

HumanitAI Editorial Charter

A Publication for Scholarship and Public Inquiry in the Age of Artificial Intelligence

I. Purpose

HumanitAI is a publication of the Mirandola Institute devoted to scholarship and serious public inquiry into human flourishing in the age of artificial intelligence.

Its purpose is to provide a forum in which ideas about human capability, intelligent machines, knowledge, institutions, and human formation can be developed, examined, criticized, and extended.

HumanitAI takes AI Humanism as an intellectual starting point rather than a doctrine that contributors must affirm.

The publication welcomes work that develops the four pillars of AI Humanism—Human Agency, Institutional Integrity, Knowledge Stewardship, and Governed Intelligence—as well as work that challenges their assumptions, identifies their limitations, proposes alternative explanations, or introduces questions the framework has not yet considered.

HumanitAI seeks intellectual progress rather than agreement.

Its central editorial question is:

What do we need to understand about human beings and human institutions as artificial intelligence becomes increasingly capable?

The publication exists to make that inquiry cumulative, interdisciplinary, accessible, and consequential.

II. Intellectual Scope

HumanitAI publishes work concerning the relationship among human beings, artificial intelligence, knowledge, and institutions.

Its primary interest is the development of human and institutional capability under conditions of increasingly abundant machine intelligence.

This includes questions about how people learn, reason, create, exercise judgment, form purposes, and delegate action; how institutions organize authority, responsibility, expertise, and accountability; how information becomes knowledge and understanding; how machine execution

can remain connected to human purposes; and how education and civic life change as intelligent systems become widely available.

The publication also welcomes work that places these developments in historical, philosophical, scientific, technological, economic, organizational, artistic, or cultural context.

HumanitAI is deliberately interdisciplinary.

The relevant discipline should follow the question.

A contribution may therefore originate in the humanities, social sciences, management, economics, engineering, computer science, education, law, design, medicine, the arts, or professional practice. Interdisciplinarity does not reduce the standards of individual disciplines. Contributions should engage seriously with the methods, evidence, and scholarship relevant to the claims they make.

The publication gives particular attention to work that connects levels of analysis.

A study of artificial intelligence in professional work, for example, may illuminate individual judgment, institutional authority, knowledge formation, and machine delegation simultaneously. HumanitAI encourages scholarship capable of showing how these relationships interact.

III. Relationship to AI Humanism

AI Humanism provides HumanitAI with an intellectual orientation.

It begins with confidence in the cultivability of human capability and asks:

What can human beings become in an age of capable machines?

HumanitAI provides a forum in which that question can be investigated rather than merely affirmed.

The publication therefore gives sustained attention to the four commitments of AI Humanism:

Human Agency concerns the ability of people to form purposes, exercise judgment, and remain meaningful authors of consequential action.

Institutional Integrity concerns the organization of authority, responsibility, and accountability as work moves across people and intelligent systems.

Knowledge Stewardship concerns the conversion of informational abundance into understanding, expertise, discovery, and durable knowledge.

Governed Intelligence concerns the mechanisms through which delegated machine execution remains directed, observable, and revisable.

These pillars organize inquiry without determining its conclusions.

HumanitAI should publish evidence that strengthens them, evidence that narrows them, and arguments that show where they require revision.

The credibility of AI Humanism depends in part on its ability to learn from criticism.

HumanitAI exists to make that learning possible.

IV. Editorial Standards

HumanitAI derives its authority from the quality of the work it publishes.

Its editorial standards follow the broader standards of inquiry established by the Miranda Institute while adapting them to publication.

Evidence

Empirical claims should rest on evidence appropriate to the question.

Contributors should distinguish observed findings from interpretation, projection, and speculation. Claims about the capabilities or effects of artificial intelligence should identify the basis on which those claims are made.

Intellectual Clarity

Arguments should make their important assumptions visible.

Key concepts should be defined precisely enough to permit examination and disagreement. Complexity should arise from the subject rather than from unnecessary obscurity.

HumanitAI values clear writing because clarity makes scholarship more contestable.

Technological Seriousness

Contributions involving artificial intelligence should engage the technology at the level necessary to support their conclusions.

Descriptions of systems should distinguish demonstrated capabilities from analogy, marketing claims, anthropomorphic language, and projections about future systems.

Historical Seriousness

Claims about technological transformation should benefit from historical perspective when relevant.

Historical comparison should clarify rather than flatten differences across periods. Contributors should distinguish recurring institutional patterns from genuinely new technological conditions.

