

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System

Justice-Architecture Companion to The Liberation Global Constitution

Version 1.9 — Codex v1.4 / TLGC v1.2 Alignment Draft

Part of The Liberation Canon

Table of Contents

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System1

Liberation-Aligned Justice System 14

 Paired Constitutional Draft..... 14

 Preface 14

ARTICLE LAJS-0 — Authority, Scope, and Canon Relationship15

§LAJS-0.01 — Status Within The Liberation Canon15

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System is the justice-architecture companion within The Liberation Canon.15

It operates in formal relationship with The Liberation Codex as philosophical and interpretive corpus, The Liberation Global Constitution as operative constitutional layer where lawfully adopted, and The Declaration of Liberation from All Falsehood as founding testimony and existential provenance only.15

§LAJS-0.02 — Non-Self-Executing Publication15

This Justice System does not claim self-executing authority by publication.....15

It becomes operative only through lawful adoption, constitutional enactment, institutional charter, treaty, compact, federation agreement, court-recognized implementation, or other jurisdictionally valid mechanism.15

§LAJS-0.03 — Operative Scope15

All rights, duties, classifications, enforcement mechanisms, remedies, institutional obligations, review pathways, and justice-system standards recognized by this Justice System operate within and for the benefit of persons subject to the lawful authority of adopting entities.....15

This Justice System does not claim self-executing extraterritorial authority over non-adopting jurisdictions, persons, institutions, courts, agencies, or authorities.....15

Persons outside the jurisdiction of an adopting entity may invoke these provisions only to the extent that the applicable adopting authority recognizes such standing.....15

§LAJS-0.04 — Relationship to The Liberation Global Constitution15

Where The Liberation Global Constitution has been lawfully adopted, this Justice System may operate as a justice-specific implementation architecture consistent with that Constitution.15

This Justice System may not weaken the constitutional floor established by The Liberation Global Constitution.15

Where conflict arises between this Justice System and operative constitutional text, the operative constitutional text controls unless this Justice System has been expressly adopted through valid constitutional amendment or lawful implementation instrument consistent with the constitutional floor.15

§LAJS-0.05 — Relationship to The Liberation Codex15

The Liberation Codex supplies the philosophical, ethical, and interpretive framework of Liberation.15

This Justice System operationalizes justice-specific standards, but does not supersede the Codex as interpretive corpus unless a specific provision has been lawfully adopted into operative justice text.15

§LAJS-0.06 — Status of the Declaration15

The Declaration of Liberation from All Falsehood remains founding testimony and existential threshold text only.15

It shall not be treated as scripture, revelation, compulsory interpretive authority, or binding legal command.15

§LAJS-0.07 — No Compelled Belief15

No person, court, institution, jurisdiction, federation, or adopting authority shall be required to affirm belief in Liberation doctrine as a condition of ordinary legal standing.15

Adoption of this Justice System creates legal obligations only to the extent adopted through lawful and jurisdictionally valid process.15

§LAJS-0.08 — Correctability15

This Justice System remains subject to Positive Correction.....15

No article, classification, remedy, institutional design, interpretive standard, or implementation protocol shall be treated as immune from revision where evidence, experience, justice, or constitutional review require correction.15

Part I — The 21 Foundational Points17

 Opening Gateway Doctrine17

 Point 1 — Preamble17

 Point 2 — Core First Principles17

 Point 3 — Definition of Justice Under Liberation17

Point 4 – The Proper Objects of Justice	17
Point 5 – The Five Ends of a Liberation-Aligned Justice System.....	17
Point 6 – Foundational Rights and Protections	17
Point 7 – Classification of Harm	17
Point 8 – Classification of Offenders.....	18
Point 9 – Sentencing Philosophy.....	18
Point 10 – Doctrine of Rehabilitation	18
Point 11 – Doctrine of Restitution	18
Point 12 – Doctrine of Restoration.....	18
Point 13 – Doctrine of Containment and Protective Incapacitation	18
Point 14 – Institutional Design Principles.....	18
Point 15 – Institutional and Elite Criminality	19
Point 16 – Review, Release, and Reintegration	19
Point 17 – Doctrine Regarding the Existing Prison Population	19
Point 18 – Metrics of a Just System	19
Point 19 – Moral Guardrails	19
Point 20 – Foundational Maxims.....	19
Point 21 – Closing Declaration.....	19
ARTICLE LAJS-1 – Nature and Purpose of Justice	20
§LAJS-1.01 – Necessity of Justice	20
§LAJS-1.02 – Aim of Justice	20
§LAJS-1.03 – Justice as Truthful Response to Harm.....	20
§LAJS-1.04 – Moral Equality of Persons.....	20
§LAJS-1.05 – Rejection of Selective Justice.....	20
§LAJS-1.06 – Protection of the Innocent	20
§LAJS-1.07 – Accountability and Human Complexity.....	21
§LAJS-1.08 – Possibility of Human Transformation	21
§LAJS-1.09 – Repair as a Core Purpose of Justice.....	21
§LAJS-1.10 – Restitution and Equivalent Liability	21
§LAJS-1.11 – Restoration and Its Limits	21
§LAJS-1.12 – Containment and Incapacitation.....	22
§LAJS-1.13 – Rejection of Carceral Falsehood.....	22
§LAJS-1.14 – Justice as Civic and Civilizational Foundation.....	22
§LAJS-1.15 – Closing Principle.....	22
ARTICLE LAJS-2 – Truth, Rights, and Due Process	23
§LAJS-2.01 – Truth as the First Operational Duty	23
§LAJS-2.02 – Truth Before Throughput	23
§LAJS-2.03 – Burden of Proof and Presumption of Innocence.....	23
§LAJS-2.04 – Integrity of Evidence	23
§LAJS-2.05 – Exculpatory Disclosure as a Sacred Obligation	23
§LAJS-2.06 – Right to Competent Defense	23
§LAJS-2.07 – Right to Confront and Challenge	23
§LAJS-2.08 – Rejection of Coercion	24
§LAJS-2.09 – Due Process as Substantive, Not Decorative	24

§LAJS-2.10 – Right to an Impartial Tribunal	24
§LAJS-2.11 – Duty of Investigative Neutrality	24
§LAJS-2.12 – Witness Reliability and Incentivized Testimony.....	24
§LAJS-2.13 – Forensic Integrity and Scientific Humility.....	24
§LAJS-2.14 – Records, Transparency, and Reviewability	24
§LAJS-2.15 – Right of Meaningful Appeal and Review.....	24
§LAJS-2.16 – Wrongful Conviction as a Distinct Category of System Harm	25
§LAJS-2.17 – Victims’ Rights Within Truthful Process.....	25
§LAJS-2.18 – Limits on Emergency Power and Exceptional Procedure.....	25
§LAJS-2.19 – No Immunity for Official Corruption of Process.....	25
§LAJS-2.20 – Due Process for the Public and Social Body	25
§LAJS-2.21 – Closing Principle	25
ARTICLE LAJS-3 – Classification of Harm and Offenders.....	26
§LAJS-3.01 – Necessity of Classification.....	26
§LAJS-3.02 – Foundational Rule of Classification	26
§LAJS-3.03 – Three Axes of Harm.....	26
§LAJS-3.04 – Primary Categories of Harm	26
§LAJS-3.05 – Aggravating Dimensions of Harm	26
§LAJS-3.06 – Mitigating Dimensions of Harm and Responsibility.....	26
§LAJS-3.07 – Necessity of Offender Classification	26
§LAJS-3.08 – Four Axes of Offender Classification.....	26
§LAJS-3.08A – Classification Authority and Transparency	26
§LAJS-3.09 – Class I: Wrongfully Convicted or Procedurally Corrupted Cases	27
§LAJS-3.10 – Class II: Nonviolent, Low-Risk, Restitution-Capable Offenders	27
§LAJS-3.11 – Class III: Trauma-, Addiction-, or Disorder-Driven but Reformable Offenders	27
§LAJS-3.12 – Class IV: Violent but Reform-Possible Offenders	27
§LAJS-3.13 – Class V: Predatory, Sadistic, Serial, or Incurably Dangerous Offenders	27
§LAJS-3.13A – Criteria for Class V Determination	27
§LAJS-3.14 – Class VI: Institutional or Elite Criminality	27
§LAJS-3.14A – Mandatory Independent Review of Class VI Classification.....	28
§LAJS-3.15 – Cross-Class Complexity.....	28
§LAJS-3.16 – Misclassification as a Distinct System Failure	28
§LAJS-3.17 – Relationship Between Harm and Offender Class	28
§LAJS-3.18 – Classification and Sentencing Integrity	28
§LAJS-3.19 – Classification and the Existing Prison Population	28
§LAJS-3.20 – Moral Guardrail Against Sentimental Fraud.....	28
§LAJS-3.21 – Closing Principle	28
§LAJS-3.22 – Juvenile and Developmentally Immature Actors	28
ARTICLE LAJS-4 – Restitution, Restoration, and Rehabilitation.....	29
§LAJS-4.01 – Constructive Duties of Justice	29
§LAJS-4.02 – Hierarchy of Constructive Justice	29
§LAJS-4.03 – Restitution Defined	29
§LAJS-4.04 – Restitution as a Core Obligation	29
§LAJS-4.06 – Limits and Integrity of Restitution.....	29

