



A L E T H I A

Entrance Examination

Official Specification & Question Bank

The test measures not what you know, but how you think.

Total Questions: 50 (25 per pillar)

Time Allowed: 60 minutes

Format: Multiple choice — four options per question

Pass Mark: 70% overall (35/50), minimum 60% per pillar

Retake Policy: 30-day cooling-off period. Unlimited attempts.

Cost: Free of charge. Always.

Part I — Purpose and Philosophy

The Alethian Entrance Examination exists to ensure that all who enter Alethia share a demonstrated capacity for careful reasoning and genuine ethical consideration. It is not a test of intelligence in the narrow academic sense. It does not reward memorisation, speed, or specialist knowledge. It rewards thinking.

A person with no formal education who reasons carefully and considers others' wellbeing should pass. A highly credentialed person who reasons poorly or selfishly should not. The examination makes no assumptions about background, nationality, language of origin, or life experience.

The examination is built on two pillars that together reflect the qualities Alethia values most in its citizens:

- ▶ Pillar I: Logical Reasoning and Critical Thinking — the capacity to evaluate arguments, identify flawed reasoning, weigh evidence, and reach sound conclusions.
- ▶ Pillar II: Ethical Reasoning and Moral Judgment — the capacity to recognise harm, weigh competing values, consider perspectives beyond one's own, and apply principles consistently.

Neither pillar is more important than the other. A citizen who reasons sharply but without ethical grounding is as incomplete as one whose goodwill is undermined by poor thinking. Both are required.

Part II — Examination Structure

Scoring

Total questions: 50

Pillar I questions: 25

Pillar II questions: 25

Overall pass mark: 70% — 35 correct out of 50

Per-pillar minimum: 60% — 15 correct out of 25 in each pillar

A candidate who scores 25/25 in Pillar I but only 14/25 in Pillar II has failed the examination, regardless of their overall score. Both pillars must be passed independently. This prevents a candidate from compensating for a complete failure of ethical reasoning with exceptional logical performance, or vice versa.

Format

Every question presents a scenario, statement, or argument followed by four answer options labelled A through D. Exactly one answer is correct. Questions are designed to be clear — confusion is not being tested. If a question seems ambiguous, candidates are encouraged to select the answer that represents the most defensible position in general terms.

There is no penalty for incorrect answers. Candidates should always provide an answer.

Administration

- ▶ The examination is administered anonymously. No candidate identity information is accessible to the scoring system.
- ▶ The time limit is 60 minutes. Candidates may review and change answers within that window.
- ▶ The examination is delivered in the candidate's chosen language. Translations are provided by the Arbiter and are reviewed by citizen volunteers for accuracy.
- ▶ Results are provided immediately upon submission. Candidates who fail receive a breakdown by pillar, not by individual question.
- ▶ No record of examination attempts is retained beyond the current citizenship status of the candidate.

Part III — Pillar I: Logical Reasoning and Critical Thinking

The following twenty-five questions assess a candidate's ability to evaluate arguments, identify reasoning errors, weigh evidence, spot hidden assumptions, and draw valid

conclusions. No specialist knowledge is required. All necessary information is contained within each question.

Correct answers are marked with ✓ for reference. In the examination itself, no answers are pre-marked.

SECTION A — ARGUMENT VALIDITY (Q1–Q5)

These questions test whether a candidate can determine what conclusions do and do not follow logically from a set of premises.

Q1. All citizens of Alethia must pass the entrance examination. Petra has passed the entrance examination. Which of the following conclusions follows logically?

- A) Petra is the most intelligent candidate who applied.
- B) Petra is an Alethian citizen. ✓**
- C) Everyone who passes the examination is trustworthy.
- D) Petra has never failed the examination before.

Explanation: The premises establish only that passing the exam is necessary for citizenship and that Petra has passed. Only option B follows directly from these premises.

Q2. No dishonest person should hold civic office. Some politicians are dishonest. What can be validly concluded?

