

Declaration of Liberty

Preamble

In the course of human relations, imbalances naturally emerge between those in authority and those subject to it. Power easily corrupts. We now know how institutions undergo mission creep, shifting from its originating purpose to protecting its own power. What starts as a means to solve problems easily slips into becoming an advantaged problem coercive to vulnerable lives.

Powerful institutions start well by easing the pain of the underserved. They typically organize problems into opposing categories. Employers and employees. Doctors and patients. Instructors and students. Politicians and voters. Prosecutors and defendants. Too often, these generalized differences provide more relief than resolution. When failing to responsibly resolve needs, they tend to impose authority that normalizes debilitating imbalances.

Nature's love now compels me and others to lovingly correct these imbalances, to responsibly resolve needs. I am compelled, by love, to link legitimacy of any authority to its responsiveness to impacted needs—or deem it as less legitimate. If estimated as too illegitimate, I cannot morally submit to its laws or presumed authority, but must prioritize resolution of needs. Because of who I am. Love compels it. To this love-propelled life purpose, I now publicly lay down my life.

Principles

Authority exists to serve needs. But whose needs are best served by any given authority? If you are an authority figure, I naturally resist any assumption you have any control over whatever I specifically need. *I invite you to see* how influential power too often enforces pain-relieving divisive norms at the expense of resolving needs to remove that pain. Why would anyone interfere with my love to naturally resolve needs, to remove specific causes of pain?

No one has authority over need itself. No legal or other pressure can change needs. Pressuring me or others to fit into provisional categories does not solve problems, but make them worse. *I experience* myself as nature's correction, and find authority resisting its corrective balance. I'm compelled by love to transcend familiar divisions that inhibit resolution of needs. Authorities defending familiar norms have targeted me.

No legitimate authority can oppose what its people needs. Only how it addresses needs, not the needs themselves. Opposing what another needs does not extinguish moral conflict, but enflames it. I see power differentials constraining lives on both sides when inattentive to the many needs its impacts. Especially lives like mine called to humbly and responsibly resolve such needs. Instead of opposing people with needs, love compels me to resolve the specific needs behind specific problems.

Power differentials causing problems lack legitimate authority. Authority without legitimacy is tyranny. Tyrannical authority becomes complicit in the problems they're trusted to solve. *I see* unresolved needs spilling into more problems. When these problems cause pain, *I see* them used to rationalize more pain-relieving authority. Why not resolve these needs to end this vicious cycle of tyrannical authority?

No one sits above the law. But no law sits above need it exists to serve. Without dynamic feedback, laws enforced by authority risk doing more harm than good. *I find* nature compelling me to resolve needs apart from illegitimate law, independent of authority. If that leaves me a target to law enforcement, so be it. Nature compels me (and others like me) to transcend pain-relieving oppositions to responsibly resolve pain's underlying needs.

The universal need for liberty overrules any authority you claim. By liberty, I mean the *freedom to resolve needs*—no impediments in the name of law or in the name of justice. Substance over form. Results over intentions. Resolve over relieve. Need-resolving liberty over self-serving authority.

Where others fit neatly into gender norms, I am spiritually compelled to integrate my masculine and feminine qualities into a sublime wholeness. This presents as being transgender.

Where others desire the gendered other out of sexual need, love compels me to only experience sexual attraction after a forging a deep emotional bond with a grown woman who can cultivate reciprocate such deep intimacy. This presents as being asexual, specifically demisexuality.

Where others reinforce the arbitrary power differential between employer and employee, or between well-resourced producer and under-resourced consumer, or other oppositional binaries around economic behavior, love compels me to transcend economic barriers to responsibly resolve economic needs. This presents as radical contentment for what others regard as poor.

Where others reinforce the arbitrary power differential between politician and voter, or between liberal and conservative, or other oppositional binaries around political behavior, love compels me to transcend political polarization to responsibly resolve political needs. This appears deceptively as apolitical but profoundly conciliatory.

Where others defend the arbitrary power differential between law enforcement and suspect, or between accuser and accused, or other oppositional binaries around law and justice, love compels me to transcend adversarial justice to responsibly resolve justice needs. This presents as a justice addressing the needs on all sides, over relieving the pain for the court battle winning side.