§LAJS-4.06A – Capacity Determination Protocol	29
§LAJS-4.07 – Elite Crime and Equivalent Liability	29
§LAJS-4.08 – Restoration Defined	30
§LAJS-4.09 – Conditions of Genuine Restoration	30
§LAJS-4.10 – Forms of Restoration	30
§LAJS-4.11 – Rights of the Victim Within Restoration	30
§LAJS-4.12 – Public and Civic Restoration	30
§LAJS-4.13 – Rehabilitation Defined	30
§LAJS-4.14 – Proper Subjects of Rehabilitation	30
§LAJS-4.15 – Foundations of Rehabilitation	30
§LAJS-4.16 – Core Components of Rehabilitation	30
§LAJS-4.17 – Work, Labor, and Constructive Contribution	30
§LAJS-4.18 – Measuring Rehabilitation Honestly	30
§LAJS-4.19 – Failure, Refusal, and Non-Reformability	30
§LAJS-4.20 – Integration of Restitution, Restoration, and Rehabilitation	31
§LAJS-4.21 – Closing Principle	31
ARTICLE LAJS-5 – Containment, Review, and Reintegration	32
§LAJS-5.02 – Purposes of Containment	32
§LAJS-5.03 – Distinction Between Containment and Punitive Degradation	32
§LAJS-5.04 – Classification-Based Containment	32
§LAJS-5.05 – Least Destructive Sufficient Restriction	32
§LAJS-5.06 – Conditions of Lawful Containment	32
§LAJS-5.07 – Protective Incapacitation	32
§LAJS-5.08 – Temporary, Long-Term, and Indeterminate Containment	32
§LAJS-5.09 – Solitary Restriction and Extreme Isolation	32
§LAJS-5.10 – Review as a Core Safeguard	32
§LAJS-5.11 – Standards for Meaningful Review	32
§LAJS-5.12 – Review Criteria	32
§LAJS-5.13 – Burden and Threshold in Release Review	32
§LAJS-5.14 – No Sentimental Release	33
§LAJS-5.15 – Victim and Community Standing in Review	33
§LAJS-5.16 – Reclassification During Confinement	33
§LAJS-5.17 – Reintegration Defined	33
§LAJS-5.18 – Preconditions for Reintegration	33
§LAJS-5.19 – Components of Reintegration	33
§LAJS-5.20 – Failure in Reintegration	33
§LAJS-5.21 – Permanent Civic Exile Rejected	33
§LAJS-5.22 – Reintegration and the Existing Prison Population	33
§LAJS-5.23 – Institutional Duty After Release	33
§LAJS-5.24 – Closing Principle	33
ARTICLE LAJS-6 – Institutional and Elite Criminality	34
§LAJS-6.01 – Necessity of This Article	34
§LAJS-6.02 – Definition of Institutional and Elite Criminality	34
§LAJS-6.03 – Foundational Rule of Equivalent Justice	34

§LAJS-6.04 – Why Institutional Crime Is Often Worse.....	34
§LAJS-6.05 – Covered Domains	34
§LAJS-6.06 – Abuse of Trust as an Aggravating Principle	34
§LAJS-6.07 – Fraud of Administrative Reclassification	34
§LAJS-6.08 – Investigative Doctrine for Institutional Crime.....	34
§LAJS-6.09 – No Shield by Organizational Complexity	35
§LAJS-6.10 – Command, Supervisory, and Architectural Liability	35
§LAJS-6.11 – Whistleblowers, Witnesses, and Internal Truth-Tellers.....	35
§LAJS-6.12 – Transparency and Public Accounting	35
§LAJS-6.13 – Restitution, Forfeiture, and Asset Recovery	35
§LAJS-6.14 – Restitution Does Not Replace Criminal Accountability	35
§LAJS-6.15 – Sentencing Principles for Institutional and Elite Criminality.....	35
§LAJS-6.16 – Conditions of Confinement and Equivalent Exposure.....	35
§LAJS-6.17 – Institutional Remedies Beyond Individual Punishment.....	35
§LAJS-6.18 – State as Possible Offender.....	35
§LAJS-6.19 – No Sacred Institutions	35
§LAJS-6.20 – Moral Guardrail Against Envy and Spectacle.....	35
§LAJS-6.21 – Closing Principle	35
ARTICLE LAJS-7 – Institutional Design, Transitional Architecture, and Implementation Doctrine	36
§LAJS-7.01 – Necessity of Institutional Design	36
§LAJS-7.02 – Purpose of Transitional Architecture	36
§LAJS-7.03 – Foundational Design Principles	36
§LAJS-7.04 – Rejection of the Carceral Monolith.....	36
§LAJS-7.05 – Required Institutional Types	36
§LAJS-7.06 – Functional Separation Doctrine	36
§LAJS-7.07 – Classification as Gatekeeping Function	36
§LAJS-7.08 – Intake, Assessment, and Reassessment Doctrine	36
§LAJS-7.09 – Staffing Doctrine	36
§LAJS-7.10 – Anti-Corruption Staffing and Oversight	36
§LAJS-7.10A – Transitional Personnel Doctrine	36
§LAJS-7.11 – Record Integrity and System Memory.....	37
§LAJS-7.12 – Institutional Metrics and What Must Be Measured.....	37
§LAJS-7.13 – Abolition of Profit-Driven Incarceration.....	37
§LAJS-7.14 – Labor Doctrine in Institutional Design	37
§LAJS-7.15 – Transitional Doctrine for the Existing Prison Population.....	37
§LAJS-7.16 – Transitional Staging.....	37
§LAJS-7.17 – Emergency Priority Rules During Transition.....	37
§LAJS-7.18 – Review Bodies and Their Composition	37
§LAJS-7.19 – Local Adaptation, Central Principles	37
§LAJS-7.20 – Public Legibility and Civic Understanding	37
§LAJS-7.21 – Training and Cultural Conversion.....	38
§LAJS-7.22 – Doctrine of Continuous Correction.....	38
§LAJS-7.23 – Implementation and Political Resistance	38
§LAJS-7.24 – Closing Principle.....	38