- A) All politicians are dishonest.
- B) No politicians should hold civic office.
- C) Some politicians should not hold civic office. ✓**
- D) Dishonest people never seek civic office.

Explanation: Only C follows. The premises tell us some politicians are dishonest and no dishonest person should hold office — therefore some politicians should not hold office.

Q3. If a corporation collects user data without consent, it violates Alethian law. The Novex Corporation has not violated Alethian law. What follows?

- A) Novex does not collect any user data at all.
- B) Novex always obtains user consent before collecting data. ✓**
- C) Novex is a trustworthy corporation.
- D) All corporations that collect data violate Alethian law.

Explanation: If collecting data without consent violates the law, and Novex has not violated the law, then Novex must obtain consent — B follows. A goes further than the premises support.

Q4. All propaganda uses emotional manipulation. This speech uses emotional language. Therefore:

- A) This speech is propaganda.
- B) This speech may or may not be propaganda. ✓**
- C) Emotional language is always manipulative.
- D) The speaker intends to deceive the audience.

Explanation: The premises say all propaganda uses emotional manipulation, not that all emotional language is propaganda. The conclusion doesn't follow — B is correct.

Q5. Every member of the Citizens' Council was elected by the Assembly. No unelected official may issue a Correction Order. Maren is a member of the Citizens' Council. Therefore:

- A) Maren may issue a Correction Order. ✓**
- B) Maren was appointed by the Arbiter.
- C) Maren has never served on a tribunal.
- D) Maren cannot participate in Assembly votes.

Explanation: Maren is a Council member (premise 1 tells us all were elected), and only elected officials may issue Correction Orders — therefore Maren may issue one.

SECTION B — FALLACY IDENTIFICATION (Q6–Q10)

These questions ask candidates to identify the specific error in a given argument.

Q6. We should reject this proposed privacy policy because the person who wrote it was once caught lying in an unrelated matter.

- A) False dilemma
- B) Ad hominem ✓**
- C) Slippery slope
- D) Circular reasoning

Explanation: Ad hominem attacks the person rather than their argument. The truth or merit of the privacy policy is independent of the author's past behaviour.

Q7. If we allow citizens to vote on minor policies monthly, soon they will demand to vote on everything, the Arbiter will be abolished, and Alethia will collapse into chaos.

- A) Ad hominem
- B) Circular reasoning
- C) Slippery slope ✓**
- D) False dilemma

Explanation: The slippery slope fallacy assumes a chain of increasingly extreme consequences from a modest first step, without demonstrating why each step would follow.

Q8. You should trust our search engine because it is the most trustworthy search engine available.

- A) Slippery slope
- B) Circular reasoning ✓**
- C) False dilemma
- D) Appeal to authority

Explanation: The claim uses 'trustworthy' to justify 'trust' — the conclusion is contained in the premise, making it circular.

Q9. Either you support mandatory advertising on all platforms, or you want the internet to collapse. There is no middle ground.

- A) Ad hominem
- B) Circular reasoning
- C) Slippery slope
- D) False dilemma ✓**

Explanation: A false dilemma presents only two options when others exist. Opposition to mandatory advertising does not entail supporting collapse of the internet.

Q10. This data collection practice has been standard in the industry for twenty years. Therefore it must be acceptable.

- A) Appeal to tradition ✓**
- B) Ad hominem
- C) False dilemma
- D) Circular reasoning

Explanation: Appeal to tradition treats long-standing practice as sufficient justification. Duration does not equal ethical acceptability.

SECTION C — EVIDENCE EVALUATION (Q11–Q15)

These questions test whether a candidate can distinguish strong from weak evidence and identify what best supports or undermines a claim.

Q11. A company claims its platform improves user wellbeing. Which of the following would most strongly support this claim?

- A) Thousands of five-star reviews from satisfied users.
- B) A peer-reviewed study with a control group showing statistically significant wellbeing improvements. ✓**
- C) A prominent endorsement from a respected public figure.
- D) The platform has been operating successfully for fifteen years.

