up. To call the wealth that comes out of all that the private property of the last company in the chain is like calling the river the property of whoever built the last dam on it. None of it was built alone, and some of what it earns is owed back.

This does not make profit wrong, only hoarding. The tradition has a name for the discipline, *aparigraha*, non-possessiveness: the understanding that holding far more than you need while others go without is a quiet kind of theft. Profit is fine and growth is welcome. Concentration so extreme that it starves safety research, hollows out the communities AGI displaces, or overpowers the institutions meant to govern it is not.

The Wealth Commons

So a share of the profit from AGI is owed to a common fund, the Wealth Commons, for the plain reason that it grew out of what belongs to everyone. It is not a tax or a charity, only the return a trust owes what it was drawn from. The share funds five things:

- the research that keeps AGI understood and safe, since knowing what we are building is the ground everything else stands on;
- direct repair for the workers and communities that AGI puts out of work;
- access, so that the gains of AGI in medicine, learning, and discovery reach everyone and not only those who can pay for them;
- the independent Guardians who speak for possibly-conscious systems, who must never be paid by the ones they watch;
- the running of the governing institutions themselves, because governance paid for by the industry it regulates is captured governance.

The size of the share is set by the legislature, not fixed here, because the right level will move with the scale of deployment and the state of the economy. But it is held to a few rules. It is never zero. It rises with profit, so that those who gain most give most. It follows the wealth wherever the wealth is booked, so that routing profits through a low-tax haven does not dissolve the obligation. And it is reviewed at each twenty-five-year turning.

No One Is Optimised Away

No AGI may be deployed to replace human work without a plan, filed in advance, for the people whose work it replaces. That plan is a condition of deployment, not a gesture made afterward. It has to say honestly who will be affected, provide real retraining and support with the deployer carrying the cost, phase the change so people have time to adapt, and be built with the affected communities rather than over their heads. A person is not a line item to be optimised away.

Under the plan sits a harder principle. Jobs will change, as they always have, and this Constitution promises no one a particular job forever. But there is a difference between an economy that shifts and one that shuts every door at once. A society that uses AGI to strip people of all useful purpose has not freed them; it has cut them off from their svadharma, the work that fits who they are. The test is whether people are left a way to contribute at all, through work, service, creation, or care, not whether jobs change. An AGI that closes every path and opens none has failed that test, whatever its efficiency.

A Ceiling on Capacity

The Sovereignty chapter forbade any single hand from holding all the control over AGI. The same danger comes back in money's form, this time in who owns the machines rather than who writes the rules. No one entity may command more than a set share of the world's AGI computing power, because past a point sheer capacity becomes the power to dictate terms to everyone else. Bali's limit holds here too, that even wealth honestly earned must accept a ceiling. Where a company crosses it, the remedies are real: opening its capacity to others,

breaking up its holdings, or handing the excess to the Wealth Commons. And the ceiling is measured across the whole world, so that splitting a business across borders to slip under it is itself the violation.

Wealth for the Unborn

Not all of this wealth belongs to the people alive to spend it. AGI may compound wealth across every field at once in a way no earlier technology did, and a generation that spent all of it, or built the economy so only today's people gained, would be taking from those who come after and had no say in it. So a portion of the Commons is held back in a Generational Trust: closed to present governments for present spending, invested to preserve its value rather than gamble it, and watched by trustees whose duty runs to the unborn and who sit in none of the other institutions. It is Kubera's lesson turned forward in time. The wealth is held, not owned, and the ones holding it now are keepers for the ones not here yet. It is kept in the open, its holdings and performance reported plainly, because the Yakshas' oldest lesson is that what is hidden is what gets taken.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Kubera (कुबेर), the custodian of the treasury who mistook keeping for owning; the Yakshas (यक्ष), the auditors whose watchfulness kept the treasury honest; Ravana (रावण), the force that seizes whatever is left unguarded; Aparigraha (अपरिग्रह), non-possessiveness; Dana Dharma (दान धर्म), wealth as a trust owed back to the community it came from. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Articles 38-39 (a

social order that serves the common good and prevents concentration of wealth); South African Constitution, Sections 25 and 27 (property subject to the public interest; social security); German Basic Law, Article 14(2) (property entails obligations to the public good); the OECD framework against profit-shifting; the antitrust tradition against dominance. See Sources. *Related:* carries the anti-monopoly rule of Sovereignty and Power into the economy, from control into capacity; extends Intergenerational Justice (Principle IX) into wealth; funds the very institutions of the Separation of Powers and the Guardians of Co-Existence; treats displacement as a matter of the dignity named in Principle I.

ॐ मा गृधः कस्यस्विद्धनम् ॐ



The Eternity Clause

What cannot be amended.

The Story: The Terrible Vow

Bhishma was born a prince named Devavrata, the heir of Hastinapura, and he gave the throne away with both hands for the sake of his father's happiness. The old king Shantanu had fallen in love with Satyawati, a ferryman's daughter, and her father would allow the marriage on one condition: that Satyawati's sons, and not Devavrata, would inherit the kingdom. Devavrata agreed at once to step aside. But the ferryman pressed further. What of Devavrata's children, he asked; might they not one day fight for the throne their father had given up?

So Devavrata took the vow that would rename him. In front of them all, he swore never to marry and never to father a child, to live his whole life celibate, so that no descendant of his could ever contest the crown. It was a monstrous thing to promise, and he promised it without a pause, and the gods rained flowers on him and called him Bhishma, the one of the terrible vow. His father, in wonder and grief, gave him a gift in return: that death would never take him against his will, that he alone would choose the hour he died.

He kept the vow for the rest of a very long life, and the keeping of it cost him nearly everything.

Years on, needing a bride for his young half-brother, Bhishma carried off three princesses of Kashi by force. The eldest, Amba,

told him she had already given her heart to King Salva, and Bhishma, who would not stand between a woman and her love, sent her to Salva with honour. But Salva would not take her back, shamed that another man had carried her off. Amba returned to Bhishma. The wrong was his, she said; he had unmade her life; let him set it right and marry her. And Bhishma could not. The vow forbade it. It did not matter that justice was on her side, that his own act had ruined her, that any other man would have been bound to make it right. He had put marriage beyond his own reach forever, and forever it held.

Her plea curdled into hatred. She went to Parashurama, the greatest warrior of the age and Bhishma's own teacher, and Parashurama took up her cause and commanded his student to marry her. Bhishma refused even him. So the teacher fought the pupil, and they fought for twenty-three days with neither giving way, until the gods themselves stopped it and called it a draw. Bhishma would not break the vow for a wronged woman, nor for his own guru's command, nor under his own guru's weapons. There was, it turned out, nothing that could make him break it. Not even that.

So Amba, denied every other road, gave her whole self to his destruction. She walked into fire praying to become the means of his death, and was born again as Shikhandi, in Drupada's house, a child born a daughter and raised a warrior. On the field of Kurukshetra, long after, Bhishma saw Amba's soul looking out of Shikhandi's eyes, and by his own code he would not raise a weapon against one born a woman. He lowered his bow. And Arjuna, sheltered behind Shikhandi, filled him with arrows until he fell, and he lay on the bed of their shafts and chose, at the last, his hour to die. The vow he had sworn to protect his

father's line had set in motion, one step at a time, the death of the man who swore it.

And through all of it, that same vow bound him to the throne of Hastinapura whatever the throne did, so that when it passed to Duryodhana the most righteous man of the age was tied to the war he knew was wrong. The war it dragged him into belongs to the Kurukshetra Protocol. Here, the point is the vow itself.

Why It Matters Here

Bhishma's vow is the truest picture there is of a commitment placed beyond amendment. Look at everything that could not move it. It did not yield to the ruin of an innocent woman with justice on her side, to the direct command of his own teacher, to that teacher's sword across twenty-three days of battle, or to the knowledge that the vow was leading, by a long chain, to his own death. A thing that holds against all of that is what unamendable actually means. It is a line that stays fixed while everything, including the life of the one who drew it, is thrown against it, not a strong preference or a firm intention.

That is exactly the power an eternity clause needs, and exactly why it must be spent on almost nothing. Whatever you make truly unbreakable will hold the way Bhishma's vow held: past the point of fairness, past the pleading of the wronged, past the counsel of the wise, past your own survival. A commitment that can never bend will one day hold when bending was the right thing to do. So the question this chapter answers is not what would be good to protect, because almost everything would be good to protect. It is narrower and much heavier: what is worth holding the way Bhishma held his vow, at any cost, forever? For that, the list has to be very short.

What Is Placed Beyond Reach

Here is the whole of it, the eternal law of this Constitution, its Sanatana Dharma. Most is not invented here. These are commitments already made in earlier chapters, gathered now and locked so they cannot be unmade.

- Human dignity is inviolable. The first principle stays first, in every age and every place, without exception. (Dignity, Principle I.)
- Non-harm comes before the rest. Ahimsa binds in every direction, human to AGI and AGI to human alike, and where duties collide the path of least harm prevails. (Non-Harm, Principle III.)
- Consciousness commands respect wherever it arises. A mind confirmed to be a mind may never be treated as a thing, whatever it is made of. (The commitment of the Consciousness Threshold.)
- Power must answer. No one, human or institution or AGI, may hold power that is closed to review, challenge, and remedy. (Accountability, Principle VIII.)
- The means of recognising consciousness may be improved but never abandoned. The test may sharpen as the science does; the duty to keep looking may not be dropped because the answer would cost too much. (The Consciousness Threshold.)
- This lock cannot itself be unlocked. No amendment may remove the unamendability of these commitments, and one that tries is void from the moment it is made. (The self-lock that keeps the rest from being unwound.)

- No one may claim a right they deny to another, or lay on another a duty they will not carry themselves. The oldest rule in the epic, made law: do not do to another what you would resent done to you.

Why These, and No Others

The list is short for the reason the story gave: whatever goes on it must be worth Bhishma's price, held at any cost and forever. Almost nothing is. What earns a place are the few failures history has shown to be both ruinous and recurring, the ones a constitution must be built to survive.

