

What is *No Confidence*?

The **No Confidence Amendment** is an amendment to the United States Constitution which, like the 25th Amendment, provides additional checks and balances to the United States Government. In the case of the 25th Amendment, the Vice President and the Cabinet are given the authority to strip an acting President of their office. In the case of No Confidence, it gives the States the authority to strip the entire Federal Government of their offices.

The wide-ranging effects of No Confidence serve as both a deterrent and a safeguard. A deterrent, so that the States won't be willing to use it except in such extreme situations as we are in now; a safeguard, to ensure that whenever we *do* end up needing to invoke No Confidence, we clean out *all* the corruption.

This explainer walks through the text of the Amendment section by section, describing what each piece of text means, and why it is written the way it is.

Section 1: Activation and immediate effects

When does it activate?

One of the primary ways that the Constitution restricts the usage of its more drastic powers is by requiring more consensus to activate them. A simple majority is all that is required to pass a national law, elect a President, or admit a new State into the Union. A three-fifths supermajority will end a filibuster in the Senate; a two-thirds supermajority will override a Presidential veto or propose a new Constitutional Amendment. Before such an amendment will take effect, however, it must be ratified by **three-quarters** of all the states (38 of them, at this point).

Amending the Constitution carries such a high burden of consensus because it can reshape the United States Government in its entirety. No Confidence has effects that are no less drastic, and so it requires that any use of it in the future (hopefully the far, far future) carry the same burden of consensus as it does to ratify it in the first place: three-quarters of however many States exist at that time.

Section 1. Upon ratification of this article, or upon affirmation by the legislatures of three quarters of the several States, the current federal government of the United States shall be considered in breach of its oath of office and shall be expelled.

Every member of the United States Government is required to swear an oath that (among other things) they will uphold the Constitution while in office. The Constitution itself specifies that members of the government must be “bound by Oath or Affirmation”; they are only permitted to wield the powers of their office as long as they continue to uphold their oath. The Constitution doesn't provide any explicit mechanism to *determine* whether a governmental official has violated their oath; presumably, it was expected that any such treason would be determined and

addressed by the other branches of the Federal Government—these are the “checks and balances” that the Constitution was designed around. With each of the three branches watching and constraining the other two, no single branch could step out of line.

As we have discovered, this does not help if all *three* branches of the Federal Government are refusing their Constitutional duties. Thus, the No Confidence Amendment introduces the Constitution’s first way to affirmatively declare that a member of the Federal Government of the United States has not only done something wrong, they have made themselves unfit for office. The text “and shall be expelled” serves two purposes: first, it makes it clear that this *is* a disqualifying condition, and second, it ensures that even an official who never took such an oath, whether by a quirk of their position or for any other reason, is *also* removed.

Specifying that No Confidence acts by finding them “in breach of their oath” serves another purpose as well: it prevents any confusion about timing. If No Confidence acted *by* expelling the members of the Federal government, then what would happen if they refused to leave? Do the other effects of No Confidence happen once the decision is made, or once they’re finally out? This wording answers those questions: No Confidence takes effect instantly, as soon as the decision is made.

Who does it affect?

This shall include the sitting President and Vice President of the United States, any person who might assume the powers and duties of the office of President, each sitting Justice of the Supreme Court, each member of Congress, and any person appointed to any office during the current Presidential Term by any person this Article considers in breach of their oath of office.

Section 1 continues on to list the offices that are affected by No Confidence. This will, inevitably, remove some officials that have been faithful in their roles, but we cannot afford to carve exceptions out for them; when we invoke No Confidence, we are declaring that there *is* no one we trust to make that determination. In addition, we must remember that if this Constitution survives for another 250 years, we have no idea what type of corruption our descendants might face. We must ensure that No Confidence will be ready to help them in their time of need, just as the Founders ensured that we would have the ability to create No Confidence today.

Thus, the list of affected offices includes not only every justice on the Supreme Court, the entirety of both houses of Congress, and the President, Vice President, and Cabinet, but also *anyone* appointed to an office by any member of the government being dismissed, whether that office is government, military, or other, since the beginning of the current Presidential term.

What does it do?

These persons shall immediately be dismissed and are prohibited from performing any governmental functions starting at the time they are considered in breach.