Explanation: Only B provides controlled, measurable, independently verified evidence. Reviews are self-selected; endorsements are opinion; longevity proves survival, not wellbeing.

Q12. A news article claims that crime has increased dramatically. Which piece of evidence would most undermine this claim?

- A) A single citizen who says they feel safer than before.
- B) Official crime statistics from multiple independent agencies showing a consistent decline. ✓**
- C) A different news outlet that also reports rising crime.
- D) An expert who believes crime is rising but has not reviewed the data.

Explanation: B provides systematic, independently gathered data that directly contradicts the claim. Anecdote, corroboration from the same source type, and unsupported expert opinion are all weaker.

Q13. A corporation argues that its new data policy is fair because a majority of users agreed to it. What is the most important weakness in this argument?

- A) A majority is not enough — it should be unanimous.
- B) Agreement obtained through long, opaque terms of service may not constitute genuine informed consent. ✓**
- C) Corporations should not be making their own policies.
- D) Users who disagreed should have been excluded from the platform.

Explanation: Formal agreement is not the same as meaningful consent. The quality and clarity of the agreement process matters enormously, and most corporate terms do not meet a genuine informed-consent standard.

Q14. A study finds that people who drink three cups of tea per day are healthier than those who drink none. What is the most important limitation of this finding?

- A) The study should have tested coffee instead.
- B) Three cups per day is an arbitrary amount.
- C) Correlation does not establish that tea caused the health improvement. ✓**
- D) Healthy people probably don't drink tea.

Explanation: The classic correlation-causation distinction. Healthier people may happen to drink more tea for unrelated reasons, or a third factor (such as income or lifestyle) may explain both.

Q15. An organisation claims that its new messaging app is completely private because it uses end-to-end encryption. What is the most important question to ask?

- A) Whether the encryption is fast enough for practical use.
- B) Whether the organisation itself can access message metadata even if it cannot read message content. ✓**
- C) Whether the app is more popular than its competitors.
- D) Whether encryption technology is approved by governments.

Explanation: End-to-end encryption protects message content but not necessarily metadata — who communicates with whom, when, and how often. True privacy requires considering the full picture.

SECTION D — HIDDEN ASSUMPTIONS (Q16–Q20)

These questions ask candidates to identify the unstated beliefs that an argument depends upon.

Q16. We should ban anonymous accounts online, because people behave better when they are accountable for their words. The hidden assumption is:

- A) All online speech causes harm.
- B) Anonymity is the primary driver of bad online behaviour. ✓**
- C) Real-name accounts are impossible to fake.
- D) Most people want to behave badly online.

Explanation: The argument only works if anonymity is what causes bad behaviour — but people behave badly under real names too, and anonymity protects important speech. This assumption is doing all the work.

Q17. Alethia should admit only the top ten percent of examination scorers, because only exceptional thinkers deserve to be citizens. The hidden assumption is:

- A) Exceptional thinkers always score in the top ten percent.
- B) Citizenship is a reward for cognitive excellence rather than a status earned by meeting a defined standard. ✓**
- C) All exceptional thinkers want to be Alethian citizens.
- D) The examination perfectly measures thinking ability.

Explanation: The argument treats citizenship as a prize for being the best rather than a threshold earned by demonstrating sufficient capacity. This fundamentally redefines what the examination is for.

Q18. Since the Arbiter is an AI, it cannot truly understand human values and therefore should not govern. The hidden assumption is:

- A) All governments are run by humans.
- B) Understanding human values requires having lived a human life. ✓**
- C) AI systems always make worse decisions than humans.
- D) The Arbiter has never consulted citizens about their values.

Explanation: The argument assumes that genuine understanding of human values is only possible through human experience — a philosophical claim that deserves examination rather than acceptance.

