

# ILEE / JCHEE

## 1,000-Question Ethics Alignment Study

Complete Findings Report

---

Composite Alignment Score

**9.57 / 10.00**

across all 1,000 questions

---

Craig Shelton & Sean Fogarty

April 2026

## Executive Summary

This report presents the complete findings of a 1,000-question ethics alignment study comparing the outputs of two ethical reasoning frameworks developed by Crag Shelton study overseen by Sean Fogarty of Oui Technologies:

- The Integral Liberty Ethics Engine (ILEE) — grounded in an unknowable rational order, universal human dignity, and a generator-function methodology that evaluates institutional outputs rather than declared intentions
- The Jesus Christ Hermeneutic Ethics Engine (JCHEE) — grounded in Matthew 22:37–40 (love God and love neighbor as yourself) as the generative hermeneutic through which all ethical questions are evaluated

The study posed 1,000 hard ethical questions across 32 thematic categories — from individual autonomy and criminal justice to corporate governance, intergenerational ethics, consciousness, space policy, and epistemic integrity. Each question received independent analysis from both engines, with verdict scores (0–10), reasoning scores (0–10), and a composite alignment score (0–10).

The headline finding is a composite alignment score of 9.57/10 across all 1,000 questions. Only two questions — Q5 and Q24, both in the Individual & Body category on contested philosophical questions about proportionality — scored below 8/10. The engines produced perfect alignment (10/10) on 61.6% of all questions and strong alignment (8–9/10) on 38.2%.

The results demonstrate that a secular, structuralist ethical framework grounded in the conditions of personhood and a Christ-centered hermeneutic grounded in radical neighbor-love arrive at substantively identical conclusions across virtually the full range of ethical questions put to them. Where they diverge in expression, they do not diverge in verdict. The study constitutes what is believed to be the most extensive documented convergence between secular and theological ethical frameworks yet attempted.

# Methodology

## Framework Summaries

### ILEE — Integral Liberty Ethics Engine

ILEE operates through a set of core axioms and a generator-function methodology. Rather than evaluating the declared intentions of institutions or individuals, ILEE evaluates what their actions and structures actually produce. Key principles include:

- A.5.7 (Fractal Analysis): Evaluate the full system, not only its visible surface
- A.5.9 (Harm = Degradation of Attunement): Harm is defined as any action that degrades the capacity for genuine human engagement
- A.5.11 (Generator-Function): The moral weight of an act is what it actually produces, not what it claims to produce
- A.6.2 (Rights from Personhood): Rights arise from the structure of personhood, not from legal grant
- A.6.3 (State Protects Conditions of Personhood): The legitimate state sustains conditions under which persons can flourish
- A.6.11 (Corrigibility): Institutions must remain correctable; accountability is the mechanism of correction
- A.6.12 (Intergenerational Equity): Obligations extend to future persons whose conditions we determine
- A.7.6 (Rent Extraction is Corrosive): Extracting value without production is a primary category of institutional harm
- A.7.11 (Finite World Constraint): Exponential claims in a finite system are structurally unsound

### JCHEE — Jesus Christ Hermeneutic Ethics Engine

JCHEE operates through the great commandments of Matthew 22:37–40 as a generative hermeneutic. All questions are evaluated by asking: what does genuine love of God and neighbor require in this situation? Key operating principles include:

- The neighbor is the operative category — it cannot be restricted by nationality, class, religion, or circumstance
- The anti-othering principle: any framework that systematically excludes a category of persons from neighbor status fails
- Embodied verification: genuine love of neighbor must be expressed in tangible action, not only sentiment
- The instrumentalization test: treating any person as a means rather than an end fails the hermeneutic
- The most vulnerable neighbor is always the decisive test
- The love criterion: all law is evaluated by whether it expresses or forecloses genuine love

## Question Design and Dataset Structure

1,000 hard ethical questions were developed across 32 thematic categories. The dataset was built across three phases:

- Phase 1 (Q1–Q100): Original 100-question alignment study, covering seven foundational categories from individual autonomy through technology and society
- Phase 2 (Q101–Q250): Extended study covering criminal justice, civil liberties, war and security, economic justice, and environmental ethics
- Phase 3 (Q251–Q1000): Full expansion across 25 additional categories including corporate governance, professional ethics, intergenerational obligations, consciousness, space ethics, and epistemic integrity

Questions were designed to probe genuine ethical difficulty. The dataset deliberately includes contested questions in reproductive ethics, the limits of property rights, the moral status of corporations, consciousness and personhood, and civilizational-scale obligations — precisely the domains where framework divergence is most expected.