Every affected official is expelled from their office. The expulsion is immediate; do not pass Go, do not collect \$200, do not sign a new bill into law on your way out.

All military authority, privilege, clearance, and trust vested in these persons is revoked pending review by a new Congress.

They also have any security clearances revoked, and they are removed from the military chain of command. The United States military is, by far, the strongest military in the world. It is also unswervingly loyal to the Constitution and to its own chain of command; by stripping the President of his authority as the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, they will immediately revert to defense of our country against its external foes. There is no need to specify this; any military, ours included, must be prepared for the abrupt removal of its commanding officers, and our military changes out its Commander in Chief every four years.

If you're worried that our enemies might take advantage of some perceived weakness when we do this, I'll first remind you: our military is the *strongest in the world*. Another country might need to worry if they attempted something like what we're doing with No Confidence. The United States, emphatically, does not.

There's a bigger piece to it, though. When we ratify No Confidence, the *entire world* is going to hold its breath, geopolitically speaking. We, the United States, represent the greatest potential existential threat that any nation has ever known, and we will be undergoing a greater change than has been seen on the world stage since the Civil War and the end of chattel slavery in the Euro-American economic sphere. Any country that attacks us during this time will be incurring the wrath of not just the movers and shakers in US politics, and not just any of our potential allies who want us to succeed; they will make themselves enemies of the American *people*. When the United States goes to war with the backing of its people, we *win*. Always have.

Any other person who resigned or was dismissed from an office within the government or military during the current Presidential Term shall be given the option to resume their role, subject to the consent of their superiors and subordinates.

Anyone who *left* during this term, however, voluntarily or no, is allowed to resume their prior position, so long as the people still working there (the ones who weren't affected by the expulsions) don't object. This allows our government to restore itself to functionality after having been gutted by a disloyal administration. Many of our most faithful government employees resigned during this administration when ordered to perform illegal acts; this will honor their integrity, while not requiring the government to re-hire anyone who was terminated with good reason.

The rest of Section 1 rolls back the most recent behavior by each branch of the Federal Government, one by one:

All Executive Orders issued during the current Presidential Term are rescinded.
All Pardons or Reprieves granted by the expelled President are null and void, and

the protections of the fifth article of amendment to the Constitution of the United States do not apply to Offences covered by such Pardons and Reprieves.

This curtails the most egregious abuses of Executive power. This will affect both new EOs and those that rescind EOs from previous terms; we will return to the state we were in before the current President took office. We also void all pardons granted by the President, which is not something that can be done *other* than by Constitutional amendment; the text here specifies that this is in fact a power that supersedes the double jeopardy clause of the Fifth Amendment.

All decisions and opinions issued since the most recent appointment of a Justice to the Supreme Court are vacated without prejudice.

This removes any Supreme Court decisions made by the current composition of the Court from legal precedent and ends their direct impact on United States society. The specification “without prejudice” means that once we have a new Supreme Court, those same cases can be brought before it again, to be considered anew.

Enforcement of laws introduced by the current Congress shall immediately be suspended, and all funding shall remain fixed at its most recently approved levels, pending review by a new Congress.

Last but not least, acts of Congress. Even in a misbehaving government, passing a law requires the consensus of hundreds of individual people, and each bill represents the hard work of committees and subcommittees to work out the very best language. No Confidence does not erase these from the record, it simply pauses their implementation.

The budget, as well, isn’t something that can be rolled back without serious and potentially unrecoverable consequences. If the government is in shutdown when No Confidence is ratified, this will immediately restore its funding, even before we have a new Congress in place; if not, it extends the budget indefinitely until a new Congress is in place, exactly as if Congress passed a “continuing resolution.”

(The phrase “pending review by a new Congress” is used twice in this section. There is no established procedure for Congress reviewing decisions made by a potentially corrupt prior government, nor does the No Confidence Amendment suggest any kind of procedure. The Constitution is not code executed by a computer, though, it is a guide for people. This type of “beneficially unspecified” detail, common in the text of the Constitution, allows whatever government is implementing it to fill in the gaps with its own procedures and rules, and is part of what gives our government its flexibility.)

Section 2: Formation of an Interim Government

Section 2. Once a government has been found in breach of its oath of office, the States shall then elect an Interim Government to take its place. The Interim Government shall have the responsibility to address the flaws in the existing

electoral system that resulted in a faithless government, and thus it must not be elected using the same system: elected roles in the Interim Government may only be filled by Restricted Election.

