



Partnership Standards Framework

A Rules-Based Classification Framework for United States Foreign Policy

Summary

The United States sells billions of dollars in weapons to governments that imprison journalists and execute political dissidents. It grants preferential trade agreements to nations that exploit child labor and suppress free speech. It calls itself the leader of the free world while partnering with regimes that would not survive a free election.

The American public has no mechanism to challenge these contradictions because it has no mechanism to even see them clearly. This is not an oversight. It is a design choice. American foreign policy operates without consistent, transparent standards for how the United States partners with other nations. The absence of a structured, rules-based classification system allows political leaders to prioritize strategic convenience over democratic values, to reward allies regardless of their governance record, and to obscure the contradictions between American rhetoric and American action.

The Partnership Standards Framework proposes a solution. It establishes a five-tier classification system that assigns every nation a clear status based on defined criteria. It creates two independent evaluation tracks: a Democratic-Economic Track governed by an independent, nonpartisan commission, and a Security Track governed by a dedicated security review panel staffed by career intelligence professionals. Both tracks operate with full transparency. Both are insulated from political manipulation. And both produce public findings that allow every American citizen to see exactly where each country stands and why.

The framework is built on a simple principle. Democratic governance and respect for the international order are the gateway to economic partnership. A country that does not hold free and fair elections, honor those results, protect the individual freedoms of its citizens, and respect the independence of other sovereign nations cannot be a trade partner of the United States. Strategic and security partnerships may exist independently when national and global defense requires them. But the economic relationship, the most powerful tool in American foreign policy, is reserved for nations that share our commitment to democratic self-governance.

This is not idealism. It is structural accountability. And it is long overdue.



REACH OUT:

 questcoa@gmail.com

 [@questcoalition.com](https://twitter.com/questcoalition)



Updated April 2026
© 2026 Quest Coalition. All rights reserved.



Foreign Policy Without Standards

The Problem: Foreign Policy Without Standards

The United States currently has no consistent, transparent framework for determining how it partners with other nations. Decisions about trade agreements, military alliances, diplomatic recognition, and foreign aid are made through an opaque process driven by executive discretion, congressional horse-trading, lobbying by foreign governments, and the strategic calculations of intelligence agencies. The public is rarely consulted. The criteria are rarely explained. And the contradictions are never resolved.

Consider the record. The United States maintains deep economic partnerships with nations that suppress free speech, persecute religious minorities, and imprison political dissidents. It sells weapons to governments that use them against their own people. It provides diplomatic cover for regimes that would never survive the democratic standards America claims to champion. These are not edge cases. They represent the norm.

The consequences are real. American workers compete against goods produced under exploitative labor conditions in countries the U.S. treats as valued trade partners. American taxpayers fund military aid to governments that undermine the democratic values those taxes are supposed to protect. American credibility on the world stage erodes every time the gap between our stated values and our actual partnerships becomes visible. And that gap is always visible.

The root cause is structural. Without defined criteria, without independent evaluation, and without public transparency, foreign partnership decisions will always be captured by the interests of whoever holds power at any given moment. Presidents reward allies. Corporations lobby for market access. Intelligence agencies prioritize strategic positioning over governance standards. None of these actors are required to justify their decisions against a consistent framework, and so none of them do.

The Partnership Standards Framework changes this. It replaces discretion with criteria, opacity with transparency, and political convenience with democratic accountability.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026



The Classification System

II. The Classification System

Every nation is assigned one of five statuses under the Partnership Standards Framework. These statuses are organized across two independent tracks: the Democratic-Economic Track and the Security Track. A country's placement is determined by defined criteria evaluated by independent bodies, not by presidential preference or congressional negotiation.

The Five Statuses

1. Economic Partner (Highest Tier)

A country that holds an active trade agreement with the United States. This is the strongest partnership status on the scale. Economic Partner status requires that a country first hold Diplomatic Partner status. No nation can become an Economic Partner without meeting the democratic governance threshold. The trade agreement itself is negotiated individually, but eligibility is determined by classification, not by political calculation.