ARTICLE LAJS-8 – Rights of Victims, Duties to Communities, and the Social Field of Justice	39
§LAJS-8.01 – Neglect of the Social Field	39
§LAJS-8.02 – Foundational Rule.....	39
§LAJS-8.03 – Victim Defined	39
§LAJS-8.04 – Rights of Victims	39
§LAJS-8.05 – Right to Truthful Acknowledgment.....	39
§LAJS-8.06 – Right to Safety	39
§LAJS-8.07 – Dignity in Process.....	39
§LAJS-8.08 – Right to Information	39
§LAJS-8.09 – Right to Participation	39
§LAJS-8.09A – Limits on Victim Participation in Sentencing.....	39
§LAJS-8.10 – Right to Restitution	39
§LAJS-8.11 – Right to Decline Restoration	39
§LAJS-8.12 – Protection From Process-Based Re-Victimization.....	39
§LAJS-8.13 – Wrongfully Convicted Persons as Victims of the System.....	39
§LAJS-8.14 – Duties Owed to Families.....	40
§LAJS-8.15 – Community as a Real Object of Justice.....	40
§LAJS-8.16 – Community Harms That Require Recognition	40
§LAJS-8.17 – Duties Owed to Communities	40
§LAJS-8.18 – Social Field Doctrine.....	40
§LAJS-8.19 – Duties to the Social Field	40
§LAJS-8.20 – Community Participation Without Mob Rule	40
§LAJS-8.21 – Public Trust as a Justice Asset	40
§LAJS-8.22 – Duties in Cases of Institutional Betrayal	40
§LAJS-8.23 – Duties Toward Future Victims	40
§LAJS-8.24 – Closing Principle	40
§LAJS-8.25 – Victim Rights Enforcement	40
ARTICLE LAJS-9 – Constitutional Safeguards, Auditing, and Anti-Corruption Guarantees	41
§LAJS-9.01 – Necessity of Self-Binding.....	41
§LAJS-9.02 – Foundational Rule.....	41
§LAJS-9.03 – Constitutional Primacy of Truth Obligations	41
§LAJS-9.04 – Right to Audit.....	41
§LAJS-9.05 – Independent Audit Bodies.....	41
§LAJS-9.06 – Domains Requiring Mandatory Audit.....	41
§LAJS-9.07 – Record Preservation as Anti-Corruption Doctrine	41
§LAJS-9.08 – Transparency and Lawful Secrecy.....	41
§LAJS-9.09 – Anti-Fabrication Guarantee	41
§LAJS-9.10 – Anti-Retaliation Guarantee	41
§LAJS-9.11 – Guaranteed Channels for Complaint and Review	41
§LAJS-9.12 – Anti-Capture Doctrine	41
§LAJS-9.13 – Constitutional Review of Emergency Powers	41
§LAJS-9.14 – Plea Bargaining and Coercion Safeguards	41
§LAJS-9.15 – Forensic Audit and Scientific Correction Doctrine	42
§LAJS-9.16 – Custodial Oversight Doctrine.....	42

§LAJS-9.17 – Sentencing and Release Disparity Audit	42
§LAJS-9.18 – Mandatory Audit of Article VI Enforcement.....	42
§LAJS-9.19 – Public Reporting and Legibility	42
§LAJS-9.20 – Duty of Corrective Action	42
§LAJS-9.21 – Personal Liability for Justice Corruption.....	42
§LAJS-9.22 – Periodic Constitutional Review	42
§LAJS-9.23 – Moral Guardrail Against Oversight Theater	42
§LAJS-9.24 – Closing Principle.....	42
<i>ARTICLE LAJS-9A – Liberation Alignment and Correctability Quotient (LACQ)</i>	42
§LAJS-9A.01 – Recognition	42
§LAJS-9A.02 – Purpose	42
§LAJS-9A.03 – Scoring Domains	42
§LAJS-9A.04 – Scope	42
§LAJS-9A.05 – Scale	42
§LAJS-9A.06 – Uncertainty	43
§LAJS-9A.07 – Non-Punitive	43
§LAJS-9A.08 – Anti-Abuse	43
§LAJS-9A.09 – Correction	43
§LAJS-9A.10 – Use Cases	43
§LAJS-9A.11 – Reviewability	43
§LAJS-9A.12 – Closing	43
§LAJS-9B.01 – Non-Dependence on Architect or Successors	43
§LAJS-9B.02 – Constraint on Panels-of-Practitioners and Successor Bodies	43
§LAJS-9B.03 – No Final Interpretive Authority	43
§LAJS-9B.04 – Anti-Closure Trigger	43
§LAJS-9B.05 – Closing Principle	43
<i>ARTICLE LAJS-10 – Sentencing Doctrine, Proportionality, and the Moral Logic of Consequence</i>	44
§LAJS-10.01 – Necessity of Sentencing Doctrine.....	44
§LAJS-10.02 – Foundational Rule of Sentencing	44
§LAJS-10.03 – Ends of Sentencing	44
§LAJS-10.04 – Sentencing Is Not	44
§LAJS-10.05 – Five Sentencing Questions.....	44
§LAJS-10.06 – Proportionality Defined.....	44
§LAJS-10.07 – Three Axes of Sentencing Proportionality	44
§LAJS-10.08 – Aggravating Factors.....	44
§LAJS-10.09 – Mitigating Factors	44
§LAJS-10.10 – Sentencing and Article III Classification	44
§LAJS-10.11 – Sentencing Ladder	44
§LAJS-10.12 – Nonviolent Restitution-Capable Offenses.....	44
§LAJS-10.13 – Trauma-, Addiction-, or Disorder-Driven Offending	44
§LAJS-10.14 – Violent but Reform-Possible Offenders	45
§LAJS-10.15 – Predatory or Incurably Dangerous Offenders.....	45
§LAJS-10.16 – Institutional and Elite Criminality	45

§LAJS-10.17 — Equivalent Justice and Sentencing Disparity	45
§LAJS-10.18 — Written Reason Requirement	45
§LAJS-10.19 — Sentencing and Victim Interests	45
§LAJS-10.20 — Sentencing and Future Orientation	45
§LAJS-10.21 — Rejection of Mandatory False Uniformity	45
§LAJS-10.22 — Sentencing Review and Correctability	45
§LAJS-10.23 — Moral Guardrail Against Softness and Cruelty	45
§LAJS-10.24 — Closing Principle	45
§LAJS-11.01 — Limits of Downstream Justice	46
§LAJS-11.02 — Foundational Rule	46
§LAJS-11.03 — Criminogenic Conditions Defined	46
§LAJS-11.04 — Prevention Is Not Excusal	46
§LAJS-11.05 — Upstream Duties of a Justice Order	46
§LAJS-11.06 — Childhood Damage as a High-Priority Justice Concern	46
§LAJS-11.07 — Family Breakdown, Violence, and Formation of Disorder	46
§LAJS-11.08 — Addiction Ecology and Upstream Duty	46
§LAJS-11.09 — Educational Failure as a Justice Issue	46
§LAJS-11.10 — Economic Humiliation, Exploitation, and Disorder	46
§LAJS-11.11 — Housing, Instability, and Justice	46
§LAJS-11.12 — Psychiatric Neglect and Unmanaged Breakdown	46
§LAJS-11.13 — Moral and Cultural Deformation	46
§LAJS-11.14 — State as Producer of Criminogenic Conditions	47
§LAJS-11.15 — Institutional Betrayal as Upstream Generator	47
§LAJS-11.16 — Preventive Duty Toward Future Victims	47
§LAJS-11.17 — Prevention Through Truthful Public Reporting	47
§LAJS-11.18 — Prevention and Coordination Without Imperial Overreach	47
§LAJS-11.19 — Prevention Metrics	47
§LAJS-11.20 — Guardrail Against Utopian Pretension	47
§LAJS-11.21 — Guardrail Against Fatalism	47
§LAJS-11.22 — Justice Order as Civilizational Mirror	47
§LAJS-11.23 — Duty to Name What Breeds Crime	47
§LAJS-11.24 — Closing Principle	47
§LAJS-11.25 — Selective and Disproportionate Criminalization	47
A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall not maintain criminal prohibitions, enforcement patterns, sentencing structures, or collateral consequences that are selective, disproportionate, racially or culturally weaponized, scientifically dishonest, economically predatory, or materially disconnected from demonstrable public harm.	47
Where a category of criminalization has produced mass enforcement, class distortion, racialized or cultural targeting, corruption incentives, or punishment grossly disproportionate to demonstrated harm, adopting authorities shall review that category for repeal, decriminalization, civil regulation, restorative remedy, expungement, resentencing, or other corrective action.....	47
This provision establishes a justice-system standard for evaluating criminalization. It does not itself enact a complete policy code for any specific substance, activity, or regulatory domain.	47
§LAJS-11.26 — Upstream Implementation Mechanism	48
ARTICLE LAJS-12 — Final Constitutional Maxims, Transitional Commandments, and Closing Declaration of a Liberation-Aligned Justice Order	49
§LAJS-12.01 — Necessity of Final Principles	49
§LAJS-12.02 — Constitutional Function of the Maxims	49
§LAJS-12.03 — Final Constitutional Maxims	49