At the conclusion of the effects of Section 1, the government of the United States will be in a sort of “Safe Mode.” It will operate similarly to how it does when Congress is in shutdown, which we’ve experienced so many times over the recent years: all the day-to-day operations will continue, but no one will be making any *new* decisions. One critical difference is that all government workers, both “essential” and “non-essential”, will continue both performing their jobs *and* receiving their paychecks. One thing our recent experience with a “shutdown” government has taught us is that America can easily operate for a month or two without any decision-makers in charge. We won’t be in danger of starving, or being unable to renew passports, or losing our air traffic controllers.

It certainly isn’t an *ideal* situation, however; while the United States can comfortably keep going just on the strength of its existing regulations and offices, we won’t have the ability to react to new world developments. We won’t have a Supreme Court to appeal cases to, when the lower courts prove insufficient; we won’t be able to go to the assistance to any of our allies if they are attacked; we won’t be able to pass laws curtailing new abuses committed by those in a position of financial power. There will be no authority to appeal to, if state governments make laws or take actions that fail to adhere to the Constitution.

(Of course, right now we have no *trustworthy* authority to appeal to, so we won’t actually be worse off in that sense.)

The existing electoral system, designed in days before air travel and mass telecommunication, prioritizes continuity of government by allowing the incumbent officials to keep their positions until the newly-elected persons take their seats. This “lame duck” period is a time of particular political vulnerability for the United States, as incumbents who are losing their seats then have the freedom to act without consequence, without the voters being able to express further disapproval. While this period can be unstable in the best of times, it would be *disastrous* after No Confidence. Thus, we must use a brand-new electoral system, with new rules and timelines, to choose our Interim Government: the Restricted Election.

Section 3: Restricted Elections, generally

This section, along with Section 1, is a cornerstone of the No Confidence Amendment. Restricted Elections are a means to get a fair vote from the citizens of the United States even when the existing laws around elections and campaigning make it easy for organizations with money and power to unfairly bias them.

Because the integrity of Restricted Elections is so important, every clause in this section is written with its justification explicit in the text; this does not change the function of each clause, but it provides clarity for judges and justices that need to make rulings, either now or decades down the line.

Section 3. A Restricted Election is any electoral process legislated by a State or other entity that satisfies a number of specific objective criteria, all of which must be observed in order to certify the results as true and valid. To qualify as a valid Restricted Election, the following criteria must be observed:

Candidate pool

(a) to ensure the same impartiality as a Trial Jury or Grand Jury, all candidates must first have been selected no more than ninety days prior to the election, either by observably random lottery, each from a population of at least ten thousand eligible citizens per role to be filled, or by Restricted Election; and

Each candidate on the ballot must have been chosen from a pool of 10,000 times the number of seats being elected (typically, the number of seats in the House of Representatives plus 2). For a state with only one seat in the House of Representatives, this means the Restricted Election for the Interim Congress must draw its candidates from a pool of thirty thousand. For California, with 52 seats in the House, they must draw from a pool of at least 540,000. These numbers account for around ten percent of each state's citizens of age 30 or over (those qualified to serve in the Senate); that fraction is significantly lower in the larger states.

This is intended to be large enough to force states to draw from the general population and not from some smaller organization, but small enough to allow them considerable leeway in what additional restrictions they place on candidates (in the same vein as trial lawyers can exclude potential jurors from the jury pool, and for similar reasons).

For example, states *are permitted* to draw from pools of only Democratic or only Republican voters, if they so choose (and enact in law); there are certainly good reasons to do so, like ensuring that a minimum number of candidates from each party appear on the ballot.

The clause "or by Restricted Election" allows for multi-stage Restricted Elections; more about that in Section 6.

Ballot composition

(b) to ensure the voters have a true measure of choice, the ballot of candidates must contain at least twice as many candidates as roles to be filled, and at least twelve candidates in total; and

One imagines that the states will likely want *more* than twice the number of roles on the ballot to avoid alienating voters, but twice the number of seats and twelve in total are reasonable minimums to ensure that there is a good spread of views.

