

The Great Upgrade

A scholarly research framework

Where human potential has been trapped the longest,
The Great Upgrade should arrive first.

Ranfery Sánchez | September 2026

How to read this edition

This edition explains a working civic framework. The six proposals are designs for review and testing. Their inclusion does not mean they have been legally authorized, piloted or proven effective.

The idea in one sentence

Where human potential has been trapped the longest, The Great Upgrade should arrive first. This priority rule asks where old arrangements repeatedly block health, safety, learning, mobility or a decent livelihood, and where a feasible change could release the most opportunity.

The basic method

Describe the result the present system produces. Publish a specific alternative and at least one credible rival. Ask who benefits and who bears costs. Invite a dissenter to state the strongest objection. Check law, money, safety and evidence. Test a limited version, measure outcomes and revise or stop.

Who has a voice

Residents, universities, researchers, governments, legislators, businesses, labor organizations and civil society can all contribute. Their responses are shown in separate panels. A senator speaks for a legislature only after the legislature has acted. Every institutional response states who approved it, what authority it carries and which version it reviewed.

A proposal can lose

A fair comparison includes the current system, the Great Upgrade design, and credible alternatives. A person can also say that the evidence is insufficient. Old votes stay visible when a proposal changes, but current support must be calculated from responses to the current version.

Six working proposals

001 examines substance policy and public health; 002 compares elevated active mobility with safer routes at street level; 003 organizes neighborhood repair and maintenance as Evolucracia; 004 designs a protected city infrastructure fund; 005 examines a temporary international infrastructure workforce partnership; 006 tests accountable southbound weapons inspection. All six require further legal, financial and operational work before any jurisdiction can implement them.

What counts as progress

A concept advances to a working proposal, then a legally authorized pilot with a budget, safety limits and an independent evaluator. Only a demonstrated result can justify replication. A ten year horizon organizes the work; it guarantees no proposal will reach national scale.

1 Normative commitments and scope

The framework asserts that accumulated deprivation of opportunity warrants priority attention, with human dignity and all life flourishing as constraints. This is a value proposition requiring justification, not an empirical discovery. It invites comparison with capability, systems and deliberative approaches without claiming originality or equivalence to any one literature. The relevant question is whether its institutions can turn those commitments into legitimate and corrigible decisions.

2 Formal objects of inquiry

Let a proposal version be an immutable policy specification with defined jurisdiction, population, causal mechanism, comparator, authority, resource plan and outcomes. A response is a recorded judgment tied to that version, a verified actor and declared scope of representation. Distinguish estimands for causal impact from indicators for participation coverage. The latter measure whose input is visible; they do not estimate public approval absent a suitable sampling design.

3 Epistemic discipline

Use an evidence ledger that tags each assertion as sourced observation, model, legal interpretation or open question. A napkin calculation establishes possible magnitude under declared assumptions, not a prediction. Evidence imported from another jurisdiction faces transportability problems: different baseline risks, supply chains, incentives, rights and administrative capacity. A dissenting argument should identify a falsifier or a lower risk competing mechanism.

4 Comparative evaluation

Pre-register principal outcome and harm measures for each pilot where feasible. Evaluate incremental costs and benefits against the existing system and at least one plausible alternative. Specify distributional weights explicitly when used. Test sensitivity to missing data, attrition, spillovers, implementation fidelity and secular trends. A decision can remain underdetermined even when one measured outcome improves.

5 Representation as a measurement problem

Publish counts identified, contacted, responding and certified by sector and jurisdiction. Never present institutional endorsements as a representative sample of citizens. Authority labels are data about provenance and scope, not a conversion factor for a single weighted vote. Examine the mechanism of nonresponse and whether outreach itself privileged well organized interests. Archive superseded positions and report current version freshness.

6 Proposal 001 and heterogeneous evidence

The September 2026 discussion draft separates prohibition, decriminalization and regulated medical supply. Those models should not be pooled into one treatment effect. Evidence for opioid agonist care cannot automatically validate stimulant supply; heroin assisted treatment in restricted clinical settings cannot automatically validate pharmacy or vending distribution. Clinical eligibility, misuse, diversion and treatment access require substance specific and jurisdiction specific review.

7 Design for credible pilots

Specify a causal diagram, units of assignment or comparison, baseline period, contamination pathways, power or precision target and analysis plan. A quasi experimental design may be more feasible than randomization but requires transparent assumptions. Pair outcome evaluation with process tracing and qualitative inquiry into authority, worker effects and unintended harm. Publish deviations from the registered plan.

8 Institutional failure modes

Audit conflicts, selective publication, strategic version changes, digital exclusion, false organizational authority, denominator manipulation and capture of alternative admissibility. A minority dissenter should have publication rights and a defined route to trigger review, subject to transparent evidence criteria. An independent evaluator needs contractual access to relevant records and freedom to report adverse results.

9 Falsifiable program level questions

Test whether exposure to the Representation Matrix improves understanding of who spoke; whether comparative ballots alter confidence or polarization; whether the pilot charter reduces implementation drift; and whether maintenance measures predict lasting benefit. State boundary conditions in advance. Failure to outperform ordinary practice on these measures would call for revising the framework itself.

10 Source and citation protocol

Primary project sources: The Great Upgrade Pan American Master v4.0 (September 2026); La Gran Actualización Documento Maestro Panamericano v3.2 (September 2026); Proposal 001 Three Alternatives for Drug Policy (September 2026). These establish the design under review, not independent proof of efficacy. Any empirical article or legal assertion in a publishable scholarly edition requires a separately verified bibliography, jurisdiction and access date.

Project sources and status

The Great Upgrade Pan American Master v4.0, September 2026; La Gran Actualización Documento Maestro Panamericano v3.2, September 2026; Proposal 001 Three Alternatives for Drug Policy, September 2026. These are project documents. Clinical, legal and fiscal decisions require independent, jurisdiction specific verification.