2. Diplomatic Partner

A country that meets the democratic governance, individual freedoms, and sovereignty respect threshold established by the independent commission. This is the gateway status. To qualify, a country must hold free and fair elections, honor the results of those elections, protect the individual freedoms of its citizens, and respect the independence of other sovereign nations. Specifically, a country that oppresses citizens based on religion, speech, language and culture, sex, gender, race, ethnicity and national origin, age, disability, or sexual orientation cannot achieve Diplomatic Partner status. Nor can a country that violates the sovereignty of other nations through military invasion or occupation, economic coercion designed to undermine another nation's independence, interference in another nation's elections or democratic processes, or territorial claims pursued through force or coercion rather than international legal mechanisms. This threshold is evaluated annually by the commission using standardized, published criteria.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Classification

A critical principle: the framework does not evaluate or penalize countries based on their economic system, political ideology, or cultural values. It does not punish communism. It does not punish socialism. It does not punish capitalism. It does not require any country to mirror the American model of governance or economics. The framework evaluates three things. Does the government allow its citizens to participate in choosing their leaders through free and fair elections, and does the government refrain from oppressing citizens based on religion, speech, language and culture, sex, gender, race, ethnicity and national origin, age, disability, or sexual orientation. And does the government respect the independence and sovereignty of other nations. A country may organize its economy and its governance in any way its people choose, so long as that choice is genuinely made by the people, those freedoms are genuinely protected, and the country extends the same respect for self-determination to other nations that it claims for itself. The criteria are about self-determination, human dignity, and the peaceful coexistence of sovereign nations, not ideology.

If a Diplomatic Partner also has a defense partnership with the United States, the Diplomatic status absorbs the defense designation. The defense relationship is noted but does not constitute a separate status. A country does not need to be a Defense Partner to become a Diplomatic Partner. The two tracks are independent.

3. Defense Partner

A country with an active military base agreement with the United States. Defense Partner status exists on an independent track from the Democratic-Economic Track. A country can hold Defense Partner status without meeting any democratic governance criteria. This reflects the reality that strategic geography and national security sometimes require partnerships with countries that do not share American democratic values. Defense Partner status is determined by the dedicated security review panel, not the commission.

A country cannot hold both Defense Partner and Adversary status simultaneously, with one exception. If a country with an existing defense partnership is designated an Environmental Adversary, the defense partnership is grandfathered. It continues, but the country is locked out of any upward movement on the Democratic-Economic Track. No Diplomatic status. No Economic status. The defense relationship is reviewed every 18 months for as long as the environmental adversary designation holds. If the country fails to demonstrate measurable progress on the environmental criteria at any 18-month review, the defense partnership can be terminated. This exception applies only to defense partnerships that existed before the environmental adversary designation. No new defense partnerships will be formed with any country holding any adversary designation, including environmental. This is a narrow accommodation for strategic reality, not an invitation to excuse environmental destruction.

For all other adversary subcategories, diplomatic, economic, and defense, an adversary designation terminates any existing defense partnership through the standard 90-day termination process. No exceptions.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.instagram.com/questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Classification

4. Neutral

The default status for any country that does not qualify for partnership under either track and is not designated an adversary. A Neutral country is not considered an ally but is not considered a threat. This is the starting position for every nation in the framework. Movement out of Neutral status requires meeting specific criteria evaluated by the appropriate independent body.

5. Adversary (Exclusive Status)

A country designated as an active threat to national security, world peace, or both. Adversary status is exclusive. A country designated as a diplomatic, economic, or defense adversary is subject to full cutoff from all partnership with the United States. The sole exception is that an existing defense partnership may be grandfathered when the adversary designation is exclusively environmental, subject to 18-month review cycles as detailed in the Defense Partner section above. No new partnerships of any kind will be formed with any country holding any adversary designation. The door remains open for good-faith reassessment.

Adversary designations include subcategories that specify the nature of the threat:

Diplomatic Adversary: A country that has attempted to influence American elections or undermine American democratic institutions.

Economic Adversary: A country engaged in unfair economic practices designed to harm American economic interests or destabilize global markets.