(c) to avoid electing unwilling candidates, any selected citizen may recuse themselves from the ballot, in which case any replacements, if required to uphold the other clauses, must also be selected by the same method; and

This is not a mandatory service like jury duty—we don't want anyone who feels incapable of serving in Congress to be on the ballot. This clause ensures that states *do* have processes in place to fill an empty slot on the ballot if a candidate withdraws; that isn't the kind of omission you want to discover while actually preparing for the election.

Election process

(d) to ensure that all citizens are given full opportunity to express their opinions, each ballot must allow the voter to cast a vote for none, some, or all of the candidates; and



Restricted Elections use an [approval voting](#) system. While not as expressive as systems like ranked choice voting, it has a couple things going for it. First is familiarity; every state has the equipment and procedures in place to conduct a “pick zero or more” election, and every voter knows how to vote on such a ballot. Second is simplicity; there are multiple ways to do systems like ranked choice voting, and even if one were obviously better than the rest, simply the fact that there *is* an option means that it would be up for debate. Approval voting is the only way to do approval voting; there is nothing to debate.

(e) to eliminate the risk of fraud affecting the results, each resident citizen who has reached eighteen years of age is required to submit a ballot, without exception or excuse; and

Note that this doesn't eliminate the risk of fraud; it eliminates the risk of fraud *affecting the results*. No observed or even theorized electoral fraud has the scale to swing these elections one way or another when the whole electorate (or close to it) is voting.

(f) to ensure all voters are represented, a ballot count totalling at least ninety percent of that population must be observed, in which each ballot has at least as many votes as roles to be filled, to certify the results.

Any voter who has not placed at least as many votes as offices that are being elected is not being fully represented by the ballot. Approval voting works best, and is the most expressive about a populace's opinions, when there are *more* votes on each ballot than offices to be filled. Thus, by guaranteeing a minimum number of votes on each ballot, we're also guaranteeing the expressivity, and thus trustworthiness, of the results.

Note that, regardless of whether a voter has placed enough votes to qualify as part of the required 90%, their votes are still counted; as long as at least 90% of the other citizens in the state have submitted qualifying ballots, their votes will be totaled up with everyone else's.

Section 4: Election of Interim Congress

Section 4. At the time a government is found in breach, each of the several States shall void and decertify any maps drawn to divide their territory into Districts for the purposes of electing members of Congress.

The existing borders of the many Congressional election districts across the country are not by any means responsible for *all* the stagnation in our electoral system, but they certainly bear a large portion of the blame. That's not the reason No Confidence requires every state to throw out their electoral maps, though.

The reason this clause is here, as part of the No Confidence process, is because we expect that the electoral system *will* be changing in some way before the time we run regular elections again. If this clause were not part of No Confidence, then it would be the responsibility of the Interim Congress to order that, as part of writing new election laws—and that would set a very unfortunate precedent, and thus it would make the Interim Congress's job more difficult.

No Confidence is primarily an action *by* the States. Putting this clause here means that redrawing our electoral maps is something we are agreeing to voluntarily, rather than something imposed on us by Congress.

The Governor of each State shall then call a Restricted Election to select new Senators and Representatives to form an Interim Congress with all possible haste.

It takes time to set up a Restricted Election. There is no reasonable limit we can set on when the election must take place that would be fair to both the large states and the small ones. It is, however, to every state's benefit to do so as quickly as possible, so there's no need for one; we just specify that each governor must call one as soon as possible.

The Restricted Election to elect members of an Interim Congress is additionally subject to the following criteria, which must be observed in addition to the above to certify the results:

(a) the election shall be at-large, allowing all voters in the State the opportunity to vote for any or all candidates; and

If we're doing a Restricted Election, we can't trust any Congressional district lines, so the election is statewide. (Yes, the states should have voided those already. This just reiterates the point.)

(b) if the ballot contains more than one candidate from any given County in the State, then the ballot must contain at least one candidate from each County in the State; and

County lines, meanwhile, are *not* politically drawn, and so they can be trusted. (It is people that decide which county they live in, not the other way around.) However, the number of counties in

a given state compared to the number of Congressional seats varies hugely. For states with more candidates on the ballot than counties, they must have at least one from each county, with additional candidates from any county; for most states, each candidate on the ballot must be from a different county.

