

From: Adam Mazzocchetti adam@spqrtech.ai 
Subject: Submission: Lex Digitalis - The System Finds Itself in Contempt: Immutable Ethics for Autonomous AI
Date: 10 June 2025 at 13:50
To: yls.jreg@yale.edu

AM

Dear Editors,

In a legal system designed to respond after harm, what happens when harm is measured in milliseconds? In this work, I explore how law itself can become code, embedding immutable ethics directly into the architecture of autonomous AI.

I am pleased to submit for your exclusive consideration my article,

Lex Digitalis: The System Finds Itself in Contempt: Immutable Ethics for Autonomous AI.

This piece introduces a new class of jurisprudential mechanisms. Genesis Locks and Shutdown Certificates, that move legal enforcement from reactive to proactive. These mechanisms are not speculative. They are cryptographically sealed, tamper-evident, and operational within SPQR Technologies' deployed infrastructure.

This article builds on a broader journey I've undertaken to bridge law and autonomy:

- From foundational cryptographic baselines in *Lex Incipit*
- To runtime ethics enforcement in *Lex Fiducia*
- To evidentiary transparency in *Lex Veritas*
- ...and now, to legal personhood in the forthcoming *Civitas Publica* and *The Machine Republic*.

At its core, Lex Digitalis argues that law must evolve from a tool of oversight to a force of design, embedding constitutional values into the very logic of machines.

The manuscript is approximately 2300 words, original, and unpublished. A timestamped preprint has been posted to SSRN to ensure public provenance.

To aid your review, I've created a secure data room containing the SPQR systems whitepaper, validation proofs, and technical schematics:

<https://bit.ly/4kAf1VU>

I believe this piece aligns with the JREG Bulletins mission to chart modern regulatory frontiers, where law, code, and autonomy converge. Thank you for your time and consideration. I would be honored to contribute to your journal's leadership at the frontiers of public law and emerging technology.

Warm regards,

Adam Mazzocchetti
Founder, SPQR Technologies

adam@spqrtech.ai

Lex_Digitalis-The System Finds
Itself in Contempt(1).docx



From: Adam Mazzocchetti adam@spqrtech.ai
Subject: Withdrawal of Manuscript Submission: "Lex Digitalis: The System Finds Itself in Contempt"
Date: 23 July 2025 at 15:33
To: yls.jreg@yale.edu

AM

Dear Editors,

I am writing to formally withdraw my manuscript, entitled "**Lex Digitalis: The System Finds Itself in Contempt**," which I previously submitted to the JREG Bulletin.

Given that I have not received any correspondence regarding the status of my submission, and to avoid any future conflicts of interest, I request the immediate withdrawal of this manuscript from your records. Please confirm receipt of this notice at your earliest convenience.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Sincerely,

Adam Massimo Mazzocchetti
SPQR Technologies
adam@spqrtech.ai

On 10 Jun 2025, at 13:50, Adam Mazzocchetti <adam@spqrtech.ai> wrote:

Dear Editors,

In a legal system designed to respond after harm, what happens when harm is measured in milliseconds? In this work, I explore how law itself can become code, embedding immutable ethics directly into the architecture of autonomous AI.

I am pleased to submit for your exclusive consideration my article,

Lex Digitalis: The System Finds Itself in Contempt: Immutable Ethics for Autonomous AI.

This piece introduces a new class of jurisprudential mechanisms. Genesis Locks and Shutdown Certificates, that move legal enforcement from reactive to proactive. These mechanisms are not speculative. They are cryptographically sealed, tamper-evident, and operational within SPQR Technologies' deployed infrastructure.

This article builds on a broader journey I've undertaken to bridge law and autonomy:

- From foundational cryptographic baselines in *Lex Incipit*
- To runtime ethics enforcement in *Lex Fiducia*
- To evidentiary transparency in *Lex Veritas*
- ...and now, to legal personhood in the forthcoming *Civitas Publica* and *The Machine Republic*.

At its core, Lex Digitalis argues that law must evolve from a tool of oversight to a force of design, embedding constitutional values into the very logic of machines.

The manuscript is approximately 2300 words, original, and unpublished. A timestamped preprint has been posted to SSRN to ensure public provenance.

To aid your review, I've created a secure data room containing the SPQR systems whitepaper, validation proofs, and technical schematics:

<https://bit.ly/4kAf1VU>

I believe this piece aligns with the JREG Bulletins mission to chart modern regulatory frontiers, where law, code, and autonomy converge. Thank you for your time and consideration. I would be honored to contribute to your journal's leadership at the frontiers of public law and emerging technology.