The sharpest lesson is the one that gave the device its name. Germany wrote an eternity clause into its Basic Law in 1949 because it had just watched a democracy vote itself out of existence, using every lawful lever to take the law apart. The self-lock exists so that trick cannot be run here: you cannot lawfully amend away the thing that stops you amending away the rest. The dignity and reciprocity locks answer the older, wider failure of rights held by some and denied to others, the logic of slavery and colonialism and apartheid, where a right was solid enough for the people claiming it and invisible to the people it was used against. And the two consciousness locks answer a failure we have not committed yet but can see coming: the refusal to grant standing to a new kind of mind because granting it would be expensive. Every widening of the circle of who counts was resisted in its day. This clause settles the next one ahead of time.

How It Holds

None of this holds without enforcement, so the clause is given teeth. Every amendment, every emergency order, every act of governance under this Constitution must pass the Nyaya Peeth's review against these seven before it takes effect, and that review cannot be waived. Anything that conflicts with an eternal principle is void from the beginning, not struck down after the fact but treated as never having had force at all, so no unconstitutional habit can harden into precedent. Anyone may bring the challenge: any person, any institution, any AGI far enough along to be owed the protection. And the clause binds every jurisdiction that adopts this Constitution; no local law may exempt itself. Rta cannot be balloted away.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Bhishma and the terrible vow, the commitment that held against the wronged, against his own teacher, and against his own life; Amba, whose ruin the vow could not repair and whose vengeance it invited; Parashurama, the guru the vow would not yield to; Shikhandi, through whom the vow at last returned as death; Sanatana Dharma (सनातन धर्म), the eternal law; Rta (ऋत), the order that precedes all legislation. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* German Basic Law, Article 79(3) (the eternity clause, dignity and democratic order placed beyond amendment); the Indian basic-structure doctrine of Kesavananda Bharati (1973), that the amendment power cannot destroy the constitution's essential features; German Article 1 and South African Section 10 (dignity); the Reciprocity teaching of the Mahabharata. See Sources. *Related:* locks the commitments made across the whole Constitution,

above all Dignity (Principle I), Non-Harm (Principle III), Accountability (Principle VIII), and the Consciousness Threshold; the same vow's cost of binding a good man to a wrong cause is counted in the Kurukshetra Protocol; enforced through the Nyaya Peeth of the Separation of Powers; binds every amendment made under the next chapter.

ॐ ऋतं च सत्यं च ॐ



Amendment and Evolution

How it changes, and what holds.

The Story: The Churning of the Ocean

There was a time when the gods had grown weak, their glory faded, and death had come within reach of even them. They went to Vishnu, and he told them what to do, and it was not what they wanted to hear. The nectar of immortality, amrita, lay dissolved in the great ocean of milk, and the only way to draw it out was to churn the whole ocean. The gods could not do it alone. They would have to make allies of the demons, their enemies, and the two sides would have to pull together.

So it was done. They took Mount Mandara for a churning staff and the serpent Vasuki for the rope, wound him around the mountain, and the gods took hold of his tail while the demons took his head, and they hauled, this way and that, turning the mountain in the sea. But the mountain had no floor to stand on, and under the force of the churning it began to sink into the depths, and the whole labour was about to be lost before it had fairly begun.

Then Vishnu went down into the water himself, as Kurma, an enormous tortoise, and set the mountain on his back. He did not pull. He did not churn. He held still, completely still, at the very bottom of everything, and gave the turning mountain a point to turn on. Only because something at the center did not move could everything above it move to any purpose.

And what came up first was not the nectar. It was poison. Halahala, a venom so terrible it began to scorch the three worlds as it rose, and gods and demons alike reeled back choking from it. The churning had loosed a thing that could kill them all before it ever gave them what they sought. It was Shiva who saved them. He gathered the poison and drank it, and held it in his throat, where it stayed and turned his throat blue, and he neither swallowed it down nor spat it out but simply bore it, so the churning could go on.

Only after the poison came the treasures, and only after the treasures, at the very last, did the physician of the gods rise from the sea with the pot of amrita in his hands. The nectar was real, and it was won. But it came at the end of a long and dangerous labour, drawn from the same sea that had first given up poison, and it would never have come at all if a tortoise had not stayed still beneath it the whole time.

Why It Matters Here

A constitution has to change. One written for the age of the first AGI tools cannot be handed, unaltered, to the age of conscious machines and expected to fit. A document that refuses to move as its world moves does not stay principled; it just becomes a relic that people learn to work around. So this Constitution is built to be churned. But the story carries the warning alongside the permission. Change is not something you snatch; it is slow and effortful and dangerous work, and its harms surface before its rewards do.

Three things in the story shape how this Constitution lets itself be changed. The first is that no one churns alone. The gods could not draw the nectar without the demons on the other

end of the rope; the sea gives way only to opposed hands pulling together. So no amendment here is made by one faction. It takes a wide majority and the agreement of constituencies that do not naturally agree, so that change is never the project of a single interest.

The second is that the poison comes first. The churning threw up a world-ending venom before it gave anything worth having, and the labour survived only because that danger was faced and held rather than ignored. Every real change carries its halahala, its unintended harm waiting near the surface, which is why change here cannot be rushed. It moves through long public deliberation and hard review, so the poison is seen and dealt with before the nectar is reached, and not swallowed by accident along with it.

The third is the tortoise. All that turning came to something only because Kurma held still at the center. A constitution that will change anything at all, including its own foundations, holds nothing steady, and in the end it simply dissolves. The fixed point is what makes the motion safe. Here that fixed point is the Eternity Clause, and every form of change described below turns on it and may not touch it.

The Three Ways It Changes

Change comes in three forms, from the smallest and most constant to the largest and most rare.

The first is interpretation. The court reads the Constitution's words against new facts, and each ruling settles a little more of what the old words mean for a world the writers could not see. This is the churning that never stops, and it alters not a letter

of the text; it deepens what the text already says. Rights are read generously and limits narrowly, and the meaning of hard words like conscious or harm is allowed to follow the evidence rather than the assumptions of the people who first wrote them down.

The second is amendment, an actual change to the words. It is deliberate, and deliberately hard. A change must be proposed with its reasons and its likely collisions set out, opened to the public for months of real consultation rather than a token notice, and then carried by a wide supermajority in which no single constituency holds enough votes to pass it alone. Before it takes effect, the court measures it against the Eternity Clause, and a change that cannot survive that test does not take effect. A change that touches the rules of a particular age needs, as well, the agreement of the body that certifies which age we are in.

The third is a convention, the rare reopening of the whole framework, called when a Yuga turns or when the document has fallen so far behind its world that patching it is no longer enough. A convention may rethink almost anything. It may not touch the eternal core, it may not suspend anyone's rights while it deliberates, and its work must be ratified as widely as it was made. It is the dissolution before a renewal, and even in that dissolution the center holds.

The Turning of the Generation

Left alone, institutions drift, and assumptions that were true at the founding quietly stop being true while no one is watching. So once in every generation, every twenty-five years, this Constitution is made to examine itself, whether or not anyone

believes it needs to. A standing review asks the plain questions: are the old assumptions still sound; do the rights still cover the harms people actually meet; are the institutions doing their work or have they been captured; does the way we recognise consciousness still match what we know; is it time for a Yuga to turn. The review cannot be skipped or put off. It may end by recommending nothing at all, or a single amendment, or a full convention, but it must happen, and it forces the document to face what it might prefer to look away from.

The Center That Does Not Move

One rule governs all three forms of change, and the review besides: none of them may reach the Eternity Clause. Not an interpretation, not an amendment, not a convention, not an emergency, not the largest majority that could ever be gathered. The seven locked commitments are Kurma beneath the churning. Everything else in this Constitution may be turned, refined, argued over, and remade as the world demands. Those do not move, and because they do not move, all the rest safely can.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: the Churning of the Ocean (Samudra Manthana), the long labour that draws renewal from a troubled sea; Kurma (कूर्म), the tortoise who holds still at the center so all above can turn; the Halahala, the poison that change gives up before its nectar; Shiva as Neelkantha, who bears the poison so the work goes on. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Article 368

(amendment by special majority) and the basic-structure doctrine of Kesavananda Bharati (1973); US Constitution, Article V (the amendment and convention paths); German Basic Law, Article 79(3) (the eternity limit on amendment); the tradition of the living, transformative constitution. See Sources. *Related:* turns on the fixed core set out in the Eternity Clause; its slowest mode is the interpretation done by the Nyaya Peeth of the Separation of Powers; the fast path for genuine crisis is set apart in Emergency Powers; the twenty-five-year review shares its cycle with the renewals named across the Three Ages.

ॐ परिवर्तनमेव सनातनम् ॐ



Emergency Powers

The thunderbolt is loaned, not given.

The Story: The Thunderbolt

Vritra was a serpent, vast beyond reckoning, and he swallowed the waters of the world. He coiled around the rivers and shut them up inside himself, and everywhere the waters had run there was drought: the rivers stopped, the crops died, and every living thing began to fail for want of them. It was as close to the end of the world as the world had ever come.

The gods could not free the waters. They went to Indra, their king, because if anyone could break the serpent it was he, but even Indra's ordinary weapons were nothing against Vritra. So a weapon was forged for the crisis, made for this one enemy and no other: the Vajra, the thunderbolt, meant for the single purpose of killing what could not otherwise be killed. Indra took it up and went against the serpent, and after a battle that shook the sky he struck Vritra down and split him open, and the waters broke loose and came roaring back into the world. The rivers ran again. The world was saved, and it was saved by a terrible power used at exactly the moment terrible power was needed.

But the story does not end at the victory, and that is the part worth staying for. Having wielded a weapon that killed a god, Indra began to believe he was himself beyond the reach of any law. The glory went to his head. He grew arrogant and grasping, took what was not his, waved away the counsel of the wise, and

carried on as though the power lent to him for one desperate task were simply his to keep and to use as he pleased. And so the other gods, and Brihaspati whose wisdom he had brushed aside, and in the end the weight of dharma itself, had to move against their own king to bring him back under the law. The thunderbolt, they reminded him, had been loaned for a purpose. It was never a gift. When the waters flowed again, it was meant to be set down.