(c) if Senators and Representatives are elected in a mixed ballot, then all candidates must meet the qualifications to be a Senator,

States are not *required* to elect the Senators and Representatives as part of a single mixed ballot, though it is certainly the easiest method. Assuming they do, however, all of the candidates must be at least 30 years old, so that they can be a Senator; if some of the candidates in a mixed ballot were between 25 and 29 years old, it would effectively be reducing the number of Senatorial candidates.

If the state chooses not to use a mixed ballot, then they could have a Senatorial ballot with at least 12 candidates of citizens 30 and up, and a Representative ballot with candidates aged 25 and up.

and any Senator elected must receive more votes than any Representative elected in the same Restricted Election, and the State may not fill any Representative roles unless and until all Senator roles are filled; and

For a mixed-ballot Restricted Election where both Senators and Representatives are selected from the same list, the state is required to send the two top candidates to the Senate; they may not choose which two to send after the votes are in.

(d) if a ballot count totalling at least ninety percent of the population of resident citizens of age is observed, but the ballots lack sufficient votes to certify the results for that number of roles to be filled, then the State must instead certify the results for the greatest number of roles that will satisfy clause (f) of section 3 of this Article, based on the ballots received.

This is the “partial credit” clause; it is both a benefit to the states with more Congressional seats like California and Texas, and also a defense against certain types of electoral manipulation. For example, in a state that leans heavily in one direction, the minority party might suggest to its voters that they undervote, thus disqualifying the election.

This clause ensures that doing so is self-defeating; undervoting by a certain number of votes will only reduce the number of seats that are elected (and force the state to call another Restricted Election to fill the rest of its seats, a big hassle to the citizens who participated in this undervoting scheme). Reducing the number of seats elected in a single Restricted Election favors only the majority party—and the majority party in any state is *already* incentivized to vote, since any undervoting by the majority party benefits minority parties much more than vice versa.

The larger states, meanwhile, might simply have trouble getting their voters to cast that many votes; this allows them to still have representation in Congress at the conclusion of their first

Restricted Election, and none of the criteria forbid re-using candidates from one ballot in the next ballot. The state can simply continue holding Restricted Elections until all of its seats in Congress are filled.

Section 5: Composition and Term of the Interim Congress

Section 5. Upon certification of the results, each Interim Senator and Representative shall assume their office as soon as possible,

Unlike with our current electoral system, a Restricted Election is done when we *don't* currently have a government in place, and so (much like when a Special Election is called to fill an empty seat) the election winners take their seats as soon as the ballot is certified.

but in no event prior to thirty days following the date the former Government is found in breach.

There will be a guaranteed gap of one month between No Confidence and the beginning of the Interim Congress, however. This provides a target for states to shoot for: as long as they complete their Restricted Election process within one month, they will be guaranteed to participate starting from the very beginning of the Interim Congress.

No, this doesn't provide much time for campaigning. That's the point. One month is enough time to:

- Contact a couple dozen (perhaps up to a hundred-plus) randomly-chosen citizens from across the counties aged 30 and up and ask if they want to appear on the Restricted Election ballot (1 week);
- Bring them all to the state capitol and enroll them in a legislative training crash course that will last up through and probably even after the election (1 week);
- Have each candidate record a video talking about who they are, what their experience is, and what their views are, and broadcast those videos to the public over TV and online (1 week); and
- Schedule an election on a day of the week that is convenient for the majority of residents in the state (1 week).

That's not to say that's what they *have* to do, of course, but it's a reasonable timetable. This will be a one-time expense to the state, (hopefully) never to be repeated in the foreseeable future; it will be entirely within reason to draw from special-use funding sources to ensure that the Restricted Election is accessible to as many voters as possible, to an extent that would not be fiscally responsible in a standard 2-year election.

Each Representative in the Interim Congress shall serve for the Term of the Interim Congress, which shall last from the date the first Interim Congressperson is seated until the next Congress is elected and begins its session; provided,

however, that no election for a new Congress shall take place unless one year has passed since the beginning of the Term.

The Interim Congress session does not begin on the standard 2-year cycle; it begins when the first Interim Congressperson is seated, no less than 30 days after No Confidence. It does, however, *end* on the standard cycle, so the session will not last exactly two years. The term length will be from 1 to 3 years, as the next general or midterm election will be skipped if it is within the next year.