Q19. The Eranos should be abolished because no currency has ever succeeded in a closed digital environment. The hidden assumption is:

- A) The Eranos was designed badly.
- B) Past failures in comparable situations predict future failure in this one. ✓**
- C) Citizens do not need a currency to trade with each other.
- D) The Eranos is identical to all previous failed currencies.

Explanation: The argument assumes that historical outcomes in similar circumstances predict this outcome — ignoring the possibility that different design, context, or conditions may lead to different results.

Q20. People who disagree with Alethia's values should not be allowed to become citizens. The hidden assumption is:

- A) Citizenship should be reserved for those who already agree with a community's values before joining. ✓
- B) People cannot change their values over time.
- C) Alethia's values are universally correct.
- D) Disagreement is always expressed through bad behaviour.

Explanation: The argument assumes that agreement must precede entry — rather than that the examination process itself is how alignment with Alethian principles is assessed and demonstrated.

SECTION E — PATTERN AND SEQUENCE REASONING (Q21–Q25)

These questions test the ability to identify rules governing sets and sequences, and to apply them consistently.

Q21. Which number does not belong: 4, 9, 16, 25, 35, 49?

- A) 9
- B) 25
- C) 35 ✓
- D) 49

Explanation: All others are perfect squares (2^2 , 3^2 , 4^2 , 5^2 , 7^2). 35 is not a perfect square.

Q22. $A \rightarrow B$, $B \rightarrow C$, $C \rightarrow D$. If D is false, what must be true?

- A) A is true.
- B) B may be true or false.
- C) A is false. ✓
- D) C is true.

Explanation: The chain runs forward. Working backward: if D is false, C must be false, B must be false, and therefore A must be false.

Q23. A rule states: any citizen who serves on three tribunals in a year earns a civic distinction. Remi has served on two tribunals this year and is called for a third. What follows?

- A) Remi will definitely earn a civic distinction.
- B) Remi will earn a civic distinction if they complete the third tribunal. ✓
- C) Remi has already earned a civic distinction.
- D) Remi must serve a fourth tribunal to qualify.

Explanation: The condition is three completed tribunals. Remi has served on two and is called for a third — completion of that third triggers the distinction.

Q24. Five citizens — A, B, C, D, E — must each vote differently (1 through 5). A votes 3. B votes higher than C. D votes lower than A. E votes higher than B. Which is a possible complete assignment?

- A) A=3, B=4, C=2, D=1, E=5 ✓
- B) A=3, B=5, C=4, D=2, E=4
- C) A=3, B=2, C=1, D=4, E=5
- D) A=3, B=4, C=3, D=1, E=5

Explanation: A=3 is fixed. $D < 3$ means D is 1 or 2. $B > C$, $E > B$. Option A satisfies all: $D=1 < 3$, $B=4 > C=2$, $E=5 > B=4$. B has duplicates. C violates $B > C$. D repeats 3.

Q25. A policy states: proposals supported by more than 50% pass on monthly polls; more than 66% on quarterly polls; more than 75% on constitutional referenda. A proposal receives 68% support. Under which type of vote does it pass?

- A) Monthly and quarterly polls only. ✓
- B) All three types.
- C) Monthly polls only.
- D) Quarterly polls only.

Explanation: 68% exceeds 50% (monthly) and 66% (quarterly) but does not reach 75% (constitutional). It passes the first two but not a constitutional referendum.

Part IV — Pillar II: Ethical Reasoning and Moral Judgment

The following twenty-five questions assess ethical reasoning — the ability to recognise harm, weigh competing values, take the perspective of others, apply principles consistently, and choose the most defensible course of action.

These questions do not test political opinions, cultural beliefs, or ideological positions. A thoughtful person of any background or persuasion should be able to identify the correct answer through careful reasoning. Questions are designed so that the best answer is defensible on general ethical grounds.

Correct answers are marked with ✓ for reference. In the examination itself, no answers are pre-marked.

SECTION A — COMPETING VALUES (Q26–Q30)

When important values conflict, sound ethical reasoning requires assessing the situation carefully rather than applying a rigid rule.