Defense Adversary: A country that is actively attempting to harm American citizens, violate American sovereignty, or threaten national security.

Environmental Adversary: A country that is a significant polluter of global water, air, or natural resources, contributing to environmental degradation that threatens shared planetary systems.

A country may be designated under one, several, or all four adversary subcategories. The specific designations are public, so citizens can see precisely what type of threat each adversary poses.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Gateway Logic

The Gateway Logic

The classification system operates on a clear set of rules that determine how countries move between statuses:

Democratic governance is the prerequisite for Diplomatic status. No exceptions, no workarounds, no waivers. A country either meets the threshold or it does not.

Diplomatic status is the prerequisite for Economic status. A country cannot negotiate a trade agreement with the United States unless it first qualifies as a Diplomatic Partner. This means the most powerful economic tool in American foreign policy is structurally tied to democratic values.

Defense partnership is independent. It does not require Diplomatic status and does not grant it. A Defense Partner that does not meet the democratic governance threshold cannot use its military relationship as a pathway to economic partnership.

Adversary status is exclusive. It cancels all other designations, with the narrow exception that an existing defense partnership may continue under an environmental adversary designation, subject to 18-month review. No new partnerships of any kind are formed with adversaries. A country designated as a diplomatic, economic, or defense adversary loses all partnership status without exception.

The tiers are cumulative upward on the Democratic-Economic Track. An Economic Partner is, by definition, also a Diplomatic Partner. But a Diplomatic Partner is not automatically an Economic Partner. The trade agreement must be separately negotiated once eligibility is established.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Independent Commission

III. The Independent Commission on Foreign Partnership Standards

The credibility of the entire classification system depends on who evaluates countries and how those evaluations are conducted. If the executive branch controls the process, every administration reshuffles partnerships based on political priorities. If Congress controls it, determinations become partisan leverage. The Partnership Standards Framework places this authority in an independent, nonpartisan commission insulated from both.

Composition and Appointments

The commission consists of 10 members with expertise in international law, human rights, democratic governance, and regional affairs. Appointments are split between branches of government, ensuring no single branch can stack the commission. Members serve staggered five-year terms, with two seats turning over each year. This structure guarantees that no single presidential administration can appoint a majority of the commission during one term.

Standards and Criteria

The commission evaluates countries against published, standardized criteria. The democratic governance threshold has three components, all of which must be met.

First, elections. A country must hold elections and honor the results. This means more than the act of voting. It means peaceful transfer of power when incumbents lose. It means opposition parties can operate freely. It means election results are binding and accepted by the government. Countries that hold performative elections while predetermining outcomes, overturning results, or preventing genuine opposition do not meet this standard.

Second, individual freedoms. A country must not oppress citizens based on religion, speech, language and culture, sex, gender, race, ethnicity and national origin, age, disability, or sexual orientation. This is a substantive rights floor. A country can hold perfectly fair elections and still fail this test if it persecutes religious minorities, jails journalists, suppresses indigenous cultural and linguistic identity, criminalizes homosexuality, enforces racial or ethnic discrimination, denies rights to people with disabilities, restricts the freedoms of women, exploits children or the elderly, or targets citizens based on their national origin. The commission evaluates documented patterns of state persecution, not isolated incidents.

Third, sovereignty respect. A country must not violate the independence of other sovereign nations. This includes military invasion or occupation of another nation's territory, economic coercion designed to undermine another nation's self-governance or independence, interference in another nation's elections or democratic processes, and territorial claims pursued through force, intimidation, or coercion rather than through recognized international legal mechanisms. The commission evaluates documented patterns of sovereignty violation, not isolated diplomatic disputes. A border disagreement resolved through international courts is not a sovereignty violation. An invasion is. Economic sanctions imposed multilaterally through international institutions are not coercion. Unilateral economic warfare designed to force political submission is.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Independent Commission

Investigative Authority

The commission has the authority to send observers to countries under review. It also partners with international organizations and nongovernmental organizations to gather evidence and verify conditions on the ground. The commission is not limited to reviewing reports from a distance. It has eyes on the ground, and its determinations carry the weight of direct investigation.

