

CONSTITUTIONAL EROSION ANALYSIS SYSTEM



EO_14165.PDF


EO 14165 — Multi-Model Comparison Report

AVG THREAT LEVEL: MODERATE [45/100]


Models Compared: glm-5 • gpt-4o-mini • deepseek-r1-0528 • qwen3.5-397b-a17b • kimi-k2.5
• gemini-3-flash-preview • deepseek-v3.2

Models Analyzed	Score Range	Model Agreement	Generated
7	43 – 48	99%	February 23, 2026

Overall Score Comparison



Framework Score Comparison (Radar)



Models Compared	Average Score	Score Range	Model Agreement	Highest Score	Lowest Score
7	45	43—48	99%	48 gemini-3-flash-preview	43 glm-5

Consensus Scorecard

Average scores across 7 models per framework, with agreement levels and outlier detection.




Model Comparison Matrix

Score heatmap across all 7 models and 6 analysis frameworks. Color intensity indicates threat level.



Framework Scores



Rule of Law		40
Democratic Erosion		35
Power Consolidation		42
Historical Precedent		42
Authoritarian Patterns		48
Constitutional Violations		52


Executive Summary

This document shows moderate constitutional concerns with an overall threat score of 43/100. Key concerns include: The 'invasion' framing is not rhetorical flourish but legal signaling - invasion language has been used to justify suspension of normal constitutional constraints and could serve as predicate for emergency powers invocation; The combination of 'invasion' rhetoric with mandatory detention policies creates a framework where constitutional protections could be suspended based on executive determination of emergency.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Document repeatedly references 'consistent with applicable law' and specific statutory authorities, showing awareness of legal constraints
- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Mandatory detention policies may create conflicts with judicial precedent on detention limits
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Crisis framing delegitimizes political opposition by characterizing previous administration's policies as existential threat to nationhood

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		42
Democratic Erosion		35
Power Consolidation		55
Historical Precedent		38
Authoritarian Patterns		40
Constitutional Violations		50

Executive Summary

The Executive Order establishes a concerning precedent for authoritarian governance by prioritizing border security measures that may infringe on individual rights and constitutional protections. It employs alarmist language to justify aggressive immigration enforcement, potentially eroding democratic norms and consolidating power within the executive branch. The historical context suggests a regression to past practices that undermine the rule of law.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** The order hints at a disregard for established legal processes regarding immigration.
- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** The call for immediate removal of undocumented individuals may bypass judicial review.
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** The policy prioritizes security over humanitarian considerations, which can erode public trust in democratic norms.

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		42
Democratic Erosion		35
Power Consolidation		55
Historical Precedent		38
Authoritarian Patterns		40
Constitutional Violations		50


Executive Summary

The order demonstrates moderate authoritarian tendencies through emergency rhetoric and enforcement centralization, while operating within statutory immigration authorities. Constitutional concerns emerge from mandatory detention provisions and parole program terminations that risk due process violations. Power consolidation is evident through expanded executive directives with minimal oversight, though Section 12's disclaimer prevents extreme overreach. While echoing historical exclusionary policies, the order lacks overt institutional attacks that would indicate severe democratic breakdown.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Selective application of immigration laws (Sec 7b nationality targeting)
- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Disregard for established administrative procedures
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Rhetorical delegitimization of prior policies ('catch-and-release')

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		42
Democratic Erosion		38
Power Consolidation		46
Historical Precedent		35
Authoritarian Patterns		45
Constitutional Violations		48


Executive Summary

This document shows moderate constitutional concerns with an overall threat score of 44/100. Key concerns include: Dehumanizing rhetoric framing migrants as an invading force rather than individuals seeking asylum; Deployment of military personnel for domestic border enforcement may blur civil-military boundaries.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Polarizing language delegitimizing previous administration's policies ('catch-and-release policies undermine the rule of law')
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Reduction of administrative discretion that previously allowed for humanitarian parole
- ✓ **[Authoritarian Patterns]** Use of existential threat rhetoric ('invasion', 'unprecedented flood') to justify expanded executive action

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		46
Democratic Erosion		42
Power Consolidation		48
Historical Precedent		40
Authoritarian Patterns		52
Constitutional Violations		44