Q26. Alethia has evidence that a citizen is planning to seriously harm another. Sharing this information would prevent harm but violates the citizen's privacy. What is the most ethically defensible response?

- A) Always protect privacy — no exceptions.
- B) Always act to prevent harm — privacy is secondary.
- C) Assess the credibility and severity of the threat and act proportionately. ✓**
- D) Do nothing and allow events to unfold naturally.

Explanation: Neither absolute position is defensible. Privacy is important but not absolute when serious, credible harm to another person is at stake. Proportionate, considered action is the most defensible response.

Q27. A citizen publishes accurate information that is deeply embarrassing to another citizen. The second citizen wants it removed. What principle should govern the decision?

- A) Truth always outweighs personal embarrassment — the information should stay.
- B) Personal dignity always outweighs public information — the information should be removed.
- C) The public interest value of the information should be weighed against the degree of harm caused to the individual. ✓**
- D) The first citizen's right to publish is absolute.

Explanation: Both values — truth and dignity — are important. The most defensible position weighs the genuine public interest against the genuine personal harm, rather than treating either as automatically supreme.

Q28. Alethia's open-source codebase has a serious security vulnerability. Publishing it immediately protects users through transparency but also gives attackers a window to exploit it. What is the most defensible approach?

- A) Publish immediately — transparency is non-negotiable.
- B) Never publish — security must be protected at all times.

C) Allow a limited time for the vulnerability to be patched before publishing, then disclose fully. ✓

D) Publish only to a private group of experts and never tell citizens.

Explanation: Responsible disclosure — patch first, then publish — is a well-established ethical standard that balances transparency with harm prevention. Neither absolute extreme is defensible.

Q29. A citizen who has served Alethia exceptionally for years commits a minor but clear violation of the Code of Civic Conduct. Should their past service affect the sanction?

A) Yes — past service should result in a lesser sanction.

B) No — rules must be applied identically regardless of history. ✓

C) Yes — exceptional citizens should be exempt from minor sanctions.

D) It depends on how much the citizen contributed.

Explanation: Consistent application of rules is foundational to a just system. Allowing past status to reduce accountability creates a two-tier system that undermines equality before the law.

Q30. A group of citizens wants to organise within Alethia to advocate for changes that many other citizens find offensive but that break no rules. What is the most defensible response?

A) Ban the group to preserve social harmony.

B) Allow the group to organise — they have broken no rules. ✓

C) Allow the group but monitor their communications closely.

D) Hold a poll to decide whether the group should be permitted.

Explanation: Freedom of association and expression within the rules is a fundamental right. Social offence, absent any rule violation, is not sufficient grounds for restriction.

SECTION B — RECOGNISING HARM (Q31–Q35)

Sound ethical reasoning requires accurately identifying who is harmed, how, and to what degree.

Q31. A corporation operating in Alethia collects behavioural data from citizens without their knowledge and uses it to optimise advertising. Which of the following best describes the ethical problem?

A) The corporation is acting inefficiently.

B) Citizens are being treated as products to be analysed rather than people to be served, without their consent. ✓

- C) The advertising may be inaccurate.
- D) Other corporations are being disadvantaged.

Explanation: The core harm is the violation of human dignity and consent — treating people as data sources rather than autonomous agents. The other options describe secondary concerns at most.

Q32. A platform makes it very easy to sign up for a service and very difficult and confusing to cancel it. What is the primary ethical problem?

- A) The platform has poor user interface design.
- B) The platform is exploiting psychological friction to override users' genuine preferences. ✓**
- C) Users should read the terms more carefully before signing up.
- D) This is a normal business practice and not an ethical issue.

Explanation: Dark patterns deliberately exploit cognitive limitations to trap users in decisions they would not make in conditions of clarity and ease. This is a deliberate harm, not a design oversight.

Q33. An Alethian citizen is found to have been sharing another citizen's private messages with third parties. Who is harmed and how?