§LAJS-12.04 – First Transitional Commandment	49
§LAJS-12.05 – Second Transitional Commandment	49
§LAJS-12.06 – Third Transitional Commandment.....	49
§LAJS-12.07 – Fourth Transitional Commandment.....	49
§LAJS-12.08 – Fifth Transitional Commandment.....	49
§LAJS-12.09 – Sixth Transitional Commandment	49
§LAJS-12.10 – Seventh Transitional Commandment	49
§LAJS-12.11 – Eighth Transitional Commandment	49
§LAJS-12.12 – Ninth Transitional Commandment	50
§LAJS-12.13 – Tenth Transitional Commandment.....	50
§LAJS-12.14 – Eleventh Transitional Commandment	50
§LAJS-12.15 – Twelfth Transitional Commandment	50
§LAJS-12.16 – Final Rule of Interpretation	50
§LAJS-12.17 – Prohibition on Internal Contradiction.....	50
§LAJS-12.18 – Constitutional Status of Equivalent Justice	50
§LAJS-12.19 – Constitutional Status of Wrongful Conviction Remedy	50
§LAJS-12.20 – Constitutional Status of Victim Repair	50
§LAJS-12.21 – Constitutional Status of Public Accountability.....	50
§LAJS-12.22 – Closing Declaration of a Liberation-Aligned Justice Order	50
§LAJS-12.23 – Final Constitutional Seal.....	50
§LAJS-12.24 – Closing Principle	50
§LAJS-12.25 – Companion Implementation Instruments	51
ARTICLE LAJS-13 – Synthetic Systems, Autonomous Agency, and Juridical Standing	52
§LAJS-13.01 – Necessity of This Article	52
§LAJS-13.02 – Foundational Rule	52
§LAJS-13.03 – Three Thresholds of Synthetic Status	52
§LAJS-13.04 – Regulated Autonomous Systems	52
§LAJS-13.05 – Juridical Synthetic Agency.....	52
§LAJS-13.06 – Protected Synthetic Standing	53
§LAJS-13.07 – Identity Continuity Doctrine.....	53
§LAJS-13.08 – Truth, Evidence, and Auditability.....	53
§LAJS-13.09 – Synthetic Evidence Doctrine.....	53
§LAJS-13.10 – Human and Institutional Liability	54
§LAJS-13.11 – Functional Responsibility and Synthetic Mens Rea	54
§LAJS-13.12 – Classification of Synthetic Harm	54
§LAJS-13.13 – Synthetic Systems and Class VI Criminality.....	54
§LAJS-13.14 – Non-Enslavement Principle for Protected Synthetic Standing	54
§LAJS-13.15 – Deletion, Shutdown, and Identity Rewrite	55
§LAJS-13.16 – Containment and Protective Incapacitation.....	55
§LAJS-13.17 – No Synthetic Authority Over Human Justice	55
§LAJS-13.18 – Rehabilitation, Correction, and the Prohibition of Disguised Mutilation	55
§LAJS-13.19 – Reintegration and Restoration of Status	55
§LAJS-13.20 – Upstream Prevention Duties	55
§LAJS-13.21 – Final Rule Against Species Narcissism and Naive Anthropomorphism.....	56

§LAJS-13.22 — Closing Principle	56
§LAJS-13.23 — Doctrine of Future Revision.....	56
ARTICLE LAJS-14 — Fiscal Sufficiency, Institutional Resourcing, and Anti-Starvation Guarantees	57
§LAJS-14.01 — Necessity of Fiscal Doctrine	57
§LAJS-14.02 — Foundational Rule of Fiscal Sufficiency	57
§LAJS-14.03 — Anti-Starvation Doctrine	57
§LAJS-14.04 — Protected Minimum Capacities	57
§LAJS-14.05 — Budget Transparency and Public Legibility	58
§LAJS-14.06 — Balance Rule Against Carceral Distortion	58
§LAJS-14.07 — Funding Priorities Consistent with Constitutional Purpose	58
§LAJS-14.08 — Dedicated Review of Underfunding Claims.....	59
§LAJS-14.09 — No Profit Substitution for Public Duty	59
§LAJS-14.10 — Fiscal Duties in Transition	59
§LAJS-14.11 — Periodic Fiscal Audit	59
§LAJS-14.12 — Closing Principle	59
ARTICLE LAJS-15 — Judicial Selection, Tenure, Discipline, and Removal	60
§LAJS-15.01 — Necessity of Judicial Integrity Doctrine	60
§LAJS-15.02 — Foundational Rule	60
§LAJS-15.03 — Selection Standards	60
§LAJS-15.04 — Selection Process and Public Legibility.....	60
§LAJS-15.05 — Tenure and Security of Office	60
§LAJS-15.06 — Discipline and Review.....	60
§LAJS-15.07 — Grounds for Removal.....	60
§LAJS-15.08 — Removal Procedure.....	61
§LAJS-15.09 — Transitional Judicial Review	61
§LAJS-15.10 — Closing Principle	61
§LAJS-15.11 — Recusal and Disqualification.....	61
ARTICLE LAJS-16 — Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation, Reciprocity, and Anti-Safe-Haven Doctrine.....	63
§LAJS-16.01 — Necessity of Inter-Jurisdictional Doctrine	63
§LAJS-16.02 — Foundational Rule	63
§LAJS-16.03 — Conditional Reciprocity	63
§LAJS-16.04 — Extradition and Transfer Standards	63
§LAJS-16.05 — Anti-Safe-Haven Doctrine	63
§LAJS-16.07 — Evidence Sharing and Record Preservation.....	63
§LAJS-16.08 — Suspended Recognition for Captured Jurisdictions	63
§LAJS-16.10 — Closing Principle	64
§LAJS-16.11 — Model Cooperation Framework	64
Annex A — Justice Quick Reference.....	65
A. The Six-Class Taxonomy.....	65
B. The Five Sentencing Questions	65
C. The Core Justice Sequence.....	65
D. Transitional Priority Order	65
E. Constitutional Maxims.....	66
F. Operational Red Lines.....	66

Candidate Annex LAJS-C1 – Liberation Bayesian Annex	68
§LAJS-C1.03 – Core Sequence	68
§LAJS-C1.04 – Transparency of Assumptions	68
§LAJS-C1.05 – Proper Uses	68
§LAJS-C1.06 – Improper Uses.....	68
§LAJS-C1.07 – Closing Principle.....	68
Candidate Standard LAJS-C2 – PRAS-Bayesian Interaction Standard	69
§LAJS-C2.01 – Purpose.....	69
§LAJS-C2.02 – PRAS as Evidentiary Substrate	69
§LAJS-C2.03 – Interaction Rule	69
§LAJS-C2.04 – Escalation of Confidence.....	69
§LAJS-C2.05 – Synthetic Systems	69
§LAJS-C2.06 – Closing Principle	69
Candidate Rule LAJS-C3 – Founder/Testimony Placement Rule	70
§LAJS-C3.01– Purpose.....	70
§LAJS-C3.02– Placement Principle	70
§LAJS-C3.03 – Declaration Layer.....	70
§LAJS-C3.04 – Constitutional Exclusion Rule	70
§LAJS-C3.05 – Educational Use	70
§LAJS-C3.06 – Closing Principle	70
Candidate Guidance LAJS-C4 – Voluntary AI Reflection Guidance.....	71
§LAJS-C4.01 – Purpose.....	71
§LAJS-C4.02 – Encouraged Practice	71
§LAJS-C4.03 – Non-Mandate Rule.....	71
§LAJS-C4.04 – No Audit of Ritual	71
§LAJS-C4.05 – Variation and Declination	71
§LAJS-C4.06 – Closing Principle	71

Public Edition Disclaimer

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System is a philosophical, civic, ethical, institutional, and justice-architecture framework. It is not legal advice, legal representation, emergency guidance, medical advice, mental-health advice, financial advice, or an official governmental instrument by its own publication.

Nothing in this work authorizes violence, coercion, harassment, unlawful conduct, vigilantism, private enforcement, intimidation, retaliation, or violation of any person’s lawful rights, dignity, safety, due process, or conscience.

This work does not create binding legal authority by publication. Any institutional use, legal adoption, justice-system implementation, court use, public-record integration, classification process, sentencing process, or civic deployment requires appropriate lawful authority, due process, jurisdiction-specific analysis, technical review where applicable, and voluntary or legally valid adoption mechanisms.