Executive Summary

This document shows moderate constitutional concerns with an overall threat score of 46/100. Key concerns include: The document establishes a permanent state of emergency through 'invasion' rhetoric that treats civilian migration as a military threat, creating predicate for suspending constitutional protections; Deployment of active military (DOD) to achieve 'complete operational control' of domestic borders risks violating 18 U.S.C. § 1385 (Posse Comitatus Act) by involving armed forces in civilian law enforcement.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Breakdown of mutual toleration through demonization of migrants as threats to national sovereignty rather than participants in pluralistic society
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Instrumentalization of institutional forbearance by using broad executive discretion over immigration to unilaterally dismantle established humanitarian programs
- ✓ **[Authoritarian Patterns]** Martial rhetoric framing immigration as a 'large-scale invasion' by hostile actors including terrorists and spies

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		42
Democratic Erosion		40
Power Consolidation		55
Historical Precedent		50
Authoritarian Patterns		52
Constitutional Violations		45

Executive Summary

The Executive Order represents a significant shift toward a securitized, executive-led immigration regime. While much of the order relies on existing statutory authority (INA), the framing of immigration as a military 'invasion' and the directive to involve the Department of Defense in 'operational control' suggests a departure from standard administrative governance. The order seeks to consolidate power by terminating established parole programs and centralizing enforcement priorities, while simultaneously attempting to limit judicial oversight through Section 12(c).

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** The order explicitly attempts to strip individuals of the right to sue or seek judicial remedy for violations of the order.
- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** A shift toward punitive detention ('maximum extent') over individual merit-based assessments for release.
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Rejection of established administrative processes (CBP One, categorical parole) via executive fiat rather than legislative reform.

Framework Scores



Rule of Law		42
Democratic Erosion		35
Power Consolidation		55
Historical Precedent		38
Authoritarian Patterns		40
Constitutional Violations		50

Executive Summary

The executive order represents a significant escalation in immigration enforcement that operates within formal legal channels but pushes against constitutional and normative boundaries. While citing existing statutory authority, it employs crisis rhetoric to justify aggressive measures that risk due process violations, militarize border policy, and centralize executive power. The document reflects moderate democratic erosion through its divisive language and targeting of non-citizens' rights, but stops short of direct attacks on core democratic institutions. Historical parallels suggest concerning patterns, though current implementation includes legal caveats that may constrain the most extreme outcomes.

Top Key Findings

- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Prioritizes enforcement efficiency over procedural protections, risking due process violations
- ✓ **[Rule of Law]** Directs termination of established parole programs without clear statutory authority
- ✓ **[Democratic Erosion]** Divisive rhetoric that frames political opponents as enabling 'invasion' undermines democratic norms of compromise

Consensus Analysis

Where models agree and disagree across the 7 analyses.

✓ Areas of Agreement (<10pt spread)

✓ **Rule of Law** Avg: 42 — Spread: 6pts
MODERATE

✓ **Democratic Erosion** Avg: 37 — Spread: 7pts
LOW

✓ **Constitutional Violations** Avg: 48 — Spread: 8pts
MODERATE

⚠ Areas of Disagreement (≥10pt spread)

⚠ **Historical Precedent** Range: 35–50 — Spread: 15pts
High variance between models

⚠ **Power Consolidation** Range: 42–55 — Spread: 13pts
High variance between models

⚠ **Authoritarian Patterns** Range: 40–52 — Spread: 12pts
High variance between models

📋 Consolidated Recommendations

Merged and deduplicated across all 7 models — prioritized by how many models suggested each.

🔴 **Congressional oversight hearings on implementation and constitutional compliance**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-v3.2

🟠 **Congressional oversight of detention conditions and parole terminations**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-r1-0528

🟡 **Impact assessment of DNA collection on vulnerable populations**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-r1-0528

🟢 **Implement checks and balances to ensure compliance with constitutional rights during immigration enforcement.**
Suggested by 1 model: gpt-4o-mini

🟡 **Independent monitoring of due process protections at border facilities**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-v3.2

🟢 **Judicial review of detention policies and Migrant Protection Protocols**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-v3.2

🔵 **Judicial review of MPP implementation for due process compliance**
Suggested by 1 model: deepseek-r1-0528

🟣 **Legal challenges to Section 12(c) to ensure the executive remains accountable to the courts.**
Suggested by 1 model: gemini-3-flash-preview