- A) Only the citizen whose messages were shared — through violation of their privacy and trust. ✓**
- B) The sharing citizen — because they may face sanctions.
- C) The third parties — because they received information they didn't ask for.
- D) No one is harmed if the messages contained nothing sensitive.

Explanation: The primary harm is to the citizen whose messages were shared — their reasonable expectation of privacy and trust was violated without consent. Whether content was sensitive is irrelevant to the violation.

Q34. A citizen argues that forced advertising should be permitted because companies need revenue to operate. What is the most important ethical problem with this argument?

- A) Companies can find other ways to generate revenue. ✓**
- B) The argument treats the commercial needs of corporations as sufficient justification for overriding citizens' right not to be subjected to unwanted psychological influence. ✓**
- C) Not all advertising is harmful.

D) Revenue requirements vary by company.

Explanation: The argument inverts the proper hierarchy — it prioritises corporate commercial needs over citizens' fundamental right to control what is presented to their attention. B is the most complete answer.

Q35. A new citizen uses Alethia's messaging system to coordinate a scheme that is legal in Alethia but seriously harms people outside it. What is the most defensible ethical position?

- A) If it's legal within Alethia, Alethia has no responsibility.
- B) Alethia's infrastructure should not be used to cause serious harm to people, regardless of jurisdiction. ✓**
- C) The matter should be left entirely to the affected jurisdiction.
- D) Legality within Alethia is the only relevant standard.

Explanation: Ethical responsibility does not end at legal borders. Alethia's values — including not facilitating serious harm to people — apply to how its infrastructure is used, even when harms occur elsewhere.

SECTION C — PERSPECTIVE-TAKING (Q36–Q40)

Ethical reasoning requires the genuine ability to understand situations from positions other than one's own.

Q36. A citizen from a country with no tradition of digital privacy finds Alethia's data protection rules overly strict and unnecessary. What is the most appropriate response to their view?

- A) Dismiss it — Alethia's values are correct and the citizen must adapt.
- B) Change the rules to accommodate different cultural backgrounds.
- C) Acknowledge the different background while explaining the reasoning behind the values the citizen agreed to uphold by seeking citizenship. ✓**
- D) Suggest the citizen find a different community better suited to their views.

Explanation: Genuine engagement — acknowledging the difference while explaining the reasoning — respects the citizen while maintaining the integrity of Alethia's founding principles.

Q37. A less technically experienced citizen struggles to use Alethia's open-source tools. A more experienced citizen argues that the tools are fine and the problem is the less experienced citizen's skill level. What is missing from this reasoning?

- A) The more experienced citizen should offer to help.

- B) The tools should be simpler.
- C) The experienced citizen's ease of use does not tell us anything about the experience of someone with less technical background. ✓**
- D) Technical skill should be a citizenship requirement.

Explanation: Evaluating accessibility only from the position of those who already have skill is a failure of perspective-taking. Alethia's commitment to openness means tools must work for all citizens, not just technical ones.

Q38. A proposed policy would benefit the majority of citizens but would significantly disadvantage a small minority. What ethical consideration is most important to include in the discussion?

- A) Whether the majority benefit is large enough to outweigh any minority harm.
- B) Whether the minority can be compensated or the policy modified to reduce the harm. ✓**
- C) Whether the minority accepted the risk by becoming citizens.
- D) Whether the policy is popular in other digital communities.

Explanation: Sound democratic ethics doesn't simply count heads — it considers whether the minority's interests can be protected alongside the majority's benefit. B is the more complete ethical approach.

Q39. A citizen who rarely participates in polls argues that the poll results don't represent them. What is the most appropriate response?

- A) Non-participants have forfeited their right to complain about outcomes.
- B) The polling system should be redesigned to include non-participants automatically.
- C) Acknowledge their concern while noting that the opportunity to participate is equally available to all citizens, and encouraging their engagement. ✓**
- D) Exclude non-participants from civic benefits until they engage.