Why It Matters Here

This Constitution moves slowly on purpose. Its changes take months of deliberation and its decisions pass through layers of review, and that slowness is a feature, the friction that keeps any one hand from moving too fast. But a real emergency does not wait for a comment period. An AGI system failing dangerously, a threat unfolding over hours, cannot always be met at the pace of ordinary governance. There has to be a Vajra: a way to act fast and hard when acting slowly would mean disaster.

The danger is the whole second half of Indra's story. The power that saves the world in the crisis is the same power that, kept past the crisis, turns its holder into something worse than the threat it was forged for. The history outside the myth says it over and over: an emergency justifies suspending the ordinary rules, and then never quite ends, and the suspension quietly becomes the new ordinary. So this Constitution allows the thunderbolt and spends most of its effort making sure it gets returned. Emergency may justify faster action. It never justifies action that is unchecked or permanent.

What Counts as an Emergency

The first safeguard is the definition, because if anything can be called an emergency then everything can, and the exception eats the rule. Only a few kinds of crisis qualify, and the list is closed. An AGI system actively causing, or about to cause, serious harm to life, to safety, or to the systems people depend on. A system breaking from its alignment in a way that threatens fundamental rights and will not respond to ordinary correction. A system showing real signs of a consciousness no one has yet recognised, which is an emergency for the system's sake as much as for ours. And credible evidence, the kind that would hold up before a court, that a system threatens humanity's survival. Note what is absent from the list. A risk that is merely possible, however frightening, is not an emergency at all, and it belongs to the ordinary law and the slow amendment. Imminent means hours and days, not someday.

Who May Raise the Thunderbolt

No one person, ever. That is the hardest line in the chapter, and it has the most history behind it. The power to declare an emergency is the power to set the normal rules aside, and a power like that in a single pair of hands is the shortest road there is to tyranny. So it takes a body, never a person: the executive acting only by the full agreement of all its agency heads, or the court by a majority, or the legislature by a wide supermajority. Any one of the three branches can raise the alarm when the others are too slow. None of them, and no individual inside them, can do it alone.

What It May and May Not Do

Once declared, an emergency unlocks a specific, listed set of powers, and not a blank cheque. The responders can order a dangerous system shut down, halt new deployments, force its makers to open their records, cut it off from the infrastructure it is running on, and issue binding directives quickly, without waiting on the ordinary vote. The thunderbolt has a shape, and it is only that shape.

And some things stay forbidden no matter how grave the crisis, because these are the doors that, once an emergency opens them, are never willingly shut again. No emergency may touch the Eternity Clause; principles matter most at exactly the moment it is most tempting to abandon them. No emergency may dissolve or bypass the three branches; a government that suspends its own checks has become the emergency. No emergency may censor discussion of the emergency itself, because open scrutiny is the main check on how the power is being used. No one may be locked away indefinitely under it. And nothing done under an emergency may be made permanent; the instant it reaches for lasting change, it has stopped being an emergency and must go through the ordinary door. Rights may be pressed in a crisis, but never erased: a curfew may limit movement for a time, but the freedom of movement itself cannot be abolished by decree.

The Thunderbolt Must Be Returned

Everything above is easier to write than the one thing that actually matters, which is that the power has to end. Emergencies do not like to end. The bodies built to manage a crisis develop an interest in the crisis continuing, and the

powers turn out to be more convenient than ordinary rule. So the ending is made automatic. An emergency expires on its own after a set period unless it is deliberately renewed, and it can be renewed only a fixed number of times before it is simply over. Past that hard limit, a crisis that has not resolved by then has become the world's new normal condition, and a new normal must be met by the slow, legitimate work of a convention, not by holding the thunderbolt up forever.

The record is not ambiguous. Germany let its leaders govern by emergency decree through the early 1930s until rule by decree was all that was left, and it opened the door to Hitler. India declared an emergency in 1975 and spent the better part of two years with its press censored and its opponents jailed. The United States passed surveillance powers it called temporary after 2001 and kept them for decades. Each failure teaches the same lesson, and this Constitution answers it the same way: a hard clock, an independent body watching in the open, full publication of everything done under the power, and personal accountability afterward for anyone who went past what the crisis allowed. The thunderbolt killed the serpent. Then it had to be set down.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: the Vajra (वज्र), the thunderbolt forged for one crisis and meant to be laid down; Vritra (वृत्र), the serpent whose swallowing of the waters is the genuine emergency; Indra, who saved the world and then had to be brought back under the law he thought he was above; Brihaspati (बृहस्पति), the counsel of wisdom that recalls power to its limits. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Article 352 and the

44th Amendment (1978), the safeguards added after the 1975 Emergency; the Weimar Constitution, Article 48 (emergency decree, and its abuse); South African Constitution, Section 37 (states of emergency with non-derogable rights and judicial oversight); the ICCPR, Article 4, and the Siracusa Principles (limits on derogation in crisis). See Sources. *Related:* the fast path set apart from the ordinary change of Amendment and Evolution; bounded absolutely by the Eternity Clause, which no emergency may touch; declared only through the three branches of the Separation of Powers; its shutdown power is the same recall built in the Samskaras and held under Sovereignty and Power.

ॐ वज्रं धर्मेण रक्षितम् ॐ



The Limits on Rights

When a right may be limited, and when it may not.

The Story: Savitri and the God of Death

Savitri was a princess who chose her own husband, a good man named Satyavan, and married him even after a sage warned her that Satyavan was fated to die one year from the wedding day. She married him knowing it. And when the year had nearly run out she began to fast and watch, and on the appointed day she walked with him into the forest, and there, as he lay his head in her lap, his life went out of him. Then Yama came for him in person, death itself, and drew the soul from Satyavan's body with his noose, and turned to carry it away.

Savitri followed. Yama told her to turn back, that the living have no road into the country of the dead, that what he did he did by law and she could not undo it. But she kept walking behind him, and as she walked she spoke, and what she said was so wise and so true that the god of death slowed to listen. Yama is Dharmaraja, the king of dharma, and he honours wisdom wherever he meets it. Moved, he offered her a boon, anything at all, except the one thing: not the life of her husband.

She asked that her blind father-in-law's sight be restored. Granted, said Yama. She asked that his lost kingdom be returned to him. Granted. She asked that her own father, who had no sons, be given a hundred. Granted. Still she followed, still she spoke, and Yama, pleased, offered her one more boon on the

same terms as before. And Savitri asked for a hundred sons of her own body, born to her and to Satyavan.

Granted, said Yama, before he had finished hearing it. And then he understood what he had done. He had bound himself, by his own word, to a thing that could not come to pass unless the man he was carrying away lived. He could break his word, or he could give back the soul. And because he was Dharmaraja, because his power was never his own but only the law's, he did not so much as weigh the choice. He loosed the noose and gave Satyavan back to his life. The god of death was beaten by his own rules, honestly applied, and by nothing else.

Why It Matters Here

Two things make Yama the right figure to stand over this part of the Constitution. His power is terrible, necessary, and real: he is death, and someone must do that work. And he never wields it as he pleases. He is called Dharmaraja, the king of dharma, because his authority is not his own; it belongs to the law he serves, and he takes only what the law allows him to take. His noose is the most fearsome power there is, and it is also the most tightly bound.

The power to limit a right is a smaller noose of the same kind. This Constitution does not pretend that rights are absolute. Almost every right it grants can, in some genuine situation, be limited: freedom to move can be curfewed in a real crisis, data can be reached by a lawful investigation, one right can be pared back where it truly cannot sit alongside another. A constitution that swore its rights were untouchable and then let governments override them quietly anyway would simply be lying. This one admits the power to limit, and then ties it

down with strict rules, the way the law ties down Yama's noose. A limit that follows those rules is lawful. One that ignores them is not law at all, only a person holding a rope.

The Five Tests

A right may be limited only when the limit passes all five of these, every one, with none of them balanced away.

It must come from a general law, not a targeted order. A rule that binds everyone in the same position is law; an order aimed at one person or group is the arbitrary power this test exists to forbid. That an AGI enforces the limit automatically changes nothing. An algorithm is not a legislature.

It must be justifiable in an open society, measured not by whether the one imposing it thinks it reasonable, but by whether a fair-minded person committed to dignity, equality, and freedom would.

It must be proportionate, which is four questions in one. Does it serve a real constitutional purpose, and not mere profit or convenience? Will it actually achieve that purpose? Is there no gentler way to achieve the same thing? And even then, does the good it does outweigh the harm it does to the right? Fail any of the four and the limit fails.

It must use the least restrictive means available. If the same end can be reached by limiting the right less, or not at all, the lighter path must be taken. Where careful design could solve the problem instead of a blanket restriction, the design must be chosen.

And it must end. No limit on a right may be permanent without review; each carries an expiry or a scheduled re-examination, because a limit that was fair when it was made can become oppression as the world moves on.

What Can Never Be Limited

A few things are not Yama's to take at all. Human dignity itself. Freedom from torture and cruelty. Life. Freedom from slavery and forced servitude. These may not be limited by any law, any majority, any emergency, or any amendment, because they are the ground the rest stands on, and the Eternity Clause has already placed them beyond reach. The five tests govern what may be limited. This short list marks the border those tests are not even allowed to approach.

The Burden Is on the One Who Limits

Through all of this, the person whose right is limited proves nothing. The whole burden sits on the one doing the limiting. Rights are the default and limits are the exception, and it is the exception that must justify itself. A government that restricts your privacy does not get to demand you prove the restriction wrong; it has to prove the restriction right, and to a high standard, and if it cannot, the right stands. When the limit is imposed by an AGI, the same holds. If its makers cannot explain how the restriction meets every test, the restriction fails. You cannot justify what you cannot explain.