Review Cycle

Every country is evaluated on an annual cycle. The commission may also conduct emergency reassessments when conditions change rapidly, such as a coup, a crackdown on dissent, or a sudden deterioration of press freedom. Annual reviews produce public reports. Emergency reassessments produce expedited public findings.

Transparency

All commission findings, including the criteria applied, evidence considered, and reasoning behind each determination, are published and made available to the American public. This serves the framework's dual purpose. As a governance tool, public findings prevent backroom deals and political manipulation. As a civic education tool, they allow citizens to see exactly how and why each country is classified.

Appeal Process for Diplomatic Status

A country that is denied Diplomatic Partner status or has its Diplomatic status revoked may request a formal appeal through the commission. The appeal process is designed to be open and principled without becoming a mechanism for endless relitigation.

The process works as follows. The country submits evidence that it meets the democratic governance, individual freedoms, and sovereignty respect threshold, specifically addressing the criteria the commission cited in its denial or revocation. The commission conducts a fresh review. This is not a rubber stamp of the original finding. It is a genuine reassessment using the same published criteria applied to all countries. The commission may send observers or partner with international organizations to verify the claims made in the appeal. The findings are published in full, including the specific evidence considered and the reasoning behind the decision.

If the appeal is denied, the country receives a detailed explanation of what conditions must change before a subsequent appeal will be considered. A 12-month cooling-off period applies between appeals, unless the commission determines that a significant and verifiable change in conditions warrants an earlier review. This prevents countries from flooding the commission with repeated requests while changing nothing on the ground. The door stays open. The criteria stay clear. But the process demands substance, not persistence.

Removal of Members

Commission members can be removed for misconduct, partisan pandering, or corruption. Removal authority is held by the appointing branch and the Citizens Assembly. This dual accountability ensures that members answer both to the institutional structure that appointed them and to the public body that represents citizens directly.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Security Review Panel

IV. The Dedicated Security Review Panel

The Security Track requires a different kind of expertise than the Democratic-Economic Track. Evaluating whether a country poses a threat to national security or world peace requires intelligence analysis, not human rights assessment. The Partnership Standards Framework assigns this responsibility to a dedicated security review panel designed for independence, expertise, and transparency.

Composition

The panel is staffed by career intelligence and security professionals drawn from across the intelligence community. Members serve on the panel as an independent assignment, not as representatives of their home agencies. This prevents any single agency's institutional bias from dominating the panel's assessments. Panelists are nominated by senior career intelligence leadership, not by politically appointed directors, and confirmed by the independent commission. This cross-check ensures that security professionals select their own, while the democratic governance body validates them.

Term Structure and Independence

Panel members serve staggered six-year terms, offset from the commission's five-year cycle so that the two bodies never turn over simultaneously. The longer term length provides additional insulation against short-term political pressure.

The panel's independence is protected by structural safeguards. Members cannot have held any partisan political position within 10 years of appointment. After serving, members are subject to a defined cooling-off period during which they cannot work for defense contractors or foreign governments. These provisions prevent the revolving door between intelligence work, political influence, and private profit from corrupting the panel's assessments.

Adversary Criteria

The panel evaluates countries against defined criteria across the four adversary subcategories: diplomatic (election interference and institutional undermining), economic (unfair practices and market destabilization), defense (threats to citizens, sovereignty, and national security), and environmental (significant pollution of global water, air, and natural resources). A country may be designated under one or more subcategories based on the evidence.

Defense Partner Determinations

The panel also determines Defense Partner status. When national or global security requires a military base agreement with a country that does not meet the democratic governance threshold, the panel makes that determination independently. The commission has no authority to block a Defense Partner designation, and the panel has no authority to influence the commission's democratic governance assessments. The two tracks operate in parallel.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Security Review Panel

Transparency and Dissent

Panel findings are published with the underlying methodology, though specific intelligence sources and methods may be protected. Critically, dissenting opinions within the panel must be included in all public reports. Minority assessments cannot be buried. This prevents the kind of intelligence consensus-manufacturing that has historically been used to justify predetermined policy conclusions.