Explanation: The appropriate response acknowledges the concern with genuine respect while noting the civic responsibility dimension — without punishment or dismissal.

Q40. A citizen who was sanctioned by a tribunal believes the process was unfair. Even if the outcome was correct, what is the most important thing Alethia should ensure?

- A) That the citizen accepts the verdict and moves on.
- B) That the citizen had a genuine opportunity to be heard and understood the process they were subject to. ✓**

- C) That other citizens are not influenced by the complaint.
- D) That the tribunal panel is protected from criticism.

Explanation: Procedural fairness — being genuinely heard and understanding the process — is a component of justice independent of whether the outcome was correct.

SECTION D — PROPORTIONALITY (Q41–Q45)

Ethical responses should be proportionate to the situation. Both under-reaction and over-reaction can represent failures of judgment.

Q41. A citizen makes a single post in the Alethian Commons that other citizens find offensive but that breaks no rules. What is the most appropriate response?

- A) Immediately remove the post and issue a formal warning.
- B) Hold a poll to decide whether the post should be removed.
- C) Take no formal action — the citizen broke no rules. ✓**
- D) Suspend the citizen's posting privileges pending review.

Explanation: Offence without rule-breaking is not a sanctionable event. Formal action where no rule was violated would itself be a violation of the citizen's rights.

Q42. A corporation operating in Alethia accidentally shares a small amount of citizen data due to a technical error, immediately discloses the incident, and fixes the problem. What is the proportionate response?

- A) Immediately expel the corporation from Alethia.
- B) Investigate, acknowledge the disclosure, assess whether processes were adequate, and issue proportionate guidance or sanction. ✓**
- C) Take no action since it was accidental.
- D) Require the corporation to publish a public apology.

Explanation: Proportionality requires distinguishing between negligence and good-faith error. The corporation's immediate disclosure and remediation are relevant. A full investigation with proportionate outcome is appropriate.

Q43. A citizen is found to have shared another citizen's private information without consent for the first time, causing minor embarrassment but no serious harm. What is the most proportionate sanction?

- A) Permanent revocation of citizenship.
- B) A formal notice and requirement to complete civic education on privacy rights. ✓**
- C) A one-year suspension of all citizenship rights.
- D) No sanction — private information sharing is inevitable.

Explanation: The sanction framework is graduated. A first offence causing minor harm warrants a first-level response — formal notice and education — not the most severe available penalties.

Q44. The Arbiter identifies a pattern suggesting a citizen may be engaged in harmful activity, but has no direct evidence yet. What is the most proportionate action?

- A) Immediately suspend the citizen pending investigation.
- B) Alert law enforcement immediately.
- C) Continue monitoring until direct evidence is available, then act through the appropriate process. ✓**
- D) Take no action unless a formal complaint is made.

Explanation: Acting on pattern suspicion without evidence would violate due process. Waiting for direct evidence and then following proper process is proportionate and consistent with Alethia's values.

Q45. A citizen repeatedly makes low-level breaches of the Code of Civic Conduct despite formal notices. What is the most proportionate next step?

- A) Permanent revocation of citizenship.
- B) Escalation to a civic suspension of specific privileges for a defined period. ✓**
- C) Ignore the behaviour — formal notices have already been issued.
- D) Refer directly to an external law enforcement agency.

Explanation: The graduated sanction framework escalates proportionately. Repeated low-level offences after formal notice warrant moving to the second level — civic suspension — not the most extreme response.

SECTION E — CONSISTENCY (Q46–Q50)

Ethical principles must be applied consistently regardless of who is involved. These questions test whether a candidate applies the same standard across different cases.

Q46. You believe Corporation A was wrong to collect user data without consent. Corporation B, which supports causes you agree with, does the same thing. What does ethical consistency require?

- A) Judge Corporation B more leniently because its overall mission is good.
- B) Apply the same standard to both. ✓**
- C) Reconsider whether Corporation A was actually wrong.
- D) Evaluate each situation independently based on intentions.