The more nature compels me to transcend limits to resolve needs, the more pushback I get for violating familiar relief-seeking divisive norms. Note how this is framed as a testable correlation. The legitimacy of any institution remains in doubt when not measurably accountable to the needs it impacts. In a world filled with hate as a normalizing fact, love rises as a resisted radical act.

Any authority you hold over me is duly corrupted by not knowing your influential impact on me. Your very legitimacy sits at risk. You don't know what you don't know. So let me now show you.

Practices

On July 7, 1993, I was targeted with the popular stereotype of LGBTQ people as “child recruiting” sexual predatory deviants, arrested and jailed among hostile men.

Without corroborating evidence, and despite exculpatory evidence, I was wrongly convicted based on the coaxed testimony of a troubled child.

For asserting my right to trial to honestly declare my innocence, I was targeted with the trial penalty sentence of 15 to 30 years.

After being publicly outed by this case and the press as a male-to-female transgender, I was sent to be housed with more violent and predatory men.

For being consistent in asserting my innocence, I was ineligible for parole and had to complete the maximum sentence.

Despite being transgender and demisexual—only experiencing sexual interest with my then wife and not since she divorced me due to forced separation by the imprisonment—I am required by law to register as a sex offender for the rest of my life.

All my attempts to clear my name run into systemic barriers, favoring power differentials with few if any accountabilities. After each attempt to seek help from innocence projects, I was told they only had enough resources and staff to help those whose liberty was more in jeopardy than mine.

Until now, my attempts to help resolve economic disparities, political polarization and the limits of adversarial justice remain stifled under this dark cloud of unacknowledged injustice. As long as I'm held captive under this tyranny of state custody, I fear fatal consequences for fully resolving needs.

I remain excluded from enjoying the same rights as you and others.

- I cannot own a gun.
- I can be denied housing.
- I can be denied employment for who I am, being transgender.
- I can be denied employment for who I am not, a supposed sex offender, which routinely occurs when current background checks fail to differentiate between viable innocence claims and those admittedly guilty.
- I must acquiesce to workplace harassment, knowing I'm lucky to find work, even if it's only a fast food job.
- I could be fired from my job at any time with little if any recourse.
- I must allow immature managers younger than my kids to boss me around and threaten my only means of economic security.
- I must endure demoralizing bosses who undercut my internally motivated work performance, even when this clearly disturbs my focus and causes me to commit errors, yet be assumed the problem stems fully from my incompetence and not their leadership deficits.
- I cannot freely relate to sexual innuendos of others in the workplace or elsewhere, and fear my naivete could expose my officially presumed sex offender status.
- I cannot freely call the police to complain about being victimized by others, since it's the tyranny of police power and biased adversarial justice that victimize me even more.
- I cannot be licensed as a counselor, and was not allowed to finish my counseling degree.
- Discrimination against me is legal and privileged, allowing anyone to potentially be an "entitled sex offender" by violating my asexuality with this state sanctioned sexualization of me; I have no recourse.
- Local law enforcement tasked to ensure sex offenders report as required become required sex offenders themselves by their participation in this ongoing sexual violation of my asexual gender transcendent responsibility.

Processes

Forced to live in such a society that effectively criminalizes being whole, I'm not sure if I'd even want to assert my rights. Too often, asserted rights are redressed through an adversarial process that undermines fully resolving the identified needs, often biased toward its own self-protection. Indeed, it cannot admit to its errors out of fear of being seen as guilty as those they find guilty. It can't face the justice of paying damages owed to the wrongly convicted actual innocent.

I will no longer seek justice from a process steeped deep in this injustice of normalizing dysfunction. Love compels me to only accept resolved needs on all sides, over the lower justice standard of offering relief to the court battle's winning side, at the losing side's expense. Unjust "due process" outcomes are unacceptable. **Injustice in the name of justice is no justice at all.**

If your job as justice actors fail to fulfill Peel principles with accountable results, then what in the hell are you doing? Are individual acts of interpersonal violence so appalling that the impersonal and depersonalizing criminal justice system can horrifically destroy the social fabric of whole communities? Does that not fuel the economically incentivized criminal justice system with more power differential subjects, in direct violation of grounding Peel principles? If viable alternatives exist to provide justice results more responsibly to all, how dare you or anyone stand in the way?

