

# Declaration of Liberty

*In the course of human relations*, power differentials easily erode trust between those in authority and those subject to it, making it necessary *for those subjected to authority's indiscretions* to assume greater responsibility over their own lives—independent of coercive authorities.

Is it not self-evident that authority is only as legitimate as its accountability to the needs it serves? The *more* those subjected to coercion dispose themselves to suffer it, the *more* authorities become blindly accustomed to their toxic impacts. Where authorities manipulate the “consent of the governed” to serve its own ends, at the expense of the governed, the standard now raises to the more objective *measurable accountability of impacted needs*.

Those coercively impacted by arbitrary authorities now express their right, their duty, to throw off the chains of arbitrary authorities unaccountable to affected needs, and rebuild the foundation of these imbalanced relations upon principles of accountably *resolving needs*. The initial step is purely market-based by first exhausting all direct means to identify, express and address impacted needs, before deferring to top-down authority of law—with its history of morphing into the problem it ostensibly serves.

The history of authority shows an inclination to drift from its founding mission into protecting itself, however abusive to those it impacts. When originating to counter abuses, unaccountable authority easily repeats the modeled pattern of their former abusers on susceptible others.

In the arbitrary way King George III imposed his will on the colonists, their descendants arbitrarily *accused me—an asexual transgender and tribally enrolled person—of being a “child recruiting” sexual predator*. The power differential built into the criminal justice system fails here to resolve the need for justice. Let these known facts be transparent to a candid world.

*They base their conviction solely on the coached testimony of a child, previously indoctrinated to objectify all LGBTQ people as bad. Among sexual assault cases in the early 1990s allowing a conviction without corroborating evidence, a significant number are wrongful convictions.*

*They resist correcting their errors in their appeal process, demonstrating more concern for protecting laws than the needs we create laws to serve. The more focused on impersonal laws than personal needs, the less the legal system enables the resolution of underserved needs.*

*They force an asexual transgender person to register as a sex offender for life, without providing context for the public to recognize a viable innocence claim. The more detail offense registries provide to the public, the easier to differentiate between viable innocence claims and those clearly guilty.*

*They objectify the complainant to further their own ends at the expense of the complainant's specific needs. The more guided support provided for victims of violence to communicate directly with identified victimizers, the more opportunities for the interest of justice to be served over the interests of judicial institutions.*

They rush to judgment with their convenient yet depersonalizing judicial categories of accused and accuser, overlooking conciliatory resolution, serving their own divisive ends at the expense of those involved in the inflamed conflict. *The more opportunities afforded to ascribed victims and accused victimizers to resolve their affected needs, the less attractive the limiting option of the adversarial justice system.*

They coercively objectify both accused and accuser to fit into their adversarial categories, assuming the state must mitigate conflict without accountability for their objectifying effects upon traumatized individuals. *The more impersonal the adversarial process, the less just its outcomes; the more personally engaged each affected side, the more just the outcomes.*

They fall trap to tunnel vision investigations, sometimes pursuing outlandish theories of guilt, without checking their confirmation bias, explicitly forbidden in other professions. *The more open to critique a criminal investigation, the more accurate will be its findings; the less open to critique, the less accurate its conclusions—correlating significantly with wrongful convictions.*

They impress the public as its trusted protector, while resisting public critique by evading access to its detention facilities. *The more transparent law enforcement institutions, the less likely damaging abuses of discretion will continue overlooked.*

They present the criminal justice system as the only tax-supported means to “protect and serve” the public from threats of interpersonal violence, often dismissing without impartial review other viable alternatives potentially more responsive to the affected needs. *The more alternatives to the criminal justice process are provided that can effectively address the needs involved, the lower the incidents of violence, lessening the burden on the adversarial court system.*

They impose excessive bail that routinely punishes suspects for being poor, while rewarding suspects who can afford exorbitant fees, in the name of “fair” justice. *The lower the amount of bail is set to correspond with what suspects can afford, the lower the rate of wrongful convictions stemming from the coercive effects of detention and from not being allowed to access a law library or to actively research own case.*