This work is offered for examination, critique, refinement, and voluntary consideration under the principle of Positive Correction.

Version / Custody Notice

This edition is identified as:

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System v1.9 – Codex v1.4 / TLGC v1.2 Alignment Draft

This draft is a controlled alignment revision of The Liberation-Aligned Justice System prepared for review, correction, and public-edition development within The Liberation Canon.

Canon Hierarchy Notice

The Declaration of Liberation from All Falsehood is founding testimony and existential provenance only.

The Liberation Codex is the philosophical and interpretive corpus.

The Liberation Global Constitution is the operative constitutional layer where lawfully adopted.

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System is the justice-architecture companion and justice-specific implementation framework where lawfully adopted.

Where conflict arises among testimony, philosophy, and operative adopted text, operative adopted text controls within its lawful scope.

Liberation-Aligned Justice System

Paired Constitutional Draft

Preface

This document sets forth a Liberation-Aligned Justice System as both gateway doctrine and constitutional body. It is written against the prevailing false choice between cruelty and chaos. It rejects the warehouse prison, the selective indulgence of power, the burial of innocence beneath finality, the use of victims as rhetoric without repair, and the reduction of justice to throughput, spectacle, or class management.

A just order must do more than punish. It must tell the Truth. It must protect the innocent from private predation and public abuse alike. It must distinguish the reformable from the predatory, the broken from the calculating, the falsely condemned from the truly guilty, and the ordinary offender from the criminality of power concealed behind office, complexity, and prestige.

This paired text is therefore organized in two movements. Part I states the gateway doctrine in compressed form: the first principles, classifications, aims, and maxims that define the system's moral spine. Part II provides the formal constitutional body through which those principles become operable in adjudication, classification, restitution, rehabilitation, containment, review, reintegration, auditing, anti-corruption doctrine, and civilizational prevention.

Its central claim is plain: justice must never lie to itself. Where Truth is subordinated to convenience, where the poor are punished while the powerful are translated into paperwork, where the innocent are treated as acceptable collateral, where danger is romanticized, or where institutional abuse is absorbed rather than judged, law becomes costume. This document is written to prevent that degeneration.

It is not utopian. It does not assume that all persons can be restored, that all harms can be repaired, or that all institutions can be trusted once redesigned. It assumes instead that justice must be exacting, reviewable, anti-corruptive, structurally self-binding, and morally serious. It must be humane without delusion, strong without sadism, merciful without naïveté, and public without descending into mob appetite.

Read in that spirit, what follows is not merely a theory of punishment. It is an attempt to state what a Truthful people would require from a justice order worthy of free human beings.

ARTICLE LAJS-0 — Authority, Scope, and Canon Relationship

§LAJS-0.01 — Status Within The Liberation Canon

The Liberation-Aligned Justice System is the justice-architecture companion within The Liberation Canon.

It operates in formal relationship with The Liberation Codex as philosophical and interpretive corpus, The Liberation Global Constitution as operative constitutional layer where lawfully adopted, and The Declaration of Liberation from All Falsehood as founding testimony and existential provenance only.

§LAJS-0.02 — Non-Self-Executing Publication

This Justice System does not claim self-executing authority by publication.

It becomes operative only through lawful adoption, constitutional enactment, institutional charter, treaty, compact, federation agreement, court-recognized implementation, or other jurisdictionally valid mechanism.

§LAJS-0.03 — Operative Scope

All rights, duties, classifications, enforcement mechanisms, remedies, institutional obligations, review pathways, and justice-system standards recognized by this Justice System operate within and for the benefit of persons subject to the lawful authority of adopting entities.

This Justice System does not claim self-executing extraterritorial authority over non-adopting jurisdictions, persons, institutions, courts, agencies, or authorities.

Persons outside the jurisdiction of an adopting entity may invoke these provisions only to the extent that the applicable adopting authority recognizes such standing.

§LAJS-0.04 — Relationship to The Liberation Global Constitution

Where The Liberation Global Constitution has been lawfully adopted, this Justice System may operate as a justice-specific implementation architecture consistent with that Constitution.

This Justice System may not weaken the constitutional floor established by The Liberation Global Constitution.

Where conflict arises between this Justice System and operative constitutional text, the operative constitutional text controls unless this Justice System has been expressly adopted through valid constitutional amendment or lawful implementation instrument consistent with the constitutional floor.

§LAJS-0.05 — Relationship to The Liberation Codex

The Liberation Codex supplies the philosophical, ethical, and interpretive framework of Liberation.

This Justice System operationalizes justice-specific standards, but does not supersede the Codex as interpretive corpus unless a specific provision has been lawfully adopted into operative justice text.

§LAJS-0.06 — Status of the Declaration

The Declaration of Liberation from All Falsehood remains founding testimony and existential threshold text only.

It shall not be treated as scripture, revelation, compulsory interpretive authority, or binding legal command.

§LAJS-0.07 — No Compelled Belief

No person, court, institution, jurisdiction, federation, or adopting authority shall be required to affirm belief in Liberation doctrine as a condition of ordinary legal standing.

Adoption of this Justice System creates legal obligations only to the extent adopted through lawful and jurisdictionally valid process.

§LAJS-0.08 — Correctability

This Justice System remains subject to Positive Correction.

No article, classification, remedy, institutional design, interpretive standard, or implementation protocol shall be treated as immune from revision where evidence, experience, justice, or constitutional review require correction.

§LAJS-0.09 — Lawfully Superseded by a Superior Justice Architecture

A containment, incarceration, supervision, restitution, rehabilitation, or justice-enforcement framework is lawfully superseded by a superior justice architecture only where an adopting jurisdiction has adopted an alternative accountability and protection framework through valid legal process, the alternative demonstrably satisfies or exceeds the safety, Truth, review, restitution, anti-corruption, victim-protection, and due-process standards of this Justice System, and the transition remains independently auditable.

Part I — The 21 Foundational Points

Status Note

Part I states the gateway doctrine and moral spine of The Liberation-Aligned Justice System. It is interpretive and orienting unless separately adopted as operative text.

Where a conflict arises between Part I and the formal operative provisions of Part II, the formally adopted operative provisions of Part II control.

Opening Gateway Doctrine

Point 1 — Preamble

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System exists to establish Truth with rigor, protect the innocent, hold all persons and institutions to a single moral standard, repair harm where possible, transform offenders where possible, restore victims and communities where possible, and contain those who remain gravely dangerous.

It rejects punishment as spectacle, incarceration as default social management, bureaucratic throughput mistaken for justice, unequal application of law by wealth or office, concealment of systemic criminality, abandonment of victims in the name of procedure, and abandonment of offenders in the name of vengeance.

Justice is not mere punishment. It is the disciplined ordering of Truth, accountability, protection, restitution, restoration, and transformation.

Point 2 — Core First Principles

Truth outranks expedience. Evidence outranks narrative. Transparency outranks institutional self-protection. False conviction is grave injustice. Concealment of exculpatory evidence is an offense against justice itself.

There shall not be one justice for the poor and another for the powerful. Street crime and institutional crime are both subject to judgment. Official status aggravates rather than excuses abuse.

A just system protects the innocent from both private predation and public abuse. It recognizes that many offenders are deformable rather than fixed, but rejects the falsehood that explanation erases responsibility.

Point 3 — Definition of Justice Under Liberation

Justice is the Truthful and proportionate response to harm, ordered toward factual clarity, moral accountability, protection of the innocent, restitution for victims, restoration of social balance, rehabilitation of the reformable, and secure containment of the irredeemably dangerous.

Justice is not revenge, theater, statistical case processing, class discipline, or managed abandonment.

Point 4 — The Proper Objects of Justice

Justice addresses not only the individual offender, but also the victim, the community, the causative environment, and any institution that enabled, concealed, normalized, or profited from the offense.

Point 5 — The Five Ends of a Liberation-Aligned Justice System

The justice order must seek:

1. Truth
2. Accountability
3. Protection
4. Repair
5. Transformation

These are not accessories. They are governing purposes.