All forms of policing—community policing, problem-oriented policing, proactive policing, intelligence policing, predictive policing, saturation patrolling and others—remain tainted by overemphasis on individual responsible choices in socio-environments of diminishing options. You will not find viable answers if you keep asking the wrong self-serving questions.

In this present crisis, to paraphrase a familiar critique, the adversarial justice system is not the solution to our problem; the self-protecting adversarial justice system *is* the problem. The rising tide of exonerations in a sea of mass incarcerations confronts the legitimacy of this inadequately accountable bureaucratic process. **"Due process" is overdue for a legitimacy check.**

To fill this need, I drafted a bill addressing the failure to distinguish between the minority of viable innocence claims and the vast majority of admittedly guilty. The "Informed Decisions Act" enable background screeners and their users to determine a degree of viability for innocent claimants. This includes offender registries that currently fail to faithfully judge measurable differences between the admittedly guilty and reputably innocent.

The rightly convicted who are admittedly guilty

The wrongly convicted who are reputably innocent

Targeted for identifiably proven acts of violence	Targeted for stereotypes of unproven acts of violence
Often belligerent when apprehended	Often congenial when apprehended
Seek an easy way out to avoid jail	Willingly endure jail to prove innocence
Usually accept a plea deal to avoid a harsh sentence	Usually refuse any plea deal despite facing a harsh sentence

Frequently waive their preliminary hearing or other due process rights	Rarely waive their preliminary hearings or other due process rights
Waive their right to trial by admitting to some criminality	Assert their right to trial to express their integrity
Easily react defensively to feeling they're unfairly treated	Long-sufferingly endure the many biased trial proceedings
Apt to minimize the harm of actions they admit to doing	Consistently state they did not do the accused act
Show no concern for crime victims	Show concern for victims of crime
Earn "rep" as a trouble maker in prison	Build a reputation as a model prisoner
Usually eligible for parole after showing some remorse	Rarely eligible for parole since unable to "show remorse"
Repeatedly commit crimes	Typically lack a criminal history

The failure of the current judicial process to make these measurable distinctions undercuts the legitimacy of its entrusted authority. The Informed Decisions Act adds missing nuance for the public to make better informed decisions when using background checks. Instead of screening out the innocent baby with the guilty bathwater, the public may laud the good character of the wrongly convicted not yet exonerated.

It is not well when professional judicial actors fail to correct the widely held inaccurate belief that all prisoners claim they didn't do it. For example, conflating the guilty—who routinely minimize their harm—with the innocent—who often show concern about harm and yet consistently and convincingly maintain their innocence—reflects poorly on the assumed judgment skills of judicial actors. Not to mention their wellness. It serves the public poorly when judicial actors are the ones in denial.

By what authority do you convict an innocent person like me without corroborating evidence, in blatant ignorance of exculpatory evidence, then expect me to trust this same dysfunctional (self-protective self-righteous) adversarial process to correct its errors while traumatizing me again?

By what authority do you demand a transgender asexual person, who faithfully demonstrates integrity and consistently maintains being wrongly convicted, to continue registering on the sex offender registry?

By what authority do you prevent me from resolving the unmet needs fueling economic disparities, political polarization and other divisive power differential problems? *By what authority* do keep me from reducing the rising levels of mental illness, substance abuse, suicide, and other symptoms of unresolved needs?

Pronouncements

I respect the public's need to remain safe from threats of sexual violence wherever they are. But the consistent integrity of my asexual transgender life challenges the audacity of the impersonal adversarial justice to faithfully provide for this public need. Who keeps me safe from the sexual predations of the criminal justice system, who forces me to submit to sexual fantasies of transgender folks as sexual deviants? Who legitimately requires this asexual transgender person to register as a sex offender?

Laws exist to serve needs. But whose needs are best served by the SOR? And at what cost to those most disserved by this ill attempt to serve the public? This grinds to the core of its legitimacy.

My compelling claim of innocence starts with overlooked exculpatory evidence, and persists with my profile matching other exonerees.