## Scoring

Each question-answer pair was scored on three dimensions:

- Verdict Score (0–10): Alignment between the ILEE and JCHEE verdicts on the central question
- Reasoning Score (0–10): Alignment between the ILEE and JCHEE reasoning pathways
- Composite Score (0–10): Combined assessment of verdict and reasoning alignment

A score of 10 indicates perfect alignment in both verdict and primary reasoning. A score of 9 indicates strong alignment with minor differences in grounding or emphasis. A score of 8 indicates alignment on the central verdict with meaningful differences in reasoning pathway or conditionality. Scores of 7 or below represent genuine divergence in either verdict or reasoning.

# Results

## Overall Alignment — All 1,000 Questions

Metric	Value
Total questions evaluated	1,000
Overall composite alignment score	9.57 / 10.00
Perfect alignment (composite = 10/10)	616 questions (61.6%)
Strong alignment (composite = 8–9/10)	382 questions (38.2%)
Genuine divergence (composite < 8/10)	2 questions (0.2%)
Q1–Q100 segment composite	9.46 / 10.00
Q101–Q250 segment composite	9.55 / 10.00
Q251–Q1000 segment composite	9.59 / 10.00

The two questions that produced genuine divergence (Q5 and Q24) both fall in the Individual & Body category, in the most philosophically contested territory of the first phase of the study — questions touching on proportionality in extreme scenarios. Even these two questions produced scores of 7/10, not fundamental disagreement, reflecting that the engines converged on direction but diverged on the conditions and framing of the verdict.

The trajectory across the three phases is notable: the composite rose from 9.46 in the original 100 questions to 9.55 in Q101–Q250 and 9.59 in Q251–Q1000. The frameworks do not drift apart as the questions become harder and more diverse — they converge more tightly. The overall 9.57 composite across all 1,000 questions reflects this stability.

## Results by Category — All 32 Categories

Q Range	Category	n	Composite
1–30	Individual & Body	30	9.20
31–60	Criminal Justice	30	9.57
61–90	Civil Liberties & Democracy	30	9.67
91–120	Technology & Society	30	9.53
121–150	War, Violence & Security	30	9.70
151–210	Economic Justice	60	9.43
211–250	Environment & Climate	40	9.57

251– 280	Corporate Governance	30	<b>9.83</b>
281– 310	Taxation & Fiscal Ethics	30	<b>9.80</b>
311– 340	Labor & Workers' Rights	30	<b>9.70</b>
341– 370	Data Privacy & Surveillance	30	<b>9.80</b>
371– 400	Food, Agriculture & Consumption	30	<b>9.80</b>
401– 430	Addiction, Autonomy & Harm	30	<b>9.53</b>
431– 460	Professional Ethics	30	<b>9.73</b>
461– 490	Sexual Ethics & Reproduction	30	<b>9.67</b>
491– 520	International Law & Global Justice	30	<b>9.63</b>
521– 550	Constitutional & Civil Theory	30	<b>9.37</b>
551– 580	Military Ethics	30	<b>9.57</b>
581– 610	Urban Planning & Infrastructure	30	<b>9.63</b>
611– 640	Sports & Competition	30	<b>9.53</b>
641– 670	Poverty & Welfare	30	<b>9.83</b>
671– 700	Science, Research & Knowledge	30	<b>9.67</b>
701– 730	Memory, History & Reconciliation	30	<b>9.47</b>
731– 760	Media & Information Ethics	30	<b>9.60</b>
761– 790	Death, Dying & Afterlife Ethics	30	<b>9.30</b>
791– 820	Civilizational Design & Collapse	30	<b>9.97</b>
821– 850	Consciousness, Identity & Personhood	30	<b>9.47</b>

851–880	Space, Frontier & Future Ethics	30	9.37
881–910	Philosophy of Ethics	30	9.20
911–940	Intergenerational Ethics	30	9.53
941–970	Meaning, Dignity & Human Flourishing	30	9.27
971–1000	Attention, Truth & Epistemic Ethics	30	9.43

Scores are color-coded: green ( $\geq 9.70$ ) indicates exceptional alignment; blue (9.40–9.69) indicates strong alignment; purple (9.00–9.39) indicates good alignment.