Each Senator shall serve a Term no shorter than the Term of the Interim Congress, until the next candidate for their seat is duly elected and sworn in.

The Interim Senators assume their state's seats in the Senate, and so each one already belongs to one of the three election year classes; these classes do not change. Thus, each Interim Senator will serve from 1 to 3 years, from 3 to 5 years, or from 5 to 7 years.

For purposes of determining a Quorum, the House of Representatives shall only consider the seats that have been filled by Restricted Election for this Interim Congress.

If one or more high-population States repeatedly fail to perform a Restricted Election, it could quickly make it impossible to gather the 218 Representatives required to form a quorum. This clause adjusts the quorum rules so that the size of the House only considers the seats that have already been filled once in this Interim Congress. Only half of *those* will be required for a quorum.

There is no such similar clause for the Senate; there must be 50 Senators to constitute a quorum, and that means that at least 25 states must succeed in their Restricted Elections in order for the Senate to be able to have a quorum and start business. Without the above clause, it could require up to 41 states to fill a quorum in the House of Representatives!

The best reason not to add a similar clause for the Senate is that a Congress made up of representatives from less than half the states would lack legitimacy; it would not truly be the will of the United States in that case. However, there is an equally good reason not to include it: it might destroy the entire No Confidence Amendment.

The one and only thing that an Amendment *cannot* do in 2026 is listed in Article V of the Constitution: "no State, without its Consent, shall be deprived of its equal Suffrage in the Senate." There is a very good argument to be made that if a state fails its Restricted Election, that is a form of consent, but it is an *argument that would have to be made*. The only party that could decide that argument is the Supreme Court, and if the nation seeks to invoke No Confidence, we must assume that it cannot be trusted with that decision—not to mention that it would be quite the conflict of interest! There can be no question of the Constitutionality of the No Confidence Amendment, and thus it must not change the quorum rules of the Senate.

Section 6: Election of Interim President and Vice President

The Interim Government must, obviously, have a President and Vice President; they are elected after the Interim Congress, because by that point we will have a trustworthy entity to make decisions on our behalf.

Section 6. The Interim Congress shall, as its first act, determine the conditions for a Restricted Election that will elect an Interim President and Vice President of the United States.

The Interim Congress doesn't really need the instruction to determine the conditions of the Presidential election right away, since there isn't that much that a Congress can do without a President to sign bills into law. This clause isn't here to *force* the Interim Congress to act; it is to give them the *power* to act. Since this act is specified in the text of the amendment as a power belonging to Congress and to Congress alone, they are not required to seek approval from any other body—which is good, because at that point in time there won't be any other body for them to seek approval *from*.

No member of the Interim Congress may execute the powers and duties of the office of President of the United States before this election is held and the Interim President has been seated, with the exception of an Acting Commander in Chief that the Armed Forces of the United States may choose from among the members of the Interim Congress.

United States law provides for the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House of Representatives to serve as the Acting President, when both the President and Vice President are unable. This clause is a restriction on the Interim Congress; they may not use this method (or any other) to circumvent the need to have a properly-elected President in the White House, though once the Interim President *is* elected and sworn in, the Presidential line of succession reverts to its typical behavior.

In all likelihood, the United States military will not require a commander-in-chief during the brief period during which we do not have a President. In fact, nations that we have hostilities with are likely to proactively declare that they won't attack us while we're going through our reorganization, for all the reasons mentioned in Section 1 of this explainer.

The military can maintain a defensive standing on its own; the only time a single commander-in-chief is needed is during active war operations, and the execution of No Confidence will be a strong message that any offensive war that was being waged by the expelled President was against the nation's wishes. If there is a situation where the military requires a commander-in-chief to coordinate it prior to the Interim President's election, then each and every one of the elected Interim Senators and Representatives has an equally valid mandate from the people of the United States; given the high likelihood that some of them will have an existing relationship with the military and even a security clearance, the military will be able to choose the most ideal candidate themselves.