Reassessment Process

Countries designated as Adversaries may request good-faith reassessment. The panel conducts a fresh review using published criteria and issues a public determination. This prevents an adversary designation from becoming permanent through institutional inertia. The door is always open. But the criteria are always applied.

Removal of Members

Panel members can be removed for misconduct, partisan behavior, or corruption by the commission and the Citizens Assembly, applying the same standards used for commission members. The panel is accountable without being vulnerable to political retaliation.

V. Enforcement and Transition Mechanisms

A classification system without enforcement is a suggestion. The Partnership Standards Framework includes binding mechanisms that ensure status changes carry real consequences.

The 90-Day Termination Period

When a country's status is downgraded, existing agreements enter a 90-day termination period. This applies to trade agreements when a country loses Economic or Diplomatic status and to military base agreements when a Defense Partner is redesignated. The 90-day window gives businesses, governments, and military operations time to adjust without creating the kind of overnight economic or security shock that would generate political pressure to waive the rules. But it is short enough to function as a real consequence, not a negotiation window.

Downgrade Scenario

A country currently holds Economic Partner status. The commission finds in its annual review that the country has begun suppressing religious minorities. The commission downgrades the country from Diplomatic status, which automatically triggers loss of Economic status. The active trade agreement enters the 90-day termination period. The country's new status becomes either Neutral or Defense Partner, depending on the security review panel's independent assessment. All findings, reasoning, and timeline are published.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Enforcement

Upgrade Scenario

A Neutral country implements democratic reforms. It holds free and fair elections, honors the results, ceases persecution of citizens based on religion, speech, culture, sex, gender, race, ethnicity and national origin, age, disability, or sexual orientation, and respects the sovereignty of its neighbors and other nations. The commission evaluates the evidence and grants Diplomatic Partner status. The country is now eligible for a trade agreement, which would elevate it to Economic Partner if successfully negotiated. Defense Partner status has no bearing on this process. A country cannot use a military relationship to fast-track economic partnership.

Sovereignty Violation Scenario

A country currently holds Diplomatic Partner status. The commission determines that the country has invaded or occupied another nation's territory, engaged in economic coercion to undermine another nation's independence, or interfered in another nation's elections. The commission revokes Diplomatic Partner status, which automatically triggers loss of Economic Partner status. The active trade agreement enters the 90-day termination period. The country's new status becomes Neutral unless the security review panel independently determines that the sovereignty violation constitutes a direct threat to the United States or world peace, in which case Adversary designation may also apply. If the sovereignty violation is directed at the United States specifically, such as interference in American elections or violation of American sovereignty, the security review panel designates the country as an Adversary under the appropriate subcategory, triggering full bilateral cutoff.

Adversary Designation

The security review panel determines a country is an active threat under one or more adversary subcategories. For diplomatic, economic, and defense adversary designations, any existing partnership status is terminated with the standard 90-day window. Full cutoff takes effect. For environmental adversary designations, existing defense partnerships are grandfathered but locked: the country cannot move upward on the Democratic-Economic Track, and the defense relationship is reviewed every 18 months. If the country fails to demonstrate measurable environmental progress at any review, the defense partnership can be terminated. No new defense partnerships are formed with any adversary regardless of subcategory. All specific subcategories are published. The good-faith reassessment process remains available.

Countries in Transition

When a country is undergoing political transition, such as a revolution, a coup, or the collapse of its government, its classification is frozen at the current status pending the results of elections and the establishment of a new government. The framework does not punish nations in flux. It waits for stable conditions and then evaluates



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Enforcement

Non-State Actors and Territories

Entities that function as sovereign governments but lack formal state recognition, such as Taiwan, are treated as sovereign governments for classification purposes. The framework evaluates governance, not diplomatic formality. If an entity holds elections, protects individual freedoms, and functions as a self-governing democracy, it is eligible for classification on the same terms as any recognized nation.

Adversary Communication

Adversary status means full cutoff from bilateral diplomatic, economic, and military partnership. There are no back channels and no informal arrangements. This is the framework's hardest line, and it is intentional. A country that is actively threatening American national security or world peace does not get the benefits of bilateral partnership in any form.