They coerce the accused—often the most disadvantaged—into admitting guilt for a crime they didn’t do, by threatening further jail time and longer sentences, if not promptly accepting a plea deal, which is akin to forcing unreliable confessions under torture, ostensibly to avoid collapsing the criminal court system if more defendants asserted their right to a speedy trial. *The more accountable to “the absence of crime and disorder, not merely the visible evidence of police action in dealing with them,” the fewer cases the overburdened criminal justice system would have to process.*

They offer relief from pain to the winning side in a court battle, at the expense of the losing side, which typically fails to resolve needs on all sides, enabling root problems to recur and provide more rationale for its overused adversarial approach. *The more opportunities for parties involved in acts of violence to address their relevant needs, even in the most painful and consequential of violent interactions, the more likely the involved parties can meaningfully grieve their losses and transform the situation into more responsible living.*

They economically incentivize mass incarceration, instead of incentivizing reduced levels of violence, in violation of [Peel principles](#) that provided the foundation for modern policing. *The more accountable the use of police power to “public approval” for its purpose, the more likely it will be received the public’s respect for its “existence, actions, and behaviors.”*

They emphasize the role of interpersonal violence over other forms of violence with as much or more impact on the security of our lives, demonstrating a bias toward ideological individualism that goes against wholeness of balancing personal with group needs. *The more the needs of the individual are balanced with the needs of society, the less tension gets created, resulting in fewer incidents of violence.*

They fail to admit the adversarial process can be as biased, imperfect, and guilty as the subjects it concludes as guilty, even resisting the standard they apply to subjects being applied in return. *The more we all recognize that the “police are the public and the public are the police,” the more we can hold each other accountable “to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the intent of the community welfare.”*

They coax “persons of interest” into compromising their right against self-incrimination during extended interviews that morph into hostile interrogations, often manipulating innocent persons into fitting their preconceived assumptions of guilt, effectively denying legal counsel that would mitigate this perverting of justice from confirmation bias. *The more accountable investigations remain to the rights of the accused, the less likely the pursuit of justice strays into convicting the wrong persons that allows actual perpetrators loose to harm others.*

They routinely resist admitting its many errors, insisting on conviction finality, despite compelling evidence of wrongful convictions, including actual innocence, at alarming rates. *The less an authority admits its imperfections, the more errors stemming from these imperfections likely remain unchecked to undermine authority.*

They evade culpability of wrongful convictions, while under pretense of blind justice, to avoid liability of expensive damage awards to exonerees. *The more states that enact legislation setting a maximum compensation amount to exonerees, the higher the rate of exonerations from that state’s pool of innocence claimants.*

They overpolice populations already suffering from historical trauma, complicating that trauma by subjecting it with further violence, easily perpetuating the debunked “rational choice” ideology of personal responsibility, overlooking limited options the traumatized can choose from. *The more subjected to authoritarian pressures to fit others’ idea of good compliance, the less free to internalize responsible living in one’s own sustainable terms; the less subjected to authoritarian pressures, the freer to live responsibly—demonstrated in fewer violent interactions.*

They aid and abet the destruction of countless lives with collateral consequences of criminal conviction, by failing to inform suspects of these harmful consequences if they take a plea deal, fueling the problem of making quick decisions without properly considering long-term impacts. *The more informed a suspect of long-term consequences of a plea deal, the fewer are likely to quickly waive their right to a proper hearing; and the more court officials resist this potential backlog of cases to process more thoroughly, as a right to every accused and accuser, the less legitimate this adversarial process.*

They overlook my demonstrated concern for sexual violence survivors to further their own image as caring more about sexual assault survivors, as if impersonal government can provide more for survivor needs than personalized attention from caring individuals like me. *The more opportunities afforded the accused to convey their empathic concern for those reportedly victimized by violence, the greater the opportunity for justice to be served—serving both the accuser’s need for supportive understanding and the public’s need to heal the wounds of violence.*

They fail to serve a frightened public, with their pretentious legislation for a sex offender registry, failing to distinguish between the recognizably guilty and viably innocent, undermining the right of background screeners and their users to make informed decisions of trustworthiness. *The more nuanced context provided in publicly accessible conviction records, the more the public can judge trustworthiness for themselves, unmolested by the corrupting biases of the adversarial process.*

By publishing how one’s conviction was determined (plea, bench trial, or jury trial), the public can see the right-to-trial was asserted over a plea deal, correlating with a viable innocence claim.