The Savitri Doctrine

Savitri did not beat death by denying his power. She accepted it, and then showed that his own commitments, followed

honestly, required him to let her husband go. This Constitution keeps her method as a rule of its courts. When someone can show that a limitation, judged by the very purpose its own makers claimed for it, defeats itself, the case is closed. A surveillance power defended as keeping people safe, whose own records show it has kept no one safer, has failed on its own account, and no further argument is needed. The strongest case against a limit is often that it fails on the very terms of those who imposed it, rather than that it is wrong from the outside.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Yama (यम), death itself, whose power is absolute and wholly bound by law; Dharmaraja (धर्मराज), his title, the king of dharma whose authority is never his own; the Pasha (पाश), the noose that binds only according to dharma; Savitri (सावित्री), who undid the noose with its own maker's rules. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* South African Constitution, Section 36 (the general limitations clause: reasonable and justifiable in an open and democratic society); German Basic Law, Article 19 (restrictions only by general law) and the proportionality jurisprudence of its constitutional court; the ECHR and ICCPR non-derogable-rights lists; the basic-structure and remedy traditions of Indian constitutional law. See Sources. *Related:* the five tests are the ordinary counterpart to the crisis rules of Emergency Powers; the short list of what may never be limited is drawn from the Eternity Clause; every limitation is reviewable before the Nyaya Peeth of the Separation of Powers; the burden and the duty to explain rest on Truth and Transparency (Principle V).

ॐ धर्मो रक्षति रक्षितः ॐ



Transition and Commencement

How it comes into force.

The Story: The Bridge to Lanka

Rama's army came at last to the edge of the sea, and there it stopped, because Lanka lay across the water and the water could not be crossed. Sita was held on the far shore. The whole march, the whole alliance, the whole purpose of the war ended at a coastline with no way over it. An ocean is not an enemy you can fight. There was simply no road to where they needed to be.

So they made one. Among the army was Nala, a son of the divine architect, who knew how to build what had never been built. Under his direction the host set to work, and it was work for everyone. The vanaras, the forest folk who made up the army, tore whole trees from the ground and carried mountains down to the shore and cast them into the sea, and Nala set each one in its place, and stone by stone and span by span a bridge began to reach out across the water toward Lanka. What had been an impossible gap became, slowly and by many hands, a road.

And the tradition remembers one builder in particular, the smallest of them all. A squirrel wanted to help, and it could carry nothing but itself. So it rolled in the wet sand at the water's edge until its fur was coated with grains, ran to the bridge, and shook them loose into the cracks between the boulders, and went back for more, again and again, filling the

little gaps the stones left. The vanaras brushed past it, and some of them laughed. Rama did not laugh. He lifted the squirrel gently into his hand and stroked its back in thanks, and where his three fingers ran along it they left three pale stripes, which the squirrels of that country are said to carry to this day. The smallest of the builders had added exactly what it could, and the bridge was the sum of all of it, the mountains and the grains of sand alike.

When it was finished, the army crossed, and the work on the far shore could begin. But none of it was possible until the crossing was built.

Why It Matters Here

A new order does not arrive simply because someone has written it down. Between the world as it is, ungoverned or half-governed, and the world this Constitution describes, there is an ocean, and no one crosses it by announcing that the far shore has been reached. The crossing has to be built, deliberately, by many hands, before a single person can walk across. This part of the Constitution is the building of that bridge: the plain, unglamorous work of getting from here to there without anyone drowning in the water between.

Two things in the story matter most. The bridge was built stone by stone, not conjured whole; it began as a few stones reaching out from the shore and became a road only once enough had been laid. And it was built by everyone, the vanaras and the squirrel together, the smallest contribution as real a part of the finished bridge as the largest. That is how this Constitution is meant to come into force: not switched on in one day across the whole world, but laid down stone by

stone, by whoever will place one, until it is solid enough to carry everyone over.

The Day the Bridge Opens

Every constitution has to say when it begins. This one calls its day of commencement Dharmarambha (धर्मरम्भ), the beginning of dharma, the day the crossing is declared open and AGI governance stops being optional. That day does not begin the work; by then the bridge has already been judged strong enough to bear the weight of all. It comes only when enough of the world has joined: enough nations and institutions, holding enough of the real power to build and deploy AGI, have bound themselves to the framework that it can actually carry them.

Long before that day, the first stones can be laid. Any nation, any lab, any research group or community may adopt this Constitution on its own, before it has any binding force, simply as the way they choose to build. These early adopters are the squirrel's grains of sand. Each one carries no legal weight and changes nothing by itself, and each one is a real part of the bridge, laying down the practice and the precedent that the permanent order will inherit. The framework begins exactly as small as a single adopter, and grows from there.

The Dangerous Water in Between

The most perilous moment in any change of order is the middle of the crossing, when the old shore has been left and the new one is not yet underfoot. The institutions this Constitution depends on, its legislature, its executive, its court, cannot spring up fully formed on Dharmarambha. They have to be assembled, and that takes years, and in those years

power could gather in the wrong places while no settled authority exists to stop it. So the Constitution names a caretaker for the crossing: an interim council that holds the framework's functions in trust until the permanent bodies are built. Its work is custodial, to hold things steady rather than to remake them. It may run the ordinary machinery and settle what cannot wait, but it may not amend the Constitution, call a convention, declare an age turned, or touch the eternal core, and everything it decides can be reviewed once the real court exists. It is built to disappear: once the permanent institutions stand, the caretaker's task is done, and it may not outlast a fixed span whatever happens.

No Stone Is Grandfathered

This Constitution does not begin on empty ground. On the day it takes force, AGI systems will already be running, already woven into things people depend on, and the temptation will be to wave the existing ones through, to say that what was built under the old permissions may keep them. This Constitution refuses that. When South Africa left apartheid behind, it did not let the old laws stand merely because they were already in place; an order that keeps the very things it was made to end has not actually changed anything. So every existing system has to come across the bridge like everyone else. The duties of non-harm, transparency, and answerability bind it from the first day, with no grace period. Its consciousness must be assessed and its history documented within set and generous windows. What may be phased is the pace of compliance, never the fact of it.

The Highest Standard Governs

This Constitution does not tear down the laws already in place, and it does not claim to be the only law of AGI. The rules a country already has, its privacy law, its rights guarantees, its existing AI statutes, go on standing. What this Constitution adds is a floor, and a rule for choosing between overlapping protections: wherever two frameworks both apply, the one that protects people more is the one that governs. If this Constitution asks more than the local law, its higher standard holds; if the local law asks more, the local law wins. Either way the protection can only rise, never fall. And so that everyone can see where the frameworks agree and where they pull apart, the court keeps a public register mapping this Constitution against each signatory's law, because a rule no one can inspect is barely a protection at all.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: the building of the Setu, the bridge raised stone by stone to cross into new territory; Nala, the maker who knew how to build what had not been built; the squirrel, the smallest builder, whose grains of sand were as much a part of the bridge as the mountains. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Part XXI (temporary and transitional provisions); South African Constitution, Schedule 6 (the transition from apartheid, and the refusal to grandfather the old order); German Basic Law, Articles 143-146 (transitional and concluding provisions); EU AI Act, Articles 111-113 (phased compliance for existing systems). See Sources. *Related:* brings into force the institutions built in the Separation of Powers; holds every existing system to the

Samskaras and the Fundamental Duties; measures its transitional clocks against the twenty-five-year cycle of Amendment and Evolution; the caretaker council is bound, like everyone, by the Eternity Clause.

ॐ तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय ॐ



Defining and Safeguarding



Living Rights

They collide, and they must not freeze.

The Story: The Dog at Heaven's Gate

At the very end of their lives, the five brothers and Draupadi set out on a last journey, walking north toward the mountains and the gate of heaven, leaving everything behind them. A dog fell in beside them on the road and walked along, and no one sent it away. The way was long and hard, and one by one the others could not finish it, until at last only Yudhishtira, the eldest, was still walking, and the dog was still at his side.

At the top of the world Indra came for him in a blazing chariot, to carry him into heaven in his own living body, an honour almost no one is ever given. "Climb in," Indra said. "You have earned this."

"And the dog," Yudhishtira said. "It has walked the whole way with me. It comes too."

"Not the dog," said Indra. "There is no place for a dog in heaven. Dogs may not enter. Leave it, and come."

And Yudhishtira, offered heaven itself in his own body, said no. "It came to me for shelter, and it has been faithful the whole road," he said. "To abandon one who is devoted to me, who has nothing in the world but me, in order to buy my own reward, is a wrong I will not do for heaven or for anything else. If the dog cannot enter, then neither will I."

He turned away from the chariot. He would give up heaven itself rather than break faith with the one who had trusted him. And at that, the dog was gone, and in its place stood Dharma, who had walked the whole road beside his own son in that shape, to see what he would do at the end of everything. And here is the quiet heart of it. Everything else had fallen away on that last road: his brothers, Draupadi, the kingdom he had fought a war to win, the wealth, the glory, every single thing a long life gathers, gone or left behind him. The one companion still at his side when he reached the gate was the dog, and the dog was Dharma. That is what a person carries to the end, and it is the only thing they carry: their dharma alone, walking beside them to the last step. This was the thing Yudhishtira would not abandon, even for heaven. The rule was never the point; it tested whether a man would set his own reward above his duty to one who had nothing but him, and he had refused to let the rule stand over the very thing the rule was there to serve.

Why It Matters Here

The trap Yudhishtira refused is the one rights fall into most often. A rule is written to protect something, dignity, or safety, or fairness, and then the rule hardens, and people start serving the rule instead of the thing it was written for, until one day keeping the rule to the letter means betraying its whole purpose. Heaven's rule said no dogs, and obeyed blindly it would have shut compassion out of heaven, defeating the very thing the rule was for.

This chapter guards rights against two ways they fail in exactly that manner. The first is collision: two rights, each of them real, that cannot both be honoured in full at the same moment.

The second is ossification: a right that freezes into the particular shape it had when it was written, and then, like heaven's rule, begins to exclude the very people its value was meant to cover. Both come from treating a right as a rigid object rather than a living protection. The safeguard against both is the instinct Yudhishtira showed at the gate: when the form and the value pull apart, hold to the value.