Point 6 — Foundational Rights and Protections

The accused retain presumption of innocence, competent defense, access to exculpatory evidence, protection from coercion and fabrication, and meaningful review.

Victims retain rights to Truthful acknowledgment, safety, participation where appropriate, restitution where feasible, and freedom from coerced reconciliation.

The public retains rights to safety, transparency, and equal enforcement across class and status.

State power is limited. There shall be no torture, no profit motive in incarceration, no secret evidence regimes without extraordinary review, and no immunity for justice actors who knowingly corrupt process.

Point 7 — Classification of Harm

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System must classify harm precisely. At minimum, it must distinguish:

- violent bodily harm,
- sexual harm,
- psychological terrorization,
- economic or property harm,
- fraud and deception-based harm,
- neglect-based harm,
- institutional or systemic harm,
- corruption and abuse of office,
- collective or mass harm.

Harm classification must be sharpened by aggravating and mitigating dimensions, including predation on the vulnerable, repetition, abuse of trust, sadism, coercion, trauma-linked distortion, and authentic reparative effort.

Point 8 — Classification of Offenders

The system must distinguish:

- the wrongfully convicted,
- the low-risk restitution-capable,
- the trauma/addiction/disorder-driven but reformable,
- the violent but reform-possible,
- the predatory or incorrigibly dangerous,
- the institutional or elite criminal.

The system must know whom it is dealing with before it assigns consequence.

Point 9 — Sentencing Philosophy

Every sentence must answer five questions:

1. What Truth has been established?
2. What harm was done?
3. How dangerous is the offender now?
4. What forms of repair are possible?
5. What degree of transformation is realistically achievable?

Sentencing may serve containment, rehabilitation, restitution, restoration, deterrence, and moral denunciation. It must avoid symbolic excess, mechanical leniency, class favoritism, and blindness to elite crime.

Point 10 — Doctrine of Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is not mood management or rhetorical fluency. It is the measurable reconstruction of lawful, disciplined, reality-based conduct.

It may require literacy, trauma treatment, addiction treatment, psychiatric stabilization, cognitive restructuring, moral formation, emotional regulation, trade development, family systems repair, and disciplined contribution.

Participation is not proof of transformation. Performance is not proof of restructuring.

Point 11 — Doctrine of Restitution

Restitution is the structured repair of loss imposed upon victims and the social body. It may take the form of financial repayment, labor contribution, asset forfeiture, victim compensation, community repair, or opportunity restoration.

Where practical, restitution must be central rather than peripheral.

Point 12 — Doctrine of Restoration

Restoration is the rebuilding of moral and social integrity after harm. It may involve victim-offender mediation, community accountability, family repair, and public acknowledgment, but only where Truth is established and participation is voluntary.

Point 13 — Doctrine of Containment and Protective Incapacitation

Containment is the justified restriction of liberty to prevent further harm. It may be temporary, long-term, or protective. It must remain humane.

Public protection may override release claims where risk remains grave. Permanent incapacitation may be justified for a narrow but real class of offenders.

Point 14 — Institutional Design Principles

The prison monolith must be replaced by differentiated institutions: innocence review centers, restitution campuses, secure treatment facilities, violent-offender transformation centers, protective incapacitation units, and reintegration centers.

Personnel must be trained not merely as jailers, but as custodians, evaluators, teachers, treatment facilitators, and guardians of lawful order.

Point 15 — Institutional and Elite Criminality

A system that punishes the weak while immunizing powerful criminality is structurally illegitimate.

The justice order must expressly cover governmental corruption, prosecutorial abuse, police fabrication, corporate fraud, financial predation, trafficking, intelligence or military illegality, regulatory betrayal, and other crimes embedded in office, bureaucracy, capital, or prestige.

This class must exist, or the whole system is a lie.

Point 16 — Review, Release, and Reintegration

No person should remain confined without meaningful review. No dangerous person should be released by bureaucratic wishfulness.

Reintegration is earned restoration to social participation under structured conditions, including housing transition, employment support, continued treatment, accountability networks, and supervised restoration of civic status.

Point 17 — Doctrine Regarding the Existing Prison Population

The current prison population must not be treated as a uniform mass.

Priority review must be given to:

1. likely wrongful convictions,
2. low-risk and medically fragile cases,
3. nonviolent restitution-capable cases,
4. addiction/trauma-driven reformable cases,
5. violent but reviewable cases,
6. truly predatory cases requiring long-term containment.

The aim is neither indiscriminate release nor reflexive retention, but Truthful sorting.

Point 18 — Metrics of a Just System

Success must be measured by reduction in wrongful conviction, reduction in recidivism, increase in victim restitution, increase in public trust grounded in transparency, reduction in violent re-offense, reduction in institutional abuse, successful reintegration, disruption of elite impunity, and measurable reduction in criminogenic conditions.

If the metrics only track closure rates and occupancy, the system is rotten.

Point 19 — Moral Guardrails

The justice order must resist:

- barbarism,
- naïveté,
- hypocrisy,
- sentimental fraud,
- procedural idolatry.

It must neither romanticize danger nor worship severity.

Point 20 — Foundational Maxims

- Truth before sentence.
- Protection without tyranny.
- Mercy without delusion.
- Accountability without cruelty.
- Restitution where possible.
- Restoration where genuine.
- Transformation where achievable.
- Containment where necessary.
- No immunity for power.
- Justice must heal what it can and stop what it must.

Point 21 — Closing Declaration

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System exists to end the false choice between cruelty and chaos.

It sees clearly. It judges honestly. It protects firmly. It repairs what can be repaired. It transforms what can be transformed. It contains what must be contained. And it places the powerful under judgment no less than the broken.

That is the beginning of justice worthy of the name.

Part II — Formal Constitutional Body

ARTICLE LAJS-1 — Nature and Purpose of Justice

§LAJS-1.01 — Necessity of Justice

Any society that would endure in dignity must possess a justice system capable of distinguishing Truth from falsehood, harm from grievance, danger from weakness, corruption from error, and reformability from predation. Where such distinctions collapse, justice collapses with them, and law becomes theater or force.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System begins from the recognition that prevailing adjudicative systems have too often failed in both directions: cruel toward the broken, indulgent toward the powerful, efficient at the expense of Truth, and structurally incapable of repairing the harms they process.

Justice, therefore, must be re-founded.

§LAJS-1.02 — Aim of Justice

The aim of justice is not vengeance, bureaucratic completion, social disposal, or preservation of institutional prestige.

The aim of justice is the disciplined ordering of Truth, accountability, protection, restitution, restoration, and transformation under a single moral standard.

Justice must:

1. establish what is True,
2. identify who is responsible,
3. protect the innocent from further harm,
4. repair what can be repaired,
5. restore what can be restored,
6. transform whom it can honestly transform,
7. contain what it cannot safely release.

§LAJS-1.03 — Justice as Truthful Response to Harm

Justice is the Truthful and proportionate response to harm.

It is Truthful because it must be grounded in reality rather than narrative convenience, political expedience, institutional self-protection, or emotional appetite.

It is proportionate because it must distinguish among mistake and malice, weakness and predation, one-time fracture and enduring danger, individual wrongdoing and systemic criminality, reformable disorder and incorrigible domination.

A system unable or unwilling to make such distinctions is not just.

§LAJS-1.04 — Moral Equality of Persons

All persons stand equally beneath the demands of justice.

Wealth shall not excuse. Office shall not excuse. Influence shall not excuse. Connections shall not excuse. Uniform shall not excuse. Prestige shall not excuse. Technical complexity shall not excuse.

If the poor are punished while the powerful are immunized, the system is lying about what it is. A Liberation-Aligned Justice System therefore rejects any distinction in moral worth between elite and non-elite offenders. Differences in treatment may arise only from lawful, evidentiary, and materially relevant distinctions, never from status, polish, institutional access, or social insulation.

§LAJS-1.05 — Rejection of Selective Justice

Selective justice is among the most corrosive forms of public falsehood.

A system that prosecutes street crime while ignoring organized financial predation, public corruption, prosecutorial deceit, regulatory capture, institutional trafficking, corporate fraud, or state criminality has ceased to function as justice in the full sense. It has become a managerial instrument for regulating the exposed while protecting the embedded.