The only path forward is the good-faith reassessment process. An adversary country may submit a formal request for reassessment to the security review panel. That request is the sole permitted channel of direct communication regarding partnership status. If the panel accepts the request, a fresh review is conducted using published criteria and the determination is made public. The formal request mechanism ensures that a country seeking to change its behavior always has a door to walk through, without creating informal channels that could be exploited for political purposes.

The bilateral cutoff does not affect multilateral engagement. The United States will continue to participate in international organizations, including the United Nations, NATO, and other multilateral bodies, even when member nations hold adversary status. These institutions serve broader purposes of global governance, collective security, and diplomacy that operate outside the scope of bilateral partnership. The framework governs how the United States partners directly with other nations. It does not govern participation in international institutions.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Transparency

VI. Transparency and Civic Education

The Partnership Standards Framework serves two purposes simultaneously. It is a governance tool that structures American foreign partnerships around defined criteria. And it is a civic education tool that gives the American public visibility into how and why their government relates to the rest of the world.

Public Reporting

Every country's classification, including the full reasoning behind it, is published and accessible to any citizen. This includes the commission's annual reviews, the security review panel's findings and dissents, the specific adversary subcategories applied to each designated threat, and the timeline and reasoning for any status changes. Nothing is hidden. Nothing is classified beyond the protection of specific intelligence sources and methods.

Making Contradictions Visible

The framework's most powerful civic function is forcing uncomfortable questions into public view. Why are we trading with this country? Because they are democratic, they protect individual freedoms, and they respect the sovereignty of other nations. Why are we not trading with that country? Because they invaded their neighbor. Or because they interfere in other countries' elections. Or because they oppress their own people. Why do we have a military base in a non-democratic country? National security necessity, and here is the panel's justification.

When the two tracks produce tension, such as a Defense Partner that fails the democratic governance threshold, that tension is reported explicitly. The public sees both the security justification for the military relationship and the commission's finding that the country does not meet democratic standards. The contradiction is not resolved by bureaucratic fudging. It is documented and published.

Incentive Structure

Transparency creates incentives. Countries that want access to the American economy know exactly what is required: democratic governance, individual freedoms, and respect for the sovereignty of other nations. There is no shortcut through military cooperation, no backdoor through lobbying, and no waiver available through executive discretion. The criteria are public, the evaluation is independent, and the pathway is clear. This gives reformers inside those countries a concrete target to aim for and a structural argument to make to their own governments.

Democratic Accountability

When American citizens can see the full picture of their country's foreign partnerships, they can hold their government accountable in ways that are currently impossible. They can ask why a country that jails journalists still receives trade benefits. They can demand justification for a military base in a country that persecutes religious minorities. They can evaluate whether the security review panel's threat assessments match the evidence. This is democratic self-governance applied to foreign policy, a domain that has historically operated beyond the reach of public accountability.



REACH OUT:

 questcoa@gmail.com

 [@questcoalition.com](https://twitter.com/questcoalition)



Updated April 2026

Values-First Foreign Policy

VII. A Values-First Foreign Policy

The United States has spent decades proclaiming democratic values while conducting foreign partnerships that contradict them. The gap between rhetoric and reality has cost American credibility abroad, undermined American workers at home, and denied the American public any meaningful voice in how their government engages with the world.

The Partnership Standards Framework closes that gap. Not with speeches or aspirational language, but with structure. An independent commission that evaluates democratic governance against published standards. A dedicated security panel that assesses threats without political interference. A classification system that ties economic partnership to democratic values and makes the entire process visible to every citizen.

This framework does not pretend that foreign policy is simple. It acknowledges that the United States will sometimes need military partnerships with countries that do not share our democratic values. It builds that reality into the system rather than hiding it. But it draws a hard line where it matters most: the American economy is not available to governments that oppress their own people. Trade is earned through democratic governance, not granted through political convenience.