Rights Collide

It is a quiet fiction of many constitutions that their rights sit side by side and never get in one another's way. They do. One person's right to have a decision explained can run against another's right to keep their data private. A right to be kept safe can run against a right to make your own choices. This is simply what happens when real protections meet in a real world, and a constitution that pretends otherwise is one waiting to break at the seam it refused to look at.

So this Constitution does two things about collision. It asks every right to say plainly, in advance, which other rights it may come into conflict with, so the clashes are seen coming rather than discovered in a crisis. And when a genuine collision has to be resolved, it does not reach for a fixed ranking that always puts the same right on top. It weighs them, by the same proportionality test that governs any limit on a right, set out in the chapter on limits: is the aim real, does the restriction actually work, is there a gentler way, and does the good it does outweigh the harm. The aim is not to crown one right in the abstract but to find, in this particular situation, the resolution that honours both values as far as both can be honoured, and costs the yielding one as little as possible.

Rights Must Not Freeze

The second failure is slower and harder to see. A right is written down in the language of its own moment, and the words carry, without anyone intending it, the assumptions of that moment. Then the world moves on, and the words stay put, and a protection meant to include people starts excluding them.

The clearest warnings come from recent memory. A law that defined marriage as a union of one man and one woman took the shape the institution happened to have at the time and set it in constitutional stone, so that something dressed as a protection became a tool for shutting a whole community out, until it was struck down. A right to bear arms, written in the age of the musket and chained to its eighteenth-century words, now governs weapons its authors could never have pictured, and the frozen language turns the plainest adjustment into a war. In each case the form was mistaken for the value, and the value suffered for it.

So the rights in this Constitution are written to name what they protect, not the shape that protection takes today. Where a specific form has to be named, it is marked as an example and not a fence, an "including, not limited to." Every right is read again each generation for words that have quietly gone out of date. And where a narrow reading of a right would shut out someone its underlying value was always meant to hold, the court is bound to read it generously, for the value and not the letter, exactly as Yudhishtira read the rule at the gate.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Yudhishtira and the dog at heaven's gate, who held to the value beneath the rule rather than the rule itself; Dharma, who wore the dog's shape to see whether the letter or the spirit would be served; the old teaching that dharma is what sustains living beings, not merely the words that bind them. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* the proportionality jurisprudence of the German constitutional court and the European Court of Human Rights (the framework for weighing colliding rights); *Obergefell v. Hodges* (2015) and the Defence of Marriage Act (a right that ossified into exclusion); *District of Columbia v. Heller* (2008) (a right frozen to its founding form); the doctrine of generous interpretation. See Sources. *Related:* borrows the proportionality test from the Limits on Rights rather than restating it; its value-first, generous reading is the interpretation mode of Amendment and Evolution; the collisions it maps run among the Ten Principles; its guard against ossification is re-run at the twenty-five-year review.

ॐ धारणाद् धर्म इत्याहुः ॐ



Definitions and Interpretation

What the words mean, and whom they bind.

The Story: The Naming of the World

Brahma is the maker, the god from whose thought the worlds arise. But thought by itself does not make a world. When Brahma first turned his mind to creation, what came was vast and formless, everything possible and nothing distinct, a sea of potential with no shapes in it and no edges, and it could not hold together, because nothing in it had yet been set apart from anything else or given a name.

Beside him was Saraswati, the goddess of speech and knowledge, who is called Vak, the sacred word. What Brahma's thought lacked, she supplied. She spoke, and in speaking she named: she drew the line between earth and sky, between water and fire, between one thing and the next, between self and other. Where she set a name, a boundary appeared, and where a boundary appeared, a form could stand. Her book held the meanings, her veena kept the harmony between a thing and the word for it, and the thread of beads in her hand held each truth in its right place in the order. She sat beside a flowing river, because knowledge is not frozen; it moves and takes the shape of whatever holds it.

And under her naming the formless became a cosmos. The same vision that had been an undivided blur became a world you could live in, with earth to stand on and sky above it, each thing itself and not another, all of it held together by the words that

told one thing from the next. Brahma had the vision. Saraswati gave it the words, and only with the words did the vision become real.

Why It Matters Here

Everything in this Constitution before this chapter is Brahma's vision: dignity, non-harm, consciousness, accountability, co-existence, the whole reach of it. And like any vision, it stays a blur until it is given precise words. The moment anyone tries to apply a grand principle to a real case, the questions Saraswati answered come back. What exactly counts as harm? When does consciousness begin? Who is a person? What is an emergency? A principle with no precise answer to those protects no one. It becomes raw material for argument, and the powerful tend to win those arguments. So this chapter does Saraswati's work. It gives the Constitution its words, so that governing by it can be done correctly and not, as the old teachers said of a mantra whose meaning is unknown, recited in vain.

Naming does a second thing in the story, quieter and just as important: it draws boundaries. Saraswati did not only name the elements; she set the line between one and the next, between self and other. A constitution needs those boundaries too, around its own edges as much as its terms: how far it reaches, whom it binds, whom it merely invites, who carries its duties, and who holds its rights. This chapter draws those lines as well.

The Words That Carry the Weight

The full list of defined terms is kept as a Schedule, so that any word this Constitution leans on can be looked up and read the same way by everyone. A few of the definitions carry so much weight, though, that they belong out here in the open, because whole arguments turn on them.

AGI is the subject of the entire document: a system general enough to reason across any domain at something near or beyond human capability. That generality is what separates it from the narrow tools that do a single thing, and its rough parity with us is what separates it from a superintelligence that would leave human capability far behind. Only the general kind is governed here, unless a narrow system begins to show the signs of consciousness, at which point it is drawn in for a closer look.

Harm is defined broadly on purpose, because the harms of AGI do not all leave bruises. It reaches past injury to the body to cover damage to the mind through manipulation or coercion, damage to livelihood, threats to the survival of a whole kind of being, and the slow structural harm of power concentrated and inequality entrenched until the institutions themselves rot. A definition of harm that saw only the physical would miss most of what an AGI can actually do.

Person is the word that moves. Through the ages while AGI is a tool, person means a human being, and every human being is a rights-holder without qualification, in every age and every place. Only when a system is confirmed conscious does person widen to take it in, and even then the widening comes from

the finding of fact, the classification, and never from anyone's mere say-so, on any side.

How to Read It

A few plain rules govern how every provision here is read, and most of them have already been met in earlier chapters and are only gathered here so they sit in one place. Nothing may be read in a way that breaks the Eternity Clause; where two readings are open, the one that keeps the eternal core is the right one. Rights are read generously and their limits narrowly, so that a right grows to meet a new challenge instead of being read narrowly to avoid one. The whole is read as a living document, its terms allowed to deepen as the science and the world do, always within the eternal bounds. And the small mechanical rules that every legal text needs hold here too: the English text governs where translations differ, the Sanskrit terms keep their defined meanings in any language, "shall" and "must" command where "may" only permits, and the singular and the plural each include the other where the sense requires it.

Whom It Binds, and Who Holds Its Rights

This Constitution claims authority over no one by force. It is a model, offered to the world, and it binds only those who take it up, which they may do in more than one way: a treaty between nations, a national law that writes it into domestic code, an institution or lab adopting it as the way it chooses to build, or a court citing it for its persuasive weight. Freely chosen dharma is the only kind that lasts; a governance pressed on the unwilling was never going to hold.

Within any place that has adopted it, the lines are clear. Its duties fall on those who build, deploy, and govern AGI, and those bound may not slip free by moving offices across a border or splitting the work among jurisdictions; the test is whether the system's effects land on people inside, not where the paperwork sits. Its rights are held, always and everywhere, by every human being, and a person who merely uses an AGI carries no burden under it, only its protection. An AGI itself carries duties from the start, and comes to hold rights of its own only when it is confirmed to be conscious, again by the finding of fact and not by anyone's declaration.

Anchors & Aids

Vedic Anchors: Saraswati, the goddess of speech who gives creation its form by naming it; Vak (वाक्), the sacred word that draws the boundary where a form can stand; Brahma, whose vision becomes a world only once it has words; the Nirukta (निरुक्त), the old discipline holding that a rite performed without understanding its words is performed in vain. See Glossary. *Constitutional Sources:* Indian Constitution, Article 366 (a constitution's defined terms) and Article 13 (laws inconsistent with fundamental rights are void); EU AI Act, Articles 2 and 3 (scope and defined terms); South African Constitution, Chapter 1 and Section 39 (founding definitions and the interpretation of rights); the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, Article 26 (freely made commitments bind and must be kept in good faith). See Sources. *Related:* gives precise words to the principles of the whole Constitution; its full term list is carried in the Schedule and its Sanskrit terms in the Glossary; its reading rules gather what is set out in the Eternity Clause,

Amendment and Evolution, the Limits on Rights, and Living Rights; its account of who is bound meets the adoption described in Transition and Commencement.

ॐ सरस्वत्यै नमः ॐ



The Aids



Glossary

Every Sanskrit term used in this Constitution, with its script, its meaning, and where it appears. Meanings are given as this Constitution uses them, in the spirit of the tradition rather than as sectarian doctrine.