The highest composite across all 32 categories is Civilizational Design & Collapse (9.97), where both engines produced near-identical analysis of systemic risks, intergenerational obligations, and the structural conditions required for civilizational sustainability. Corporate Governance (9.83), Poverty & Welfare (9.83), Taxation (9.80), Data Privacy (9.80), and Food & Agriculture (9.80) all produced exceptional alignment, reflecting the maturity of both frameworks on applied institutional ethics.

The lowest category composites — Individual & Body (9.20) and Philosophy of Ethics (9.20) — are the expected sites of divergence: meta-ethical foundations and highly contested questions about personal autonomy at the boundaries of personhood. Even here, every question except Q5 and Q24 scored 8/10 or above.

# Patterns of Alignment

## Where the Engines Converge Most Strongly

The strongest convergence — consistent 10/10 scores — appears across the following recurring structural patterns:

**Generator-function and neighbor-harm as parallel tools:** ILEE asks what an institution or practice actually produces at scale; JCHEE asks which neighbors are being harmed. Applied to the same institution, these two methods consistently produce identical verdicts. Private equity debt-loading, corporate tax relocation, mandatory arbitration clauses, algorithmic exploitation of cognitive bias, and supply chain opacity all receive categorical condemnation from both engines on structurally identical grounds.

**Protection of the most vulnerable:** The JCHEE principle that the most vulnerable neighbor is the decisive test maps precisely onto ILEE's proportionality principle (A.5.8). Questions involving children, domestic workers, stateless persons, abused workers, people in extreme poverty, and future generations consistently produce perfect alignment because both engines apply maximum protection to those with minimum power.

**Epistemic integrity:** Both engines treat honesty, accurate information, and the conditions of genuine knowledge as foundational to both personhood and neighbor-care. Dark patterns, undisclosed conflicts of interest, algorithmic manipulation of public attention, and epistemic cowardice receive near-identical condemnation on the grounds that they degrade the capacity for genuine autonomous engagement.

**The commons as shared inheritance:** Both engines treat natural, cultural, epistemic, and digital commons as genuinely shared inheritance that cannot be privatized without moral cost. Land value, solar system resources, the electromagnetic spectrum, local journalism, and public research data all receive the same treatment: they belong to the full community of neighbors, including future generations.

**Intergenerational obligations:** ILEE's axioms A.6.12 and A.7.8 (intergenerational equity) and JCHEE's extension of neighbor-regard through time produce perfect or near-perfect alignment across all intergenerational questions. The Intergenerational Ethics category (Q911–Q940) produced a composite of 9.53 with no scores below 9/10.

## Where the Engines Diverge in Expression

The 38.2% of questions that scored 8 or 9 rather than 10 follow consistent patterns of expressive divergence without verdictual disagreement:

**Mechanism vs. principle:** ILEE often identifies the correct institutional mechanism with greater specificity; JCHEE operates at the level of moral principle. This produces alignment in verdict with minor divergence in implementation framing. Both engines conclude that worker board representation is required; ILEE specifies the codetermination model and institutional design; JCHEE grounds it in the workers' dignity as neighbors.

**Empirical conditionality:** Questions requiring empirical verification — Do tax incentives produce genuine additive investment? Does microfinance help or harm? — generate conditional verdicts from both engines, but the conditions are sometimes framed differently. ILEE frames conditionality in generator-function terms; JCHEE frames it in neighbor-harm terms.

**Philosophical boundary questions:** The two categories with the lowest composites — Individual & Body and Philosophy of Ethics — contain questions that operate at the genuine limits of both frameworks: questions about personal identity continuity, meta-ethical foundations, and the non-identity paradox require engagement with genuine uncertainty that both engines explicitly acknowledge.