After repeated attempts at exoneration and contacting political leaders to address this need, my responsibility to needs persist ignored. You cannot ignore the needs of one segment to serve another and remain legitimate.

To put it bluntly, *I can no longer falsely register as a sex offender.* Indeed, what stable residential address could I provide if by this illicit law I am made homeless? No, I will not—I cannot—comply with this immoral unaccountable law. I cannot submit to being the state's sex slave.

If provided a reliable way to measure my actual threat to the community, then I could relent and resume required reporting. But my life transcends politics; I am spiritually compelled to resolve the needs divisive politics struggles to address. Only by accountable outcome measures can I oblige such a politically motivated law.

No, my refusal cannot be easily dismissed as an act of civil disobedience. As if I could simply choose to comply and remain functional. Depression sets in to redirect me to respect needs toward their full responsible resolution—away from placating unaccountable wishes of distant others.

To continue submitting to this sexualized pressure makes sex offenders out of law enforcers. Any pressure forcing me to register aids and abets the sexual violence of this wrongful conviction. If you are serious about protecting the public from threats of sexual violence, then register yourself. When you accuse another of being sexually immoral, one of you is right. The same measure you give boomerangs back to you. Look. See it flying in your direction right now.

Without transparent measures to keep judicial actors accountable to just outcomes, then entrusted providers of justice tend to provide for their power differential interests. The current standard for justice sits not much higher than revenge. Adversarial justice aims almost as low. It offers relief to the winning side in a "legal" contest, at the expense of the losing side whose needs get overlooked, in a process mostly serving its own interests.

Substantive justice aims much higher. It is not content until all involved in a conflict responsibly resolve their needs—no exceptions! Resolving needs removes much of the causes for violence. Pain is not tolerantly relieved, it is removed! **Justice is not an indulgent win-lose contest, it is the innate right and responsibility of us all to resolve all affected needs fairly!**

Those convinced all pain is bad and must be relieved at someone's expense are among the most evil in the world. Those who patiently endure pain as messengers of trouble to be removed are among the most upright in the world.

Brutal cops, vicious lawyers, uncaught criminals and shameless convicts belong to the former. Mindful cops, proactive attorneys, transformed criminals and wrongly convicted innocents belong in the latter. Pain and pathology don't care who you are.

If I must, I will stand up to you alone. I welcome others who share this vision, whom injustice didn't kill but helped make stronger. We have a bold message for you, the failed criminal justice system.

Together, we will raise the bar of justice to respect all needs. We will not bend to your low standards of adversarial justice, with its dysfunctional contagion. We will not settle for your court battle outcomes that offer fleeting pain relief to the winning side, while spreading more pain to the losing side.

We will replace your adversarial malice with responsiveness to the needs on all sides. We will not serve your institutional needs at the expense of the accused and accusers. We will replace your self-serving bias with accountable measures. We will replace your racial disparities with honor to all have endured your denied racial disparities. We will replace your lack of faith in us with uplifting hope, your darkness with light, your hate with love.

We will show all the love it takes to spread substantive justice, to replace your second-rate justice. We will never concede to your substandard justice. We will love, and you will love in return or be no more.

America, America, you who imprison more people in history than any other nation and wrongly convict the innocents like me, how I have longed to help you solve your problems by resolving your needs with loving nature-grounded wisdom, but you remain unresponsive.

See, you remain contagiously dysfunctional, as you arrogantly lose the legitimacy to even recognize true innocence. For I tell you now boldly yet humbly, **you will not exonerate me until *after* I exonerate you.**

If there is indeed no greater love than to lie down one's life for another, then know I have just laid down my life for you. You can reciprocate that love by responsiveness to needs—first your own and then to mine and others. Or continue slipping down the abyss of your mounting despair and collapsing illegitimacy.

If I face arrest and further imprisonment for being true to love's cause of resolving needs over perpetuating dysfunction, than what does this say about your legitimacy? If authority arrogantly demands I comply to this illicit law, detaining me until I relent and register as a sex offender I am clearly not, then love compels me to resist such hate.

It matters less to me if I must die for being who I am. If I must continue suffering for meaningfully prioritizing need-resolving over popular pain-relieving, then so be it. Because when I stare down any threat of pain or death by denying its familiar sting, I am never more alive.

* * *