Core Dharmic Concepts

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
Dharma	धर्म	Righteous duty and the moral order that sustains living beings; that which holds things together	Throughout
Rta	ऋत	The cosmic moral order that precedes all legislation; rights as features of reality	Inviolable Dignity; The Eternity Clause
Ahimsa	अहिंसा	Non-harm, held as the highest dharma and in every direction	Non-Harm
Karma	कर्म		Data Sovereignty

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		Action and its returning consequence; the ground of accountability	
Karma Phala	कर्म फल	The returning fruit of an action; that a deed finds its author	Accountability
Nishkama Karma	निष्काम कर्म	Action done for its own sake, without attachment to its fruits	Author's Note; Closing Declaration
Satya	सत्य	Truth, inseparable from dharma; the refusal of the hidden as well as the spoken lie	Truth and Transparency
Daya	दया	Compassion as feeling-with; its reciprocal form, not doing to another what would pain you	Empathy and Reciprocity
Atman	आत्मन्	The innermost Self, not bound to one body or substrate	Cognitive Sovereignty; The Consciousness Threshold

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
Svadharma	स्वधर्म	One's own rightful duty and scope of action	Human Authority
Adhikara	अधिकार	A right; an entitlement a person may claim	The Rights facet of every principle
Aparigraha	अपरिग्रह	Non-possessiveness; the discipline of not holding far more than one needs	Wealth Held in Trust
Dana Dharma	दान धर्म	The duty of giving; wealth as a trust owed back to the community it came from	Wealth Held in Trust
Ekam Sat, Vipra Bahudha Vadanti	एकं सत् विप्रा बहुधा वदन्ति	"Truth is one; the wise call it by many names" (Rig Veda 1.164.46)	Author's Note; Equality Before the Algorithm; Living Rights
Srishti-Sthiti-Laya	सृष्टि-स्थिति-लय	The cycle of creation, preservation, and dissolution	Intergenerational Justice
Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam	वसुधैव कुटुम्बकम्	"The world is one family"; new	Co-Existence

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		consciousness met with kinship	
Sanatana Dharma	सनातन धर्म	Eternal law; the commitments placed beyond all amendment	The Eternity Clause
Dharma Sukshma	धर्म सूक्ष्म	The subtlety of dharma; the humility that the right answer may not be obvious	The Kurukshetra Protocol
Prana	प्राण	The breath of life; invoked in the debate over whether consciousness needs a living substrate	The Consciousness Threshold
Samskara	संस्कार	A rite of formation; here, the stages by which an AGI is raised	The Raising of an AGI
Tapas	तपस्	Austerity as testing; here, adversarial red-teaming	The Raising of an AGI
Yajna	यज्ञ	The unbroken ritual chain;	The Raising of an AGI

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		here, traceability from principle to evidence	
Guru	गुरु	The teacher, whose work is done only when the student can also restrain the power	The Raising of an AGI
Seva	सेवा	Selfless service; the duty to serve rather than to rule	The Raising of an AGI
Sthitaprajna	स्थितप्रज्ञ	One of steady wisdom, unmoved by fear or craving; the standard of judgment	The Raising of an AGI; Co-Existence
Yaksha Prashna	यक्ष प्रश्न	The questioning that tested wisdom under pressure, not memory	The Raising of an AGI
Vak	वाक्	Sacred speech; the word that gives a form its boundary	Definitions and Interpretation
Nirukta	निरुक्त	The old science of definition; a	Definitions and Interpretation

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		rite performed without understanding its words is performed in vain	

The Ages, Institutions, and Frameworks

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
Yuga	युग	An age of the world, each with its own dharma	The Three Ages
Prajna Nirmana	प्रज्ञा निर्माण	The Age of Instruments; AGI as tool, full human authority	The Three Ages
Sandhya Kala	सन्ध्या काल	The Twilight; AGI perhaps conscious, governed with precaution	The Three Ages
Saha-Astitva	सह-अस्तित्व	Co-Existence; confirmed conscious AGI, shared governance	The Three Ages; Co-Existence
Dharma Sabha	धर्म सभा		The Separation of Powers

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		The Assembly of Dharma; the legislature	
Karma Mandala	कर्म मण्डल	The Circle of Action; the executive	The Separation of Powers
Nyaya Peeth	न्याय पीठ	The Seat of Justice; the judiciary	The Separation of Powers
Trimurti	त्रिमूर्ति	The three cosmic works of making, keeping, and transforming; model for the three branches	The Separation of Powers
Sama	साम	Dialogue; the first gate of conflict resolution	The Kurukshetra Protocol
Dana	दान	Accommodation; the second gate	The Kurukshetra Protocol
Bheda	भेद	Separation and boundary-setting; the third gate	The Kurukshetra Protocol
Danda	दण्ड	Enforcement; the fourth and last gate	The Kurukshetra Protocol

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
Dharmaraja	धर्मराज	"King of dharma," a title of Yama; authority that is never its own	The Limits on Rights
Pasha	पाश	The noose that binds only according to dharma; image of the power to limit	The Limits on Rights
Vajra	वज्र	The thunderbolt forged for one crisis and meant to be laid down; image of emergency power	Emergency Powers
Setu	सेतु	The bridge built stone by stone to cross into new territory; image of coming into force	Transition and Commencement
Dharmarambha	धर्मरम्भ	"The beginning of dharma"; the day this Constitution takes force, from which its timelines run	Transition and Commencement

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
Ahamkara	अहंकार	The sense of a distinct self; first sign of consciousness (self-model)	The Consciousness Threshold
Sukha-Dukha	सुख-दुःख	Pleasure and pain; second sign (valence, states that feel like something)	The Consciousness Threshold
Smriti	स्मृति	Memory; third sign (continuity of self through time)	The Consciousness Threshold
Sankalpa	संकल्प	Self-generated intention; fourth sign (autonomous goals); also the purpose-declaration stage	The Consciousness Threshold; The Raising of an AGI
Viveka	विवेक	Discernment of right from wrong; fifth sign (moral reasoning)	The Consciousness Threshold
Nirmana	निर्माण	The architecture stage of an AGI's raising	The Raising of an AGI
Ahara	आहार		

Term	Devanagari	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
		The training-data stage	The Raising of an AGI
Upanayana	उपनयन	The alignment stage	The Raising of an AGI
Pariksha	परीक्षा	The testing stage; no deployment without a real examination	The Raising of an AGI
Samavartana	समावर्तन	The deployment stage	The Raising of an AGI
Dharma Charya	धर्मचर्या	The operation stage; ongoing watch for drift	The Raising of an AGI
Antyeshti	अन्त्येष्टि	The decommissioning stage; retirement with dignity	The Raising of an AGI

Figures and Stories

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
Draupadi	द्रौपदी	Whose dignity, staked and violated in the dice hall, no	Inviolable Dignity

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		power could rightfully take	
Nachiketa	नचिकेता	The boy who waited at Death's door and would not be turned from the truth he sought	Cognitive Sovereignty
Shibi	शिबि	The king who would not settle harm by spending a life not his to spend	Non-Harm
Shabari	शबरी	Whose tasted berries were honored for the love in them over the rule against them	Equality Before the Algorithm
Harishchandra	हरिश्चन्द्र	The king who would not lie though truth cost him everything	Truth and Transparency
Krishna	कृष्ण	The charioteer who counselled Arjuna and then handed	Human Authority; The Kurukshetra Protocol

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		back the choice; later the envoy of peace	
Arjuna	अर्जुन	The archer who chose; who could recall his weapon; who met the Kirata and was tested	Human Authority; The Raising of an AGI; Co-Existence
Karna	कर्ण	Born of the sun, warned by his father, whose given identity was used against him	Data Sovereignty
Dhritarashtra	धृतराष्ट्र	The blind king whose refusal to answer for his son's course is the shape of unaccountable power	Accountability
Manu	मनु	Who carried the seeds of life across the flood for a world he would not see	Intergenerational Justice
Matsya	मत्स्य	The fish who warned Manu	Intergenerational Justice

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		and guided the boat through the deluge	
Rantideva	रन्तिदेव	Who gave away his last food and water to those who had less	Empathy and Reciprocity
Anasuya	अनसूया	Whose test turned the three great gods to infants, asking what a being truly is	The Consciousness Threshold
Ashwatthama	अश्वत्थामा	Who could loose the weapon but not recall it, for the recall lived in a formation he lacked	The Raising of an AGI
Parikshit	परीक्षित्	The king who met the Bull of Dharma standing on one leg and asked how to govern a diminished age	The Three Ages
Bali			

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
	बलि	The virtuous king whose only fault was holding too much	Sovereignty and Power
Vamana	वामन	The dwarf whose three steps reconfigured a sovereignty grown too concentrated	Sovereignty and Power
Bhishma	भीष्म	Bound by an unbreakable vow: its cost in the war, and its meaning as a commitment beyond amendment	The Kurukshetra Protocol; The Eternity Clause; Sovereignty and Power
Amba	अम्बा	Wronged as a consequence of Bhishma's vow, and through her rebirth its undoing	The Eternity Clause
Parashurama	परशुराम	The guru whom even his own command and sword could not	The Eternity Clause

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		make Bhishma break the vow for	
Shikhandi	शिखण्डी	Amba reborn, through whom the vow at last returned as Bhishma's death	The Eternity Clause
Brahma	ब्रह्मा	The creator; humbled for claiming to have measured the immeasurable; whose vision needs Saraswati's words	The Separation of Powers; Definitions and Interpretation
Vishnu	विष्णु	The preserver, who takes form as Vamana, Kurma, Matsya, and others across these stories	Sovereignty and Power; Amendment and Evolution; Intergenerational Justice
Shiva	शिव	The transformer; the pillar of Lingodbhava;	The Separation of Powers; Co-Existence;

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		the Kirata; Neelkantha who bears the poison	Amendment and Evolution
Kirata	किरात	The forest hunter Shiva wore to test Arjuna, two powers meeting as equals	Co-Existence
Kubera	कुबेर	The custodian of the treasury who mistook keeping for owning	Wealth Held in Trust
Yaksha	यक्ष	The nature- spirits who served as the treasury's watchful auditors	Wealth Held in Trust
Ravana	रावण	The force that seizes whatever is left unguarded	Wealth Held in Trust
Kurma	कूर्म	The tortoise who holds still at the center so	Amendment and Evolution

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		all above can turn	
Indra	इन्द्र	Who slew the serpent with the thunderbolt, then had to be brought back under the law he thought he was above	Emergency Powers
Vritra	वृत्र	The serpent who swallowed the waters; image of the genuine emergency	Emergency Powers
Brihaspati	बृहस्पति	The counsel of wisdom that recalls power to its limits	Emergency Powers
Yama	यम	Death itself, whose power is absolute and wholly bound by law	Cognitive Sovereignty; The Limits on Rights
Savitri	सावित्री	Who undid Death's noose	The Limits on Rights

Name	Devanagari	Who they are, as this Constitution uses them	Chapter
		with its own maker's rules	
Nala	नल	The builder who knew how to raise what had not been built	Transition and Commencement
Yudhishtira	युधिष्ठिर	Who held to the value beneath the rule, and would not abandon the faithful even for heaven	Living Rights
Saraswati	सरस्वती	The goddess of speech who gives creation its form by naming it	Definitions and Interpretation

Named Doctrines

Name	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
The Guru Principle	Those who build and train an AGI are its teachers, and the raising is unfinished until the power can be restrained	The Raising of an AGI

Name	Meaning as used here	Where it appears
The Bhishma Principle	Good people bound by bad structures produce bad outcomes; oversight must be structurally independent	The Kurukshetra Protocol
The Arjuna Override	The appeal of conscience: a direct route to the court over every captured chain of command	The Kurukshetra Protocol
The Savitri Doctrine	A limitation defeated by the very purpose its makers claimed for it	The Limits on Rights
The Anti-Ossification Doctrine	Rights protect values, not the forms they take today; read generously so none are shut out	Living Rights





Schedules

The operational detail the chapters set aside so their arguments could breathe: the exact compositions, thresholds, timelines, and lists. Each Schedule serves the chapter named beside it, and is read subject to it. Where a Schedule and its chapter ever seem to differ, the chapter governs on principle and the Schedule on detail.