Institutional Realism

Work concerning organizations should reflect how institutions actually operate.

Authority, incentives, expertise, limited attention, competing objectives, implementation constraints, and organizational context may all shape how artificial intelligence is used and what consequences follow.

Pluralism

HumanitAI welcomes competing interpretations.

Substantive disagreement is an intellectual resource when contributors share standards of evidence, reasoning, and good-faith engagement.

The publication will not require conformity with a political, theological, commercial, technological, or philosophical position.

Revision

Knowledge develops through correction.

HumanitAI welcomes work that revises earlier claims, reports failed replications, identifies unexpected results, or changes conclusions when stronger evidence becomes available.

Intellectual revision is a contribution to knowledge.

V. Forms of Publication

HumanitAI should support different forms of serious intellectual contribution without treating every form as if it serves the same purpose.

Publication Model

HumanitAI is a digital-first publication and will ordinarily publish contributions on a continuous basis. It may also assemble selected work into thematic collections, special issues, or periodic issues when doing so advances a coherent area of inquiry.

HumanitAI seeks to make its published work broadly and freely available to readers. Its access model should support wide circulation of scholarship while preserving the intellectual independence and long-term sustainability of the publication.

The Institute may revise the publication's economic model as submission volume, editorial requirements, and operating costs develop. Changes in funding or access arrangements should preserve broad public access whenever practical and should not affect editorial standards or decisions.

Research

Research contributions present original theoretical, empirical, historical, technical, or interpretive scholarship.

They should clearly identify their question, contribution, evidentiary basis, methods where applicable, and relationship to relevant knowledge.

HumanitAI may subject research contributions to external scholarly review when appropriate. The form and level of review should be disclosed with the published work.

Essays

Essays develop an argument, interpretation, synthesis, or intellectual position for a scholarly and informed public audience.

They should advance an idea rather than merely summarize a topic.

Strong essays may connect disciplines, interpret emerging developments, propose new concepts, or make established scholarship useful to new audiences.

Dialogues

Some questions develop most effectively through disagreement.

HumanitAI may publish interviews, exchanges, debates, and structured dialogues among scholars, technologists, practitioners, artists, and institutional leaders.

Dialogue should clarify competing reasoning rather than manufacture opposition.

Reviews and Cases

Reviews may examine important books, research programs, technologies, institutional practices, or bodies of scholarship.

Cases may document consequential uses of artificial intelligence in organizations or professional settings when they provide evidence from which broader questions can be examined.

A case should illuminate a problem rather than serve as promotion for an organization or product.

The publication may develop additional formats as its intellectual community matures.

Every format should make clear what type of contribution the reader is encountering and what form of editorial review it received.

VI. Scholarship and Public Inquiry

HumanitAI occupies a deliberate position between specialist scholarship and serious public discourse.

Some contributions will speak primarily to researchers. Others will translate scholarship for practitioners, educators, institutional leaders, or intellectually engaged readers. The publication values both.

Accessibility should not require intellectual simplification.

A public essay should remain responsible to evidence. A technical article should communicate its significance beyond the narrowest specialist audience whenever possible.

HumanitAI therefore encourages contributors to ask two questions:

What does this work establish?

and

Why does it matter for human or institutional capability?

The publication should help ideas travel between disciplines and between scholarship and practice without erasing the distinctions among them.

HumanitAI will give particular attention to work that makes consequential research intelligible to people responsible for education, institutions, technology, professional practice, and public life.

VII. Editorial Independence

The Mirandola Institute sponsors HumanitAI and provides its institutional home.

Editorial judgment belongs to the publication.

Editors should select, review, revise, and publish work according to intellectual significance and editorial standards rather than the interests of founders, donors, sponsors, technology providers, institutional partners, or other external parties.

HumanitAI may publish work critical of the Mirandola Institute, AI Humanism, its research propositions, or positions previously published in HumanitAI.

Such criticism should meet the same standards of evidence and argument as other contributions.

Editorial independence also requires transparency.

Relevant financial relationships, institutional affiliations, conflicts of interest, sponsorship, and material interests should be disclosed when they could reasonably affect how a reader evaluates a contribution.

Sponsored research or supported publication may be published when the support is transparent and the sponsor does not control editorial conclusions.

The credibility of HumanitAI will depend on the demonstrated independence of its editorial decisions.

VIII. Review and Editorial Process

The form of review should follow the form of contribution.

Original research may warrant external specialist review. Essays may require rigorous editorial review rather than conventional peer review. Technical claims may require technical assessment. Historical or philosophical contributions should receive review appropriate to their disciplines.