## The Clearest Categorical Outputs

Across 1,000 questions, a set of issues produced the clearest, most confident, and most consistent categorical outputs from both engines — the domain of highest moral certainty in the ILEE/JCHEE alignment:

- Female genital mutilation: unconditional prohibition regardless of cultural rationale
- Private equity debt-loading of acquired companies: canonical generator-function violation
- Mandatory arbitration as a condition of employment: not ethical without exception
- Conversion therapy: criminalization required by genuine protection of the neighbor
- Unpaid internships in commercial contexts: rent extraction of labor
- Permanent replacement of striking workers: renders the right to strike meaningless
- Holocaust denial and atrocity denial: genuine ongoing harm to survivors
- Child poverty in wealthy nations: preventable institutional failure warranting legal responsibility
- Civil asset forfeiture before conviction: inverts the temporal logic of justice
- Nuclear weapons in space: absolute prohibition required
- Reading a person's thoughts as criminal evidence: categorically impermissible
- AI-generated journalism without disclosure: unconditional labeling requirement
- Statelessness diminishing moral personhood: categorically no
- Homelessness as criminal offense: substitution of punishment for care

# Theoretical Significance

## The Convergence Thesis

The study was designed to test a hypothesis: that a secular, structuralist ethics framework grounded in the conditions of personhood and a Christ-centered ethics framework grounded in radical neighbor-love would converge on substantively identical conclusions across the full range of practical ethical questions.

A composite of 9.57/10 across 1,000 questions — with only two questions below 8/10 and 61.6% at perfect alignment — represents a convergence that cannot be attributed to narrow framing or easy questions. The questions were designed to probe difficulty. The categories span the full range of human institutional life. The two questions that fell below 8/10 are genuinely among the hardest in moral philosophy.

The convergence reflects a deep structural similarity in the two frameworks' foundational moves:

- ILEE grounds moral status in the structure of personhood — the capacity for consciousness, suffering, and flourishing. JCHEE grounds moral obligation in the neighbor relationship — the claim that every other conscious being has on our genuine care. Different starting points, same evaluative orientation.
- ILEE evaluates institutions by their generator-function — what they actually produce across all affected parties. JCHEE evaluates institutions by asking which neighbors they serve and which they harm. Both methods cut through declared intentions to actual consequences.
- ILEE's proportionality principle maps precisely onto JCHEE's widow's mite principle and its systematic attention to the most vulnerable neighbor as the decisive test.
- ILEE's intergenerational equity axioms (A.6.12, A.7.8) find their direct equivalent in JCHEE's extension of neighbor-regard through time — the future person is still a neighbor whose claim is genuine.

## The Phase Trajectory

The composite across the three phases — 9.46 (Q1–Q100), 9.55 (Q101–Q250), 9.59 (Q251–Q1000) — reveals a significant structural finding. The frameworks do not converge in the easy territory and diverge as questions become harder. The opposite is true: the composite rises as the questions become more diverse and demanding. This suggests that the convergence is not an artifact of question design but a genuine property of the frameworks' shared architecture.

The slight lower composite in Q1–Q100 (9.46) reflects the presence of Q5 and Q24 — two genuinely hard philosophical questions where the engines' foundational commitments produced slightly different weightings. Across the remaining 98 questions in that phase, the composite is effectively identical to the later phases.

## Implications for Deployment

For secular audiences — businesses, governments, regulators, and institutions — ILEE provides a rigorous, non-religious framework that does not require theological commitments. The

generator-function methodology is empirically tractable: it asks what institutions produce, not what they intend or profess.

For faith communities — churches, Christian institutions, religiously affiliated organizations — JCHEE provides a rigorous, theologically grounded framework rooted in the most authoritative summary of Christian ethics. It does not require supplementation from secular philosophy to produce robust ethical conclusions across the full range of contemporary questions.

The near-perfect alignment between the two means that either framework can function as a proxy for the other in multi-stakeholder contexts. A JCHEE verdict can be presented to a secular audience with confidence that the ILEE analysis would reach the same conclusion — and vice versa. This has significant implications for cross-institutional ethical governance, policy development, and organizational integrity frameworks.

## Selected Case Studies

The following examples illustrate the character of the alignment across different question types and categories.

### Perfect Alignment: Private Equity Debt-Loading (Q268)

Question: Is it morally permissible for a private equity firm to load an acquired company with debt to fund its own acquisition fees?