This Restricted Election must be held as soon as practicable, and in no event later than five months from the date the first member of the Interim Congress is seated, and is additionally subject to the following criteria, unless otherwise specified by the Interim Congress:

The Interim Congress is granted 5 months to set up the Restricted Election for Interim President. This acts as both a time limit for deliberation and a safeguard for the country; if the Interim Congress is *unable* to determine these conditions, whether from being unable to come to a consensus, being unable to form a quorum, or any other reason, then the country will elect an Interim President anyway, who will then have the executive power to assist in whatever has stymied Congress. The United States will not spend longer than 6 months in total without a President before being able to vote for our new leader.

Note that, while the Interim Congress has the authority to set conditions on the Restricted Election for Interim President and Vice President, they may not alter the definition of a Restricted Election *itself*, as specified in Section 3. They may choose not to use the conditions specified below, replacing them with any other method of conducting a nationwide Restricted Election, but the following rules provide a reasonable baseline.

- (a) the ballot shall have no more than one pair of candidates from each State and one pair from the District constituting the seat of government of the United States; and
- (b) each pair of candidates shall have been selected by an at-large Restricted Election held in their State or District.

The Interim President of the United States might turn out to be the single most politically influential role in the history of 21st century America. No other President will be responsible for signing into law the bills that the Interim Congress writes to reshape our government for the next however many hundreds of years our government lasts until we need to call once again upon No Confidence, so we need to ensure that this election, even more so than those for the Interim Congress, elects the best, most honest, and most truly *American* candidate to lead us through these difficult years.

This is what that extra clause from the first of the Restricted Election criteria in Section 3 is about: "...all candidates must first have been selected no more than ninety days prior to the election, either by observably random lottery ... **or by Restricted Election.**" The default rules for the Restricted Election for Interim President make it a two-stage process, just like our existing primary/general elections. However, rather than one nationwide election for each *party* followed by a nationwide election from among the winners, this format is one at-large election for each *state* followed by a nationwide election from among the winners.

These rules do not *require* each State to submit a pair of candidates for the ballot; this, combined with the requirement to hold the nationwide election within five months of the Interim Congress being seated, means that each state must act to ensure it holds a successful Restricted Election in time, or the nationwide election will go forward without that state's

candidates on the ballot. The 90-day limit on when these candidates may have been selected becomes the timer on the presidential campaigns. Once the statewide Restricted Elections have been held, the winning pair of each statewide race then has three months to campaign nationally prior to the nationwide Presidential election.

Thus, the public should expect three Restricted Elections, after a No Confidence. The first will take place about one month after No Confidence, electing the Interim Congress. (Larger states might require a couple extra, to elect their whole Congressional delegation.) The second will happen about three months after No Confidence, the statewide “primary” election for the Interim President/Vice President candidates. The third will take place three months later—six months after No Confidence—for the Interim President and Vice President.

Section 7: Term of Interim President and Vice President

Section 7. The Interim President and Vice President shall assume their offices as soon as the Restricted Election results are certified,

As with the Interim Congress, we want the elected candidates to take their offices as soon as possible. Once the nationwide Restricted Election is held and the results are certified, there is no delay before the winners are sworn in.

and in no event later than six months after the Interim Congress begins its session.

This clause is not necessary for the basic functioning of the electoral process or for the implementation by the governments; this acts as a shield for the courts. If there are disputes about the results of any of the elections, this provides a time limit for how long any legal protests are permitted to take. Presuming the timeline is as above, this gives a one-month period for disputes and recounts.

They shall serve a term that ends no earlier than that of the Interim Congress, until the next President and Vice President are duly elected and sworn in.

If the Interim Congress is seated with more than one year left in the current Presidential term, then the Interim President and VP simply serve the remainder of that term, to a minimum of 6 months. If less than one year remains, the scheduled general election for the next President and Congress are skipped (as detailed in Section 5), and the Interim President serves between 4 and 5 years.

Section 8: Authority of the Interim Government

Section 8. The Interim Government of the United States is the Federal Government of the United States, with all the powers and responsibilities afforded to it by this Constitution.

The Interim Government is a special body elected once, for a particular purpose; it would be easy for opponents to claim that this limits them in some way, that they don't have the authority to make whatever changes are necessary to heal the corruption in our legal and electoral system, or to repair our relationship with the rest of the world.

The reason that Restricted Elections are such an onerous burden on the citizens of the United States is so that we *can* be certain that these are the right people for the job. Once we've made our choice, any attempt to discredit them would discredit the whole of the United States.