The framework also creates something that American foreign policy has never had: a structural incentive for democratization. Countries that want access to the most powerful economy on earth know exactly what they need to do. Hold real elections. Honor the results. Stop persecuting your citizens for their religion, their speech, their culture, their sex, their gender, their race, their ethnicity, their national origin, their age, their disability, or their sexual orientation. And respect the independence of other sovereign nations. The pathway is transparent, the criteria are public, and the evaluation is independent.

This is what a values-first foreign policy looks like when it has structural teeth. Not a list of aspirations. A system of rules, institutions, and accountability mechanisms that make democratic values operational in the real world. The American public deserves to know how their government partners with the world. The world deserves to know what America actually stands for. The Partnership Standards Framework answers both questions.



REACH OUT:

✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026

Join the Movement

Demand the Change that You Deserve

A Constitution That Protects All Four Roles

The American Constitution was written to protect citizens from government overreach. But even the protections it does promise, including the right to vote, are under active assault through gerrymandering, voter suppression, and the influence of unlimited money in elections. And the Constitution offers no protection at all from corporate overreach. There is no constitutional guarantee that your power as a consumer, a worker, or an owner will be defended at all, let alone with the force that a functioning democracy requires. The Four Pillars framework starts from a simple premise: a constitution for the 21st century must protect citizens in all four of the roles they actually play. Not just as voters whose rights exist on paper, but as consumers who deserve fair markets, workers who deserve fair compensation, and the opportunity for everyone to become owners to generate wealth. Every reform proposed by Quest Coalition is built on this framework. The Constitution of the New Founding establishes structural protections for all four pillars. The New Founding Act implements those protections with specific mechanisms, from tax brackets to enforcement agencies to transition timelines. The Visual Guide demonstrates that every reform is fully funded. The Clear Pathway to Citizenship extends these protections to every person who lives and works in the United States. And the Partnership Standards Framework applies the same principle internationally: democratic governance, the protection of citizens in all their roles, and respect for the sovereignty of other nations are the gateway to economic partnership with the United States. Six documents. One framework. The Four Pillars of American Citizenship.

The Four Pillars of Citizenship

The framework. How Votership, Consumership, Workership, and Ownership shape your life.

The Constitution of the New Founding

The supreme law. Rights, structures, and principles for a government that serves the people.

The New Founding Act

Implementing legislation. Tax brackets, timelines, enforcement, and every detail to make it real.

The Visual Guide

A brief overview of what changes, who benefits, why the math works.

Pathway to Citizenship

Immigration reform. Clear rules, defined timelines, structural accountability.

The Partnership Standards Framework

Foreign policy with independent enforcement. Democracy and sovereignty as the gateway to trade.

Read everything at questcoalition.com



✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://twitter.com/questcoalition)



Updated April 2026

Join the Movement

What To Do Now!

- 1. Share.** Send these documents to friends, family, and your representatives. The ideas speak for themselves when people see the numbers.
- 2. Read, Engage, Discuss.** Read the Constitution. Understand the frameworks so you can explain it to others.
- 3. Join Single-Day Peaceful Protests.** Show up. Be counted. Peaceful mass demonstration is one of the most powerful tools citizens have.
- 4. Plan Single-Day General Strikes.** When millions of workers stop for one day, the economy notices. Make the cost of inaction visible.
- 5. Boycott Companies That Support Fascism.** Your consumer power is real. Stop funding the forces that work against your interests.
- 6. Sustain the Pressure.** Plan for a sustained weeks-long protest and strike. The Civil Rights Act took a decade. Transformation requires persistence.
- 7. Demand These Reforms.** When the pressure is applied, it is important to vocalize what we want. A stronger democracy and a just economy. These frameworks can achieve that.

We created these documents to start a discussion about building “A More Perfect Union” that we believe is just within reach.

Did we get everything right? Probably not. And that’s okay.

The important part is we shared a vision that will start a conversation and lead to all of us, We The People, to collectively build the future we want.

Every System is Designed. We can build it better and make changes now.



✉ questcoa@gmail.com

🦋 [@questcoalition.com](https://www.instagram.com/questcoalition.com)



Updated April 2026
© 2026 Quest Coalition. All rights reserved.