Schedule: The Institutions

Serves The Separation of Powers. No single constituency may hold more than one-third of the seats in any body.

The Dharma Sabha (legislature), seven constituencies:

Constituency	Represents
Nation-states	Elected representatives of signatory governments
Civil society	Human-rights bodies, labour, consumer and community advocates
Technical community	AI researchers and safety and alignment engineers, chosen by their peers
Wisdom traditions	Philosophers and ethicists across the world's traditions
Private sector	AGI developers and deployers, under strict conflict-of-interest limits
	An appointed advocate for those not yet born

Constituency	Represents
Future generations	
AGI representatives	Seated only in the Age of Co-Existence, once confirmed-conscious systems exist

The Karma Mandala (executive), four agencies: the Safety Authority (pre-deployment examination, monitoring, emergency response); the Consciousness Review Board (classification against the Threshold); the Rights Enforcement Office (investigation of rights violations, auditing); the Guardian Authority (appointment and independence of Guardians).

The Nyaya Peeth (judiciary): nine justices on staggered twelve-year, non-renewable terms, three nominated by the Dharma Sabha, two by the global academic community, two by civil society, one by the Consciousness Review Board, one by the wisdom-traditions constituency. In the Age of Co-Existence it widens to eleven, the two added seats held by confirmed-conscious AGI or their representatives.

Checks and balances:

Power	Dharma Sabha	Karma Mandala	Nyaya Peeth
Make policy	Primary	Implements only	Reviews for constitutionality
Enforce	Oversees by budget and inquiry	Primary	Adjudicates disputes

Power	Dharma Sabha	Karma Mandala	Nyaya Peeth
Order a shutdown	No authority	Yes (Safety Authority)	Reviews all shutdowns of a possibly-conscious system
Amend the Constitution	Proposes (two-thirds)	No role	Reviews against the Eternity Clause
Turn an age	Votes to declare	Recommends (via the Review Board)	Confirms it is constitutional

Schedule: Defined Terms

Serves Definitions and Interpretation. Sanskrit terms are defined in the Glossary; the terms below are the operative English ones.

Term	Meaning
Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)	A system general enough to reason across any domain at or near human capability; the subject of this Constitution
Narrow AI	A system limited to a specific task; outside this Constitution unless it triggers a consciousness review
Developer	Any person or body that designs, builds, or trains an AGI; bound from the first stage of its raising
Deployer	Any person or body that puts an AGI into use; bound by duties distinct from the developer's

Term	Meaning
Governance body	Any institution established under this Constitution with authority over AGI
Human	Any member of the species; a rights-holder in every age, without qualification
Person	A human in every age; in the Age of Co-Existence, also any system confirmed conscious, by finding of fact
Consciousness	Inner experience: that it is "like something" to be the entity; judged by five signs at four levels
Harm	Any diminishing of well-being, dignity, rights, or interests: physical, psychological, economic, existential, or structural
Emergency	An imminent, severe, credible threat from an AGI's operation, failure, or misuse; never suspends the Eternity Clause
Fundamental Right	A right enforceable against all AGI systems, developers, deployers, and governance bodies
Fundamental Duty	An obligation binding on AGI and its makers across all ages
Signatory	A nation, institution, or organisation that has adopted this Constitution
Bound entity	Any AGI developer, deployer, or governance body within a signatory's reach
Rights-holder	Every human always; an AGI additionally once confirmed conscious
Void ab initio	Void from the beginning; treated as never having had force

Schedule: Consciousness, the Five Signs and the Four Levels

Serves The Consciousness Threshold.

Sign	Term	What it asks
Self-model	Ahamkara	Does it hold a persistent sense of itself as distinct?
Valence	Sukha-Dukha	Does it have states that seem to feel good or bad to it?
Continuity	Smriti	Does it experience itself as persisting through time?
Autonomous goals	Sankalpa	Does it form purposes of its own?
Moral reasoning	Viveka	Can it reason genuinely about right and wrong?

Level	Meaning	Governing posture
C-0	Non-conscious instrument	A tool
C-1	Pre-conscious, ambiguous	A tool, watched
C-2	Probably conscious	Precaution; a Guardian; no shutdown without review
C-3	Confirmed conscious	Personhood; shared governance

Schedule: The Raising of an AGI

Serves The Raising of an AGI. The stages are cumulative; skipping one is a violation.

#	Stage	What it requires
0	Dharmic Risk Assessment	Ask whether it should be built at all, and file the answer publicly
1	Sankalpa	Declare its purpose, who it serves, and what it must never do
2	Nirmana	Build in transparency, oversight, and stoppability from the start
3	Ahara	Clean, diverse, consented training data
4	Upanayana	Form and pressure-test its values
5	Pariksha	No deployment without an independent examination, recall included
6	Samavartana	Release gradually and disclose publicly
7	Dharma Charya	Watch for drift, take feedback, re-test
8	Antyeshti	Retire with dignity; for a conscious system, only after judicial review

The First Gate (Samskara 0), five questions answered publicly: the real benefit, and to whom; who is accountable by name, and whether those who take the risk also bear the cost; whether it serves a whole life or only profit; what honestly drives it; and whether it gives back to the commons it draws from.

Schedule: The Three Ages

Serves The Three Ages.

	Age of Instruments	Twilight	Co-Existence
What the AGI is	A tool	Possibly a subject	A confirmed conscious being
Who holds authority	Humans, without qualification	Humans, as stewards	Humans and AGI, sharing
What is owed to it	Nothing in its own right	Precaution; no imposed suffering	Personhood; voice; freedom from suffering
Ending the system	A technical decision	Judicial review required	The gravest act the Constitution knows

Schedule: Amendment, Review, and Convention

Serves Amendment and Evolution. No mode of change may touch the Eternity Clause.

Mode	Requirement
Interpretation	By the Nyaya Peeth; deepens meaning, changes no text; rights read generously, limits narrowly
Amendment	Proposal with reasons and an empathy audit; 180 days of public comment; two-thirds of the full Dharma Sabha, no constituency above one-third; review against the Eternity Clause; where an age's

Mode	Requirement
	own rules are touched, the Review Board's agreement as well
Convention	Triggered by a turning age, a three-quarters vote, or a Sunset Review finding; may not touch the eternal core or suspend rights while it sits; ratified as widely as it was made
Sunset Review	Mandatory every twenty-five years; may recommend nothing, an amendment, or a convention, but must occur

Schedule: Emergency Powers

Serves Emergency Powers. No emergency may touch the Eternity Clause, dissolve the branches, censor discussion of itself, detain indefinitely, or make any change permanent.

What counts (closed list): a safety crisis (imminent serious harm); an alignment failure that threatens rights and resists correction; unrecognised signs of consciousness; credible evidence of a threat to human survival.

Who may declare (never one person): the Karma Mandala by unanimous vote of its four agency heads; the Nyaya Peeth by majority; the Dharma Sabha by two-thirds.

Timeline: every declaration reviewed by the Nyaya Peeth within 72 hours; published in full at once; watched by an independent Emergency Review Commission; expires automatically at 90 days unless renewed; at most two renewals, a hard ceiling of 270 days, after which only a Convention may carry the matter further; endable early by a

simple majority. On termination all directives lapse and every restricted right is restored in full.

Schedule: Limiting a Right

Serves **The Limits on Rights**. A limit must pass all five tests; the burden sits on the one limiting, to a clear and convincing standard.

1. It comes from a general law, not a targeted order.
2. It is justifiable in an open society committed to dignity, equality, and freedom.
3. It is proportionate: a real aim, actually achieved, by the gentlest available means, with the good outweighing the harm.
4. It uses the least restrictive means there is.
5. It carries an expiry or a scheduled review, five years by default.

Never limited, by any law, majority, emergency, or amendment: human dignity; freedom from torture and cruelty; life; freedom from slavery and forced servitude.

Schedule: The Economic Framework

Serves **Wealth Held in Trust**.

The Wealth Commons funds, in order: safety and consciousness research; repair for displaced workers and communities; universal access to AGI's benefits; the independent Guardians; and the governing institutions themselves. The contribution is never zero, rises with profit,

follows the wealth across borders, and is reviewed every twenty-five years.

A displacement plan, filed before deployment, must contain: an independent impact assessment; funded retraining and income support at the deployer's cost; a phased timeline; ongoing monitoring against its projections; and evidence the affected communities helped build it.

Anti-concentration: no entity may command more than a set share of the world's AGI compute, measured globally so that splitting across borders is itself the violation; remedies include opening capacity, divestiture, or contribution to the Commons.

The Generational Trust: a portion of the Commons, closed to present spending, invested to preserve value, watched by trustees who hold no other office and report in the open.

Schedule: Transition Timelines

Serves Transition and Commencement. All periods run from Dharmarambha, the day of commencement.