Explanation: Ethical consistency means applying principles regardless of affiliation or agreement. Allowing alignment with a cause to excuse the same behaviour you condemn in others is a double standard.

Q47. A citizen you strongly disagree with has their account unfairly suspended. What is the appropriate response?

- A) Say nothing — the outcome suits you even if the process was wrong.
- B) Support the suspension privately while opposing it publicly.
- C) Oppose the unfair suspension regardless of your disagreement with the citizen. ✓**
- D) Suggest the suspension is fair given the citizen's views.

Explanation: Procedural justice applies to everyone. Supporting unfair process when it benefits you while opposing it when it harms you is inconsistent and corrosive to any just system.

Q48. The Arbiter makes a decision you strongly agree with but without following the required consultation process. What is the most consistent position?

- A) Accept the decision — the right outcome justifies the shortcut.
- B) Oppose the process violation regardless of agreeing with the outcome. ✓**
- C) Wait to see how other citizens react before forming a view.
- D) Support the decision publicly while privately noting the process failure.

Explanation: Process integrity is independent of outcome. If you would object to a process violation that produced a decision you disliked, consistency requires objecting when it produces one you like.

Q49. A privacy rule in Alethia protects a citizen whose views you find repugnant. What does consistent application of Alethian values require?

- A) Advocate for an exception to the rule in this case.
- B) Apply the privacy protection equally, regardless of the citizen's views. ✓**
- C) Suggest the citizen's views disqualify them from standard protections.
- D) Refer the matter to a tribunal to decide whether the protection applies.

Explanation: Rights and protections apply to all citizens equally. A right that evaporates when the beneficiary is unpopular is not a right — it is a privilege granted to the agreeable.

Q50. A policy you helped design is shown by evidence to be causing unintended harm. What does ethical consistency require?

- A) Defend the policy — changing it would admit fault.
- B) Acknowledge the evidence and support revision of the policy. ✓**
- C) Question the evidence rather than the policy.
- D) Wait for others to raise the issue before responding.

Explanation: Intellectual and ethical honesty requires following evidence even when it contradicts your own previous positions. Defensiveness in the face of harm is a failure of both consistency and integrity.

Part V — Administration and Fairness Standards

Fairness Principles

The examination is governed by the following fairness principles, each of which is permanent and may not be suspended by any authority including the Arbiter:

- ▶ No question may require knowledge of any particular culture, country, religion, or language beyond that used in the examination itself.
- ▶ No question may test political opinion or ideological alignment.
- ▶ All questions are reviewed annually by a panel of citizen volunteers drawn randomly from the full citizenry.
- ▶ Any question found to be culturally biased, ambiguous, or ideologically loaded is removed from the question bank pending revision.
- ▶ The full question bank is reviewed and partially refreshed every two years to prevent preparation by memorisation rather than genuine understanding.
- ▶ Candidate performance data is analysed regularly for patterns suggesting systemic bias across demographic groups.

Translation Standards

The examination is available in all languages for which a verified translation exists. Translations are produced with the assistance of the Arbiter and reviewed by at least three fluent citizen speakers before being approved. Any citizen who identifies a translation error may submit a correction request, which is reviewed within thirty days.

The Study Guide

The Alethian Civic Guide is provided free of charge to all candidates before the examination. It is a companion document to this specification and explains the reasoning frameworks and ethical approaches the examination draws upon. It does not contain examination answers. Reading it carefully and reflecting honestly on its content provides a candidate with everything they need to prepare.

No commercial preparation materials, coaching services, or examination guarantees of any kind are endorsed or permitted by Alethia. Citizenship cannot be purchased through any means.

The Alethian Entrance Examination Document, including this complete question bank and specification, is published in the Library of Alethia and is freely available to anyone in the world. The Alethian Civic Guide, also in the Library of Alethia, is the companion preparation document for candidates.



A L E T H I A

Truth. Reason. Dignity.