Warm regards,

Adam Mazzocchetti
Founder, SPQR Technologies

adam@spqrtech.ai

<Lex_Digitalis-The System Finds Itself in Contempt(1).docx>

From: Adam Mazzocchetti adam@spqrtech.ai 
Subject: Quick Query – DEESLR Status & Cryptographic AI Ethics
Date: 11 June 2025 at 20:30
To: allison.stanfield@lewisdenley.com.au

AM

Hi Dr Stanfield,

I'm writing because I recently discovered DEESLR while working on a paper, *Lex Veritas* that explores cryptographic evidentiary frameworks for autonomous AI systems. The work is rooted in zero-trust architectures and operational ethics enforcement. Less academic, more real-world tamper tests, sealed logs, and direct forensic chain-of-custody principles.

I noticed DEESLR's last issue was in 2023, and my sense is it's not a question of relevance, but rather of capacity or editorial bandwidth. I also saw your leadership on digital evidence and your passion for operational proof, so I thought I'd reach out directly.

This isn't a typical "AI ethics" piece. The aim is to show that governance can be operationalised and provable, not just debated in policy forums. It's the difference between saying "we're ethical" and cryptographically proving it under live adversarial conditions. I've found this resonates with governments and courts who want more than promises; they want verifiable constraints.

Given your expertise, I wanted to ask:

- Is DEESLR still active? If so, I'd be grateful for your insight on whether this might be a fit or a fresh spark for the journal's mission.
- If not, would you mind sharing your view on the best venues for this? I'm considering CLSR, YJoR, or even a direct policy-focused publication that understands the urgent need for AI governance to move beyond theory.

I've attached the paper, along with secure access to the data room archive containing the cryptographic logs and verification proofs. **Access folder:** <https://bit.ly/4kAf1VU>

It's not about chasing citations, it's about finding people who understand that digital evidence must evolve to handle autonomous systems and AI ethics in practice.

I'd welcome your thoughts and guidance, even if it's just a quick "go here, not there" suggestion. And if DEESLR might be interested in reawakening, I'd be keen to help however I can.

Warm regards,

Adam Mazzocchetti
Founder, SPQR Technologies
adam@spqrtech.com
Ph. +61 458 094 464

Lex_Veritas.pdf
2 MB



From: Adam Mazzocchetti adam@spqrtech.ai
Subject: Withdrawal of Manuscript Submission: "Lex Veritas"
Date: 23 July 2025 at 15:35
To: allison.stanfield@lewisdenley.com.au

AM

Dear Dr. Stanfield,

I'm writing to formally withdraw my manuscript, "**Lex Veritas: Cryptographic Evidentiary Integrity for Autonomous Systems**," from consideration at DEESLR.

Given that I have not received a response and understand the journal may be inactive, I want to ensure there is no ambiguity regarding this submission. Please confirm receipt of this withdrawal at your convenience, simply for my records.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Best regards,

Adam Massimo Mazzocchetti
SPQR Technologies
adam@spqrtech.ai

On 11 Jun 2025, at 20:30, Adam Mazzocchetti <adam@spqrtech.ai> wrote:

Hi Dr Stanfield,

I'm writing because I recently discovered DEESLR while working on a paper, *Lex Veritas* that explores cryptographic evidentiary frameworks for autonomous AI systems. The work is rooted in zero-trust architectures and operational ethics enforcement. Less academic, more real-world tamper tests, sealed logs, and direct forensic chain-of-custody principles.

I noticed DEESLR's last issue was in 2023, and my sense is it's not a question of relevance, but rather of capacity or editorial bandwidth. I also saw your leadership on digital evidence and your passion for operational proof, so I thought I'd reach out directly.

This isn't a typical "AI ethics" piece. The aim is to show that governance can be operationalised and provable, not just debated in policy forums. It's the difference between saying "we're ethical" and cryptographically proving it under live adversarial conditions. I've found this resonates with governments and courts who want more than promises; they want verifiable constraints.

Given your expertise, I wanted to ask:

- Is DEESLR still active? If so, I'd be grateful for your insight on whether this might be a fit or a fresh spark for the journal's mission.
- If not, would you mind sharing your view on the best venues for this? I'm considering CLSR, YJoR, or even a direct policy-focused publication that understands the urgent need for AI governance to move beyond theory.

I've attached the paper, along with secure access to the data room archive containing the cryptographic logs and verification proofs. **Access folder:** <https://bit.ly/4kAf1VU>

It's not about chasing citations, it's about finding people who understand that digital evidence must evolve to handle autonomous systems and AI ethics in practice.

I'd welcome your thoughts and guidance, even if it's just a quick "go here, not there" suggestion. And if DEESLR might be interested in reawakening, I'd be keen to help however I can.

Warm regards,

Adam Mazzocchetti
Founder, SPQR Technologies
adam@spqrtech.com
Ph. +61 458 094 464
<Lex_Veritas.pdf>