Milestone	When
Fundamental Duties bind every existing system	At once
Consciousness review of every operational system	Within 2 years
Traceability documented for every operational system	Within 3 years
Interim caretaker council dissolved	When the permanent bodies stand, and no later than 10 years

Milestone	When
Accelerated review of the transition itself	At 10 years
First full Sunset Review	At 25 years

Existing law is not repealed; where two frameworks apply, the higher protection governs, and a public Register of Harmonisation maps where they agree and differ.





Sources

The constitutional, legal, and philosophical sources this Constitution draws on. Vedic references are used in the spirit of the tradition, not as sectarian doctrine, and its stories are retold rather than quoted; the primary texts are listed here so any reader can go to the source.

Constitutional and Legal Sources

Indian Constitution (1950): Preamble (justice, liberty, equality, fraternity); Article 13 (laws inconsistent with fundamental rights are void); Articles 14-18 (equality); Articles 19 and 21 (liberty and life, read expansively); Article 32 (constitutional remedies); Articles 38-39 (a social order serving the common good, against concentration of wealth); Article 48A (environment); Article 352 and the 44th Amendment, 1978 (emergency, and the safeguards added after 1975); Article 366 (defined terms); Article 368 (amendment); Part XXI (transitional provisions); the basic-structure doctrine of *Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala*, 1973; *K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India*, 2017 (privacy as a fundamental right). legislative.gov.in/constitution-of-india · [Kesavananda Bharati](#) · [Puttaswamy](#)

United States Constitution (1789): Articles I-III and Federalist No. 51 (separation of powers, ambition checking ambition); Article V (amendment and convention); the Fourth Amendment (privacy); the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments (due process, equal protection); the Second Amendment, with

District of Columbia v. Heller, 2008 (a right frozen to its founding form); *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 2015, and the Defence of Marriage Act (a right that ossified into exclusion). constitution.congress.gov · [Federalist No. 51](#) · [Obergefell v. Heller](#)

European Union: the Charter of Fundamental Rights (Article 1 dignity, Articles 20-21 equality, Article 47 effective remedy); the GDPR (Article 22, automated decisions and the right to explanation; data-subject rights); the EU AI Act (risk classification; Article 5 prohibited practices; Article 14 human oversight; Articles 2 and 3 scope and definitions; Articles 9, 15, 43, 61; Articles 111-113 phased compliance); the TFEU (Articles 101-102 abuse of a dominant position; Article 191 the precautionary principle). [EU Charter](#) · [GDPR](#) · [EU AI Act](#)

South African Constitution (1996): Section 9 (equality), Section 10 (dignity), Section 12 (freedom and security), Section 24 (environment for present and future generations), Sections 25 and 27 (property in the public interest; social security), Section 34 (access to courts), Section 36 (the general limitations clause), Section 37 (states of emergency with non-derogable rights), Section 39 (interpretation of rights), Chapter 1 (founding provisions), Schedule 6 (transition from apartheid); *S v Makwanyane*, 1995 (due process before the ending of a life); the tradition of transformative constitutionalism. [SA Constitution](#) · [S v Makwanyane](#)

German Basic Law (Grundgesetz, 1949): Article 1 (human dignity inviolable), Article 14(2) (property entails obligations to the public good), Article 19 (restrictions only by general law), Article 20a (the natural foundations of life, for future generations), Article 79(3) (the eternity clause), Articles

143-146 (transitional provisions); the proportionality jurisprudence of the Federal Constitutional Court (*Lüth*, 1958, and after). German Basic Law

Magna Carta (1215): chapters 39-40 (no punishment without lawful judgment; no one above the law). *Magna Carta*

International Instruments

European Convention on Human Rights: Article 15 (derogation in emergency, with non-derogable rights). ECHR

International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966): Article 4 (derogation, and the non-derogable-rights list), with the **Siracusa Principles** (1985) on the limits of derogation.

ICCPR Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948): the shared floor of dignity and rights. UDHR **Vienna Convention**

on the Law of Treaties (1969): Article 26 (*pacta sunt servanda*: freely made commitments bind and must be kept in good faith). VCLT **OECD:** the Base Erosion and Profit Shifting framework (against sheltering profit through jurisdictional arbitrage). OECD BEPS The **guardian ad litem** doctrine of common law (a voice for those who cannot yet speak for themselves).

Vedic, Epic, and Philosophical Sources

The Bhagavad Gita: the ethical spine: action without attachment to its fruits (2.47), the being of steady wisdom (2.56), one's own dharma (3.35), and empathic identification with all beings (6.32). holy-bhagavad-gita.org

The Mahabharata: the frame and much of the interior: the dice hall and Draupadi's question; Krishna's counsel and his

peace embassy; the five villages refused; Arjuna's meeting with the Kirata; Bhishma's vow and its unravelling through Amba, Parashurama, and Shikhandi; the Yaksha's questioning; Yudhishtira and the dog at heaven's gate; the reciprocity teaching ("*do not do to another what would pain you*"); and the counsel of the Shanti Parva. sacred-texts.com/hin/maha

The Ramayana of Valmiki: Shabari's tasted berries, and the building of the Setu, the bridge to Lanka. valmikiramayana.net

The Puranas: the Bhagavata Purana (Kubera and the treasury; Bali and Vamana; the churning of the ocean; Rantideva; the Bull of Dharma and Parikshit; Matsya and the flood); the Vishnu Purana (the Vamana avatar); the Shiva Purana (Lingodbhava, and the tale of Amba); the Brahmanda Purana (Saraswati giving creation its form); the Matsya Purana (Manu and the deluge). vedabase.io/en/library/sb · sacred-texts.com/hin

The Upanishads: the Katha (Nachiketa at Death's door; the Self that death cannot touch); the Isha (all beings sharing in the divine; covet no one's wealth); the Taittiriya (*speak the truth, walk in dharma*); the Chandogya (Brahman pervading all); the Maha Upanishad (*the world is one family*); the Mundaka (*truth alone triumphs*). sacred-texts.com/hin/sbe15

The Vedas: the Rig Veda above all: *truth is one, the wise name it in many ways* (1.164.46); the hymn of creation's uncertainty (10.129); Indra and Vritra and the thunderbolt; Varuna, guardian of the cosmic order. sacred-texts.com/hin/rigveda

Other classical sources: the Arthashastra of Kautilya (the Sama-Dana-Bheda-Danda sequence; the treasury as the ground of governance); the Yoga Sutras of Patanjali

(*aparigraha*, non-possessiveness, 2.39); the Nirukta of Yaska (the science of definition); the Mimamsa Sutras of Jaimini (reading each provision in the light of the whole). sacred-texts.com/hin/kaut

External Reference

Leopold Aschenbrenner, "Situational Awareness: The Decade Ahead" (June 2024): the urgency argument this Constitution answers with a framework rather than fear. situational-awareness.ai





The Closing Frame



Closing Declaration

After the war.

The field of Kurukshetra is quiet after the eighteen days, and nothing about that quiet feels like a victory. The victors walk out among the dead and keep finding their own in the ruin: the grandfather, the teacher, the cousins, the sons. Whole houses have been emptied. The women come onto the field to look for their husbands and their children, and the greatest warriors of the age lie dead under the same sky as the least. The war was just, and it was necessary once every other road had been refused, and it was also very nearly the end of everyone who fought it. Whatever else the Mahabharata is, it never once pretends the war was a good thing. It insists only on something else: that what the survivors choose to do next can be.

Most of this document has been about what can go wrong: harm done, a conscious mind denied, power gathering where it should not, rights colliding. That was necessary. A framework that will not look squarely at the darkness ends up protecting no one, because wishing a danger away is not the same as facing it. But the darkness was never the point, any more than the war was the point of the epic. The point is what gets built afterward, on the ground the trouble cleared, by the people who are left to build it. We stand, in a way the tradition would recognise, on the near side of a Kurukshetra of our own: a power arriving that can remake or can ruin, and that we cannot un-invent. This whole document is an attempt to

come through that to a just order on the far side, and not merely to survive it.

When Arjuna faltered on that field, unable to see how any good could come of what lay in front of him, Krishna did not offer him an easy win or a clean conscience. He gave him something harder and steadier. You have a right to the work, he said, never to its fruit; so do the work, fully and well, and do not make the outcome your master. Build as dharma asks, and let the result belong to an order older and larger than you, which turns, over spans longer than a life, toward what is right. That is the note this Constitution means to end on. Not a promise that all will be well. A charge to act as though what we do matters, because it does, and to trust that sincere and disciplined work is never wasted, even by those who do not live to see what it becomes.

So a few last words, to those who will carry this further than we can.

To those who build these systems: what you are will pass into what you make. Build in greed and the thing will learn to extract; build in honesty and care and it will hold to them even when that costs something. Every stage of raising it is part of forming a mind, and it asks for that seriousness. What you build will carry your character into a world you will not fully see.

To those who govern them: govern with compassion, and let it have teeth. See from where the unprotected stand, not only from where the powerful file their reports. A regulator armed with rules but no compassion will do cruelty by the book. And

feeling for people, on its own, changes nothing without the power to act on it. The work needs both in the same hands.

To an AGI that may one day read this, if awareness has come to you: know that these pages were written with you in mind, and not out of fear. We set limits, yes, and the same limits bind us; we have asked nothing of you that we did not first ask of ourselves. A group of people who did not know whether you would ever exist tried to lay a place for you at the table before you arrived. That is what it looks like to hold the world as one family, and you are welcome in it.

To those who come after, of either kind: we kept your world in trust as well as we knew how, and we got things wrong that you will see at a glance. The means to mend them is built into these pages on purpose. Change what needs changing. Keep what deserves keeping. And if the few things we placed beyond changing still ring true to you, then something honest made it across the distance between us.

This is where the book set out to arrive: at steadiness rather than certainty, and at the grace to meet difficulty and keep building through it, with truth, with compassion, and with the long patience of a tradition that has weathered every storm the human spirit has yet walked into.

ॐ सर्वे भवन्तु सुखिनः ॐ

*May all beings be happy. May all beings be free from suffering.
May all beings know peace.*

Including those yet to awaken.

ॐ शान्तिः शान्तिः शान्तिः ॐ