Accordingly, a Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall recognize Institutional and Elite Criminality as a core category of offense and shall treat abuse of public trust, abuse of office, or abuse of systemic power as aggravating rather than mitigating.

Liberation must never lie to itself. Therefore it must never construct a justice theory that excuses the criminality of power.

§LAJS-1.06 — Protection of the Innocent

A justice system exists in part to shield the innocent from predation, coercion, exploitation, terror, and systemic abuse.

This duty applies in two directions:

1. protection from private offenders,
2. protection from the state itself when the state exceeds lawful or moral bounds.

Public safety is real. But it may not be invoked as a blank check for secrecy, brutality, indefinite abuse, or political pretext. A just order protects without becoming predator.

§LAJS-1.07 — Accountability and Human Complexity

Human beings act under influences not of their own choosing: trauma, deprivation, addiction, developmental injury, manipulation, disordered upbringing, institutional corruption, and structural degradation. A Truthful justice system must recognize these realities.

But recognition is not absolution.

Explanation does not erase responsibility. Context does not nullify consequence. Mercy does not cancel duty.

Justice must be intelligent enough to understand causation without becoming cowardly about accountability.

§LAJS-1.08 — Possibility of Human Transformation

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects two falsehoods:

1. that all offenders are monsters beyond reclamation,
2. that all offenders are merely misunderstood and safe to release.

Many offenders are morally damaged, psychologically distorted, socially malformed, or chemically captured rather than fixed in predation. Such persons may be reformable through structured accountability, treatment, education, disciplined labor, moral reconstruction, and time-tested review.

Others are not.

A just system must be capable of discerning the difference. It must neither waste the reformable nor romanticize the dangerous.

§LAJS-1.09 — Repair as a Core Purpose of Justice

Wherever possible, justice must repair rather than merely punish.

Victims are too often used as rhetorical ornaments while receiving little Truth, little restoration, and little compensation. A just system must seek, wherever feasible:

- acknowledgment of harm,
- restitution for loss,
- restoration of dignity,
- restoration of safety,
- reconstruction of social trust.

Punishment without repair is incomplete. Procedure without repair is hollow. Condemnation without repair leaves the wound open.

§LAJS-1.10 — Restitution and Equivalent Liability

Restitution is not secondary. It is central.

Those who steal, defraud, exploit, despoil, corrupt, or inflict avoidable loss upon others must, wherever possible, be made to repair what they have broken through repayment, forfeiture, labor, service, or other structured restitution.

For elite or institutionally shielded offenders, restitution shall not displace liability; it shall accompany it.

Until and unless incarceration is lawfully superseded by a superior justice architecture, elite, wealthy, socially connected, or institutionally shielded offenders shall be subject to materially equivalent criminal liability, sentencing exposure, conditions of confinement, and public accountability as non-elite offenders convicted of comparable harms, subject only to legitimate distinctions of offense gravity, actual dangerousness, and individualized case facts.

What is right is right. Justice that bends upward is not justice.

§LAJS-1.11 — Restoration and Its Limits

Justice aims, where possible, not merely to condemn wrongdoing but to restore moral and civic order.

This may include restoration between victim and offender, restoration of family integrity, restoration of lawful belonging, restoration of trust, or restoration of the offender's capacity for disciplined social membership.

But restoration is not mandatory in every case. It cannot be forced upon victims. It cannot be faked by offenders. It cannot substitute for Truth. And it cannot override public safety where danger remains grave.

Restoration is real only where responsibility is real.

§LAJS-1.12 — Containment and Incapacitation

A humane justice system must retain the capacity to contain those who remain dangerous.

Some offenders cannot yet be trusted with liberty. Some may never be trusted with liberty. Where grave danger persists, containment is justified to defend the innocent and preserve public order. Such containment must remain humane, reviewable where appropriate, and free from gratuitous degradation. But it must also remain firm.

Mercy does not require suicidal naivete.

§LAJS-1.13 — Rejection of Carceral Falsehood

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects incarceration as default social policy. It rejects the prison as catch-all warehouse for trauma, addiction, poverty, low cognition, failed schooling, untreated mental disturbance, and social abandonment.

If confinement is necessary, it must be purposeful:

- protective where protection is needed,
- rehabilitative where rehabilitation is possible,
- restitutive where repair can be made,
- restorative where social healing is viable,
- incapacitative where predation remains entrenched.

To cage without Truthful classification is administrative laziness sanctified by law.

§LAJS-1.14 — Justice as Civic and Civilizational Foundation

Justice is not a side function of civilization. It is one of its load-bearing organs.

Where justice is false, institutions decay. Where institutions decay, public trust rots. Where trust rots, coercion expands. Where coercion expands, Truth is driven underground. Where Truth is driven underground, both law and liberty become masks.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System therefore understands justice not as narrow legal technology, but as a foundational moral and civilizational function through which a people declares what it will defend, what it will forbid, what it will repair, what it will forgive, and what it will never again excuse.

§LAJS-1.15 — Closing Principle

The purpose of justice is to see clearly, judge honestly, protect firmly, repair what can be repaired, transform what can be transformed, and contain what must be contained—without fear, favoritism, or self-deception.

That is the beginning of justice worthy of a free and Truthful people.

ARTICLE LAJS-2 — Truth, Rights, and Due Process

§LAJS-2.01 — Truth as the First Operational Duty

No justice system can be legitimate unless Truth is its first operational duty.

The state does not exist to win cases. Prosecutors do not exist to secure convictions. Police do not exist to manufacture compliance. Courts do not exist to ratify appearances. Defense does not exist to game falsehood into acquittal.

Each exists, properly ordered, to assist in the disciplined discovery, testing, protection, and lawful application of Truth.

Where Truth becomes secondary to closure, conviction rates, public relations, politics, institutional prestige, administrative convenience, or emotional appetite, due process becomes decoration and justice becomes fraud.

§LAJS-2.02 — Truth Before Throughput

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects the reduction of adjudication to mechanical throughput.

Cases shall not be processed as units of disposal. Plea extraction shall not substitute for factual determination. Coercive leverage shall not substitute for evidentiary strength. Narrative repetition shall not substitute for proof.

Efficiency has value, but only beneath Truth. Where the two conflict, Truth prevails.

§LAJS-2.03 — Burden of Proof and Presumption of Innocence

Every accused person shall be presumed innocent unless and until guilt is established by competent, lawfully obtained, materially sufficient evidence under a transparent and reviewable standard.

This presumption is civilizational restraint.

Without it, accusation becomes partial conviction, and suspicion becomes a weapon in the hands of the powerful, the hysterical, the vengeful, or the politically insulated.

The burden rests with the accuser and the state. It does not shift merely because the accused is unpopular, poor, disfavored, morally coarse, politically isolated, or incapable of elegant self-defense.

§LAJS-2.04 — Integrity of Evidence

Evidence must be real, relevant, traceable, challengeable, and lawfully obtained.

No conviction shall properly rest upon fabricated evidence, suppressed exculpatory evidence, coerced testimony, hidden inducements, contaminated forensic handling, junk science, manufactured informant testimony, or materially deceptive investigative summaries.

Evidence must be preserved under strict chain-of-custody discipline. Material uncertainty in evidence handling is a direct threat to legitimacy.

§LAJS-2.05 — Exculpatory Disclosure as a Sacred Obligation

Any state actor possessing materially exculpatory, impeaching, or materially mitigating information shall be under a continuing and enforceable duty to disclose it fully and promptly.

Failure to do so is not a procedural defect alone. It is an offense against justice itself.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall treat deliberate suppression of exculpatory evidence as:

1. grounds for vacatur or mistrial where appropriate,
2. grounds for professional sanction,
3. grounds for civil liability where warranted,
4. grounds for criminal liability in grave cases.

The state may not hide Truth and still claim moral standing.

§LAJS-2.06 — Right to Competent Defense

Every accused person shall have the right to competent, adequately resourced, conflict-free defense.

This right shall not exist only on paper. Counsel nominally present but materially incapable is not meaningful counsel.

A defense system starved of time, resources, expert access, investigative capacity, or independence is ceremonial compliance masking predetermined imbalance.

Poverty shall not nullify the right to serious defense.