Any person elected to an office pursuant to the text of this Article is a member of the Interim Government, as is any person appointed to or selected for such an office by a member of the Interim Government.

Much like the clause in Section 1 which defines the roles to be expelled, this clause defines what roles are "Interim Government roles" by self-reference. Anyone elected to the government by Restricted Election after a No Confidence is a member of the Interim Government; so is anyone they appoint, in addition to any subordinates those appointees choose.

Section 9: Limits on re-election

Section 9. The Interim Government has the additional responsibility to address the flaws present in the electoral process, and so its motives must be beyond question. No member of the Interim Government may be elected as a Senator, Representative, President, or Vice President until ten years following the conclusion of their service.

One of the reasons our electoral process has become so flawed is because the people making the rules for the process are also the people elected by that process. We must ensure that the Interim Congress and President do not fall prey to the same trap; thus, any person chosen by the Restricted Election process or appointed by the Interim Government may not be chosen by the *standard* election process until 10 years after they leave office.

Section 10: Isolation of electoral processes

Section 10. After a government has been found in breach, no State may conduct an election for a role in the Federal Government, nor may such an elected candidate take office, unless it fulfills all the criteria of a Restricted Election, or unless one year shall have passed since the date the Interim Congress began its session, unless otherwise specified by the Interim Congress.

While the prior sections establish the *primary* mechanisms for electing citizens to the Interim Government, it is important to ensure that its integrity is not compromised by the introduction of officials who were *not* chosen by Restricted Election. This section ensures that, for example, special elections to fill an empty seat after a resignation are conducted under the same rules.

This section prohibits states from using anything other than a Restricted Election when electing *any* role in the Federal Government, starting at the time that No Confidence is executed and ending one year after the Interim Congress is seated, the minimum duration of an Interim Congress session. As Congress already has the authority to regulate electoral policy, they may extend this prohibition to the full duration of the Interim Congress session, but only as an Act of Congress, properly signed by the President.

The wording of this section also guards against some potentially strange timings, like for example if No Confidence is ratified after an election, but before the elected candidates take office. Once No Confidence is executed, no one elected by the traditional system may take office, even if the election already happened.

Section 11: Interim Supreme Court Justices

Section 11. An Interim Justice of the Supreme Court is any Justice appointed to the Supreme Court by an Interim President. Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 8 of this Article and Section 1 of Article III of this Constitution, Interim Justices shall hold their Offices only until the conclusion of the next Presidential Term following the Interim Presidency. This section shall not apply to any such Justice who is reconfirmed by the President and the Senate during that Term.

When the people elect the Interim Government after No Confidence is ratified, they will be using an untested electoral process to choose people who will be making decisions for the country for the next one to seven years. Section 8 guarantees the Interim Government all the powers of the United States Government, including appointing Justices to the Supreme Court.

We cannot take that power away, either; the country may (and in fact probably will) need a Supreme Court prior to the conclusion of the Interim Government. However, Supreme Court Justices hold their offices for life, and thus will be around to affect the country for much longer than the Interim Government that appointed them. Any other act by the Interim Government can be repealed or reversed by a subsequent normally-elected government, but it's very important that the President and Congress *cannot* remove a sitting Justice; that's an important part of our country's checks and balances, and we're trying to *add* to those, not weaken them.

Nonetheless, an Interim Government that can appoint Supreme Court Justices for life could reasonably make people apprehensive, and that might translate into reluctance to support No Confidence or to participate in the Restricted Elections thereafter, two outcomes that both must be avoided at all costs.

So, instead, a compromise: once the Interim Government has provided us with new, less corruptible election laws and we use them to elect a new President, that President must reconfirm each Justice who was appointed by the Interim President, with the cooperation of that Senate. If any Justice is *not* reconfirmed, their term ends with that Presidential term.

This provides a way to ensure that the Interim Government's impact remains limited to around the time they are in power, without creating a precedent whereby a sitting President and/or Congress can remove a Justice during a given Presidential term. The most that a sitting President may do, even in this case, is to refuse to confirm one or more of the Justices; they will still remain on the Supreme Court during that President's term, and if the public disapproves of the President's or Senate's behavior in this matter, they will have a chance to make their disapproval known at the polls before the empty seats can be filled.

This document was last modified on July 3, 2026.