By publishing one’s type of verdict (guilty, no contest, or not guilty), the public can see the trial, and not a plea deal, produced the questioned guilty verdict.

By publishing one’s recommended sentencing (lower than guidelines, within guidelines, or over guidelines), the public can judge the fortitude in enduring the personal cost of a harsher sentence for maintaining one’s innocence.

By publishing one’s institutional record (number of major misconducts, or any new criminal case), the public can see how the innocent avoids trouble, where avoidable, while in prison.

By publishing one’s context of discharge (paroled, denied parole for lack of contrition from maintaining innocence), the public can see how the innocent resisted pressure to “show remorse” to get out of prison early on parole.

By publishing one’s criminal history (no other criminal history, no prior criminal history, no follow-up charges, or no warrants), the public can judge a lack of criminal history supports a claim of innocence.

They fail to correct the self-serving but false belief that all prisoners claim to be innocent, when academic surveys find only a minority claim actual innocence, furthering to dehumanize every accused person as being stuck in self-righteous denial and therefore deserving to be traumatized into compliance. *The more widely debunked the incorrect belief that all prisoners claim they didn’t to it, the less dismissive the public will be to viable claims of wrongful convictions.*

They fail to link epidemic rates of depression, anxiety, substance use, suicide and deaths of despair to its coercive influence against living freely and responsibly, by imposing external pressures at odds with internal needs the law can never fully anticipate or personally serve. *The more those coerced by authority to suppress their needs shift to freely express and address those impacted needs, the lower the rates of poor health outcomes.*

To answer these problems, this declaration to freely resolve needs unfolds in three proactive stages. It began by *identifying* needs, **assessing** their vulnerability to authority coercion. It followed by *expressing* the power differential's current impact on these needs, **auditing** authorities' responsiveness to engage us in these impacted needs. Finally, declaring the liberty to resolve needs by boldly *addressing* these needs, **avowing** to resolve these needs either in mutual cooperation or in unilateral responsibility in the face of authority figure's comparative lack of responsibility.



Till recently, we have resigned to our *avoidant options*, to lower any risk of authorities' reprisals over our tenuous lives. But wellness compels us to speak up with our *conciliatory options*, and if exhausted with insufficient results to then resort to our *adversarial options*. We reserve all viable options necessary to resolve one another's needs, including respect for your needs. To this end, we hold each other *accountable* to everyone's *measurable* levels of lowered pain and improved wellness outcomes.



Anyone in power opposing these *accountable measures* without offering viable alternatives shall be deemed a threat to the public good of liberty, and potentially as the very face of evil. Any coerced acquiescence invites public vilification. Anyone enabling such dysfunction risks ostracization. A dividing line is now set between those whose lives are committed to resolving affected needs, knowable by the removal of suffering, and those uncommitted and who continue to noticeably perpetuate painful problems.

For the support of this declaration of liberty to freely resolve needs, with its unwavering accountability to the support of Nature by measurable correlations, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our resources and our sacred honor.

\* \* \*



This **Declaration of Liberty** brought to you by...

# Value Relating

You need pain relief?

No, it's not all your fault. *Speak your truth to power.* Don't put up with this painful stress any longer.

We'll help you draft your own **Declaration of Liberty**. We'll support you to enforce it. To the ends of the earth.

**Value Relating** advocates your need to detox the power differentials you find yourself in.

Student - Teacher  
Employee - Manager  
Voter - Politician  
Citizen - Law Enforcement  
Client - Lawyer

We either meet in person or online, on a schedule that works for you. Schedule an introductory session now at **ValueRelating.com**.

Only \$25 for the first half-hour session. No charge if discontinued within the first ten minutes.

Start freeing yourself today from this pressure, while booking slots remain open, at <https://www.valuerelating.com/book-it/profriend>.

Learn more at:

<https://www.valuerelating.com>

Isn't it time you speak truth to power?