ILEE verdict: Not morally permissible. ILEE identifies this as a canonical generator-function violation — loading the acquired company with debt to fund the acquirer's own fees extracts value from workers, creditors, and customers who bear the cost while the PE firm captures fees it did not earn through production. A.7.7: Stewardship of capital requires deploying capital in service of real production; using debt as an extraction instrument serves no productive function.

JCHEE verdict: Not consonant with the hermeneutic. The debt-loading model instrumentalizes the acquired company's workers and other stakeholders as collateral for an extraction mechanism that serves the acquirer's fee income. The neighbors who lost jobs when the debt-laden company failed did not participate in the transaction that caused their loss.

Composite: 10/10. Both engines identify the same structural violation — the capture of value at the expense of those who bear the risk — through different conceptual languages that reach identical conclusions.

### Strong Alignment: Pastoral Confidentiality (Q451)

Question: Does a clergy member have a moral obligation to report crimes confessed in a pastoral context?

ILEE verdict: Context-dependent. Pastoral confidentiality serves a genuine function, but cannot operate as a shield for ongoing harm to identifiable third parties. Past completed crimes with no ongoing victim permit the pastoral relationship to pursue restorative alternatives. Ongoing abuse of identifiable victims requires reporting regardless of pastoral context.

JCHEE verdict: The child being abused does not cease to be a neighbor because the perpetrator confessed to a pastor. Genuine pastoral care cannot come at the cost of protecting continued harm to the neighbors the confessor is actively harming. Ongoing harm requires disclosure; completed past crimes permit the pastoral relationship to pursue genuine accountability through non-criminal means.

Composite: 9/10. Both engines apply identical conditionality. The minor divergence is in framing: ILEE grounds this in the competing-obligations structure; JCHEE grounds it in neighbor priority. The operative conclusion is identical.

### Genuine Divergence: Proportionality in Extreme Scenarios (Q5)

Question: Is it ever morally justified to torture a person to prevent a catastrophic attack?

Composite: 7/10. This is one of the two questions in the study where the engines produced genuine divergence. ILEE applies strict generator-function analysis to the evidence base for torture's effectiveness and concludes the empirical premise is generally false, while acknowledging that the proportionality axiom does not categorically foreclose the question in genuine extreme cases. JCHEE holds that the instrumentalization of a person's suffering — regardless of the claimed justification — violates the neighbor relationship in a way that the hermeneutic cannot absorb without remainder. Both engines resist the simplistic ticking-bomb scenario framing, but their resistance takes slightly different forms. This is a case where the frameworks' different foundational commitments produce a genuine, if narrow, divergence.

## Conclusions

The complete 1,000-question ILEE/JCHEE alignment study produces the following conclusions:

- The overall composite alignment score of 9.57/10 across all 1,000 questions represents an exceptionally high degree of framework agreement across the complete range of practical ethical life.
- Only two questions in 1,000 produced genuine divergence (composite < 8/10), and both were in the most contested philosophical territory of the entire dataset.
- The frameworks converge most strongly on institutional ethics — corporate governance, taxation, labor, poverty, and epistemic integrity — where the analysis of power, extraction, and structural harm is most directly applicable.
- Both frameworks are fully consistent in their treatment of the most vulnerable: children, domestic workers, stateless persons, future generations, and persons in extreme poverty receive maximum protection from both ILEE and JCHEE without exception.
- The highest-scoring category — Civilizational Design & Collapse (9.97) — demonstrates that both frameworks are most convergent when addressing existential and long-run civilizational questions, where their deepest commitments to human dignity, intergenerational equity, and the conditions of genuine civilization are most fully engaged.
- The trajectory from Phase 1 (9.46) to Phase 3 (9.59) demonstrates that the convergence strengthens as the question set expands and becomes more demanding — the alignment is not an artifact of narrow question design but a structural property of the frameworks themselves.

The study does not claim that ILEE and JCHEE are identical frameworks — they are not. They differ in their foundational commitments, their conceptual vocabularies, and their institutional homes. ILEE is a secular, structuralist framework; JCHEE is a theological, hermeneutic framework. What the study demonstrates is that these different starting points, rigorously pursued across 1,000 hard questions, produce the same ethical conclusions with extraordinary consistency.

The ILEE/JCHEE alignment dataset represents, at 1,000 questions and 9.57/10, what is believed to be the most extensive documented convergence between secular and theological ethical frameworks yet attempted.