HumanitAI should not imply a review process that a contribution has not received.

Published work should therefore identify its editorial status when meaningful—for example, externally reviewed research, editorially reviewed essay, invited dialogue, or documented case.

Editors should evaluate submissions according to several questions:

Does the contribution ask an important question?

Does it advance understanding?

Are its claims supported at the level required by the argument?

Does it engage relevant scholarship or practice seriously?

Are important assumptions visible?

Does it distinguish evidence from interpretation?

Can readers understand why the contribution matters?

A contribution need not agree with AI Humanism to satisfy these criteria.

It must contribute seriously to the intellectual territory HumanitAI exists to explore.

IX. Artificial Intelligence in Research and Writing

A publication concerned with artificial intelligence should establish clear expectations for its own use.

HumanitAI permits the use of artificial intelligence in research, analysis, drafting, editing, coding, translation, visualization, or other forms of scholarly work when such use is consistent with applicable disciplinary standards.

Human authors remain responsible for the work.

An intelligent system cannot assume responsibility for evidence, reasoning, originality, attribution, conflicts of interest, or published conclusions and therefore should not be listed as an author.

Contributors should verify factual claims, quotations, citations, calculations, and source references regardless of whether artificial intelligence assisted in producing them.

Material uses of artificial intelligence that affect the substance, method, analysis, evidence, or presentation of a contribution should be disclosed when that information would help readers evaluate the work.

Disclosure should illuminate the research process rather than become a ritual inventory of ordinary tools.

The governing principle is human authorship:

Delegate execution while preserving responsibility for the work.

Artificial Intelligence in Editorial Work

HumanitAI may use artificial intelligence to assist editorial administration, initial screening, research verification, comparison, workflow management, and other forms of editorial support.

Artificial intelligence may inform editorial work, but it does not hold editorial authority. No submission should be accepted or rejected without meaningful human review. Editors remain responsible for reviewer selection, editorial judgment, publication decisions, corrections, and the integrity of the published record.

The use of artificial intelligence in the editorial process should remain appropriate to the sensitivity and consequence of the decision, with human oversight increasing as editorial judgment becomes more consequential.

The governing principle is consistent with HumanitAI's broader approach to delegated intelligence: machine capability may extend editorial capacity while human editors retain authority and responsibility.

HumanitAI should periodically revise its practices as scholarly norms, technologies, and evidence about AI-assisted research develop.

X. Corrections, Revision, and Intellectual Record

HumanitAI treats publication as part of an ongoing process of inquiry.

Errors should be corrected openly.

Material corrections should preserve a visible record sufficient for readers to understand what changed and why. Retractions should be available when evidence, research integrity, or other serious defects make continued presentation of a work misleading.

Authors should be able to respond to substantive criticism.

HumanitAI may publish comments, replies, replications, extensions, and retrospective assessments when they advance understanding.

The publication should also preserve its intellectual history.

Earlier work should remain accessible when possible, even when later scholarship changes the conclusions, because the development of ideas is itself part of the scholarly record.

A publication devoted to human learning should demonstrate the capacity to learn publicly.

XI. The Editorial Community

HumanitAI should develop an editorial community broad enough to reflect the interdisciplinary character of AI Humanism.

Editors, reviewers, contributors, and advisers should bring different disciplinary traditions, professional experiences, methods, and interpretations to the publication.

Their common commitment is not agreement.

It is serious inquiry.

Editorial authority should grow from demonstrated intellectual contribution, sound judgment, fairness, and service to the quality of the publication.

As HumanitAI develops, its governance should protect continuity while allowing new scholars and practitioners to shape its intellectual direction.

The publication should remain larger than any editor, founder, contributor, discipline, or technological moment.

XII. The HumanitAI Commitment

HumanitAI exists because artificial intelligence raises questions that no single discipline, institution, or profession can answer alone.

Some concern machines.

The most consequential concern what people and institutions become as machine capability expands.

HumanitAI will publish work that helps answer those questions with evidence, judgment, historical perspective, technological understanding, and intellectual imagination.

It will make room for argument.

It will make room for correction.

It will connect scholarship with practice and specialized knowledge with serious public inquiry.

It will judge contributions by the understanding they create rather than the positions they affirm.

And it will remain open to the possibility that the most important questions of the AI age have not yet been formulated.

HumanitAI begins from a humanist conviction:

Human capability is cultivable.

Its editorial purpose is to help develop the knowledge through which that cultivation can continue.

The humanist project continues through inquiry, criticism, and publication.