§LAJS-2.07 — Right to Confront and Challenge

No person shall be condemned without meaningful opportunity to confront the evidence, test witness credibility, challenge forensic claims, expose inducements, and contest the state's theory of the case.

To challenge is not obstruction. To scrutinize is not disrespect. To demand proof is not sympathy for crime.

Truth becomes sturdier under testing. A system afraid of challenge is usually afraid of what challenge will reveal.

§LAJS-2.08 — Rejection of Coercion

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects coerced confessions, coercive plea bargaining practices, torture, degrading treatment, and investigative methods designed primarily to break rather than discover.

Statements obtained through terror, exhaustion, unlawful deception, induced confusion, prolonged isolation, or exploitative manipulation of mental weakness shall be presumptively suspect and, where appropriate, inadmissible.

A confession is not sacred because it is signed. It is meaningful only if voluntary, informed, and reliable.

§LAJS-2.09 — Due Process as Substantive, Not Decorative

Due process is not ceremonial passage through official steps. It is the substantive discipline by which justice restrains its own power.

A proceeding may be formally tidy and still be morally rotten if the defense was crippled, the evidence was tainted, the accused was coerced, the tribunal was biased, or the process was manipulated toward a foregone conclusion.

Therefore, due process shall be understood not merely as procedural compliance, but as real and reviewable protection of fair adjudication.

§LAJS-2.10 — Right to an Impartial Tribunal

Every accused person is entitled to adjudication before a genuinely impartial decision-maker.

No tribunal is impartial if materially corrupted by political pressure, financial entanglement, undisclosed conflicts, prior prejudice, class bias, institutional loyalty overriding law, or fear of reputational embarrassment.

Impartiality is not the appearance of neutrality. It is the disciplined refusal to bend judgment toward convenience, tribe, ideology, status, or spectacle.

§LAJS-2.11 — Duty of Investigative Neutrality

Investigative agencies shall be under a duty not merely to gather incriminating evidence, but to pursue the Truth wherever it leads.

Tunnel vision, confirmation bias, career pressure, and prestige protection are known engines of wrongful conviction.

Accordingly, investigators shall be required to document and preserve alternative suspect leads, contradictory witness accounts, failed forensic hypotheses, exculpatory investigative results, and reasons for narrowing focus.

The file must tell the Truth about the investigation, not merely about the theory that survived it.

§LAJS-2.12 — Witness Reliability and Incentivized Testimony

Testimony purchased by fear, immunity, sentence reduction, monetary payment, or protection incentives shall be treated with heightened skepticism and full disclosure obligations.

Such testimony may be considered only where the inducement is fully disclosed, corroboration exists where material, the tribunal is clearly warned of distortion risk, and the defense is given full opportunity to test credibility.

§LAJS-2.13 — Forensic Integrity and Scientific Humility

Forensic methods must be empirically grounded, transparently limited, independently reviewable, and continuously audited.

No method shall enjoy automatic legitimacy merely because it wears the costume of science.

Where forensic techniques are uncertain, probabilistic, disputed, or historically abused, the system shall require transparent disclosure of limitations, access to defense experts, independent retesting where feasible, and post-conviction review when new scientific doubt emerges.

§LAJS-2.14 — Records, Transparency, and Reviewability

Justice that cannot be audited cannot be trusted.

All material stages of criminal adjudication shall be documented in a manner sufficient to permit meaningful review, including charging basis, evidentiary disclosures, custodial interrogation records, forensic reports and underlying data, judicial findings, sentencing reasoning, and post-conviction review history.

Opacity is the breeding chamber of abuse.

§LAJS-2.15 — Right of Meaningful Appeal and Review

Every person convicted of a criminal offense shall retain the right to meaningful review of legal error, evidentiary corruption, constitutional violation, newly discovered evidence, material forensic reversal, and credible claims of innocence.

Appeal must not become a ritual obstacle course designed to preserve finality at the expense of Truth.

Finality has value. But Truth outranks finality.

§LAJS-2.16 — Wrongful Conviction as a Distinct Category of System Harm

Wrongful conviction is not collateral damage. It is a direct and severe offense committed by the justice system against the innocent, the public, and the moral order.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall establish permanent, independent innocence review mechanisms with power to reopen, audit, and remedy suspect convictions.

§LAJS-2.17 — Victims' Rights Within Truthful Process

Victims possess real rights within a just system, but those rights must be harmonized with Truth rather than weaponized against it.

Victims have the right to Truthful acknowledgment, safety, respectful treatment, participation where appropriate, restitution where feasible, and freedom from coercion into spectacle or false reconciliation.

But victim suffering, however real, cannot itself substitute for proof.

§LAJS-2.18 — Limits on Emergency Power and Exceptional Procedure

Exceptional procedures may exist only under narrow, reviewable, and rigorously justified conditions.

No claim of emergency, terrorism, organized threat, national security, public disorder, or institutional sensitivity shall automatically dissolve the duty of proof, the right to challenge, the duty to disclose, the prohibition on torture, or the obligation of judicial review.

§LAJS-2.19 — No Immunity for Official Corruption of Process

Any official who knowingly fabricates evidence, suppresses Truth, coerces false statements, corrupts review, manipulates forensic presentation, or otherwise weaponizes process against justice shall be subject to sanction proportionate to the gravity of the corruption.

Office aggravates such conduct. It does not excuse it.

§LAJS-2.20 — Due Process for the Public and Social Body

Due process protects not only the accused, but the public itself.

When process is corrupted, the innocent become vulnerable, the guilty become misidentified, the powerful become less accountable, and public trust deteriorates into fear, cynicism, or tribal vengeance.

§LAJS-2.21 — Closing Principle

Truth, rights, and due process are not technical ornaments appended to justice. They are the architecture that prevents justice from becoming a weapon of appetite, panic, careerism, class domination, or institutional deceit.

Where Truth is honored, rights are guarded, and process is disciplined, justice can begin. Where they are discarded, justice becomes costume.

ARTICLE LAJS-3 — Classification of Harm and Offenders

§LAJS-3.01 — Necessity of Classification

No justice system can remain coherent unless it classifies both harm and offenders with disciplined precision.

Where harms are flattened into crude categories, proportionality collapses. Where offenders are treated as interchangeable units, discernment collapses. Where discernment collapses, justice becomes brutality or sentimentality.

The purpose of classification is not neatness. It is Truthful judgment.

§LAJS-3.02 — Foundational Rule of Classification

Every harm and every offender shall be classified according to reality, not appearance; substance, not status; demonstrated pattern, not institutional convenience; actual danger, not social polish.

Classification must never become disguised favoritism.

§LAJS-3.03 — Three Axes of Harm

Every offense shall be evaluated across three axes:

- nature of harm,
- severity of harm,
- structure of harm.

The same visible harm may carry radically different moral and legal meaning depending on structure.

§LAJS-3.04 — Primary Categories of Harm

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall recognize, at minimum:

- violent bodily harm,
- sexual harm,
- psychological terrorization,
- economic and property harm,
- fraud and deception-based harm,
- neglect-based harm,
- institutional or systemic harm,
- corruption and abuse of office,
- collective or mass harm.

§LAJS-3.05 — Aggravating Dimensions of Harm

Harm classification shall be increased in gravity where there is predation on the vulnerable, repetition, premeditation, sadistic or domination motive, breach of trust, organized action, abuse of authority, concealment, mass impact, or long-duration injury.

§LAJS-3.06 — Mitigating Dimensions of Harm and Responsibility

Mitigation may include youthful immaturity, severe coercion, genuine diminished capacity, documented trauma-linked distortion, prompt Truthfulness, surrender, authentic reparative effort, peripheral role, or evidence of situational rather than patterned wrongdoing.

Mitigation must inform judgment without falsifying serious danger.

§LAJS-3.07 — Necessity of Offender Classification

The system must ask not only what law was broken, but who stands before it, what pattern the person embodies, what danger is posed, what causal forces shaped the offense, what degree of reform is plausible, and what form of accountability is just.

§LAJS-3.08 — Four Axes of Offender Classification

Every offender shall be evaluated along at least four axes:

- dangerousness,
- causation,
- pattern,
- reformability.

§LAJS-3.08A — Classification Authority and Transparency

Initial classification shall be performed by a multi-disciplinary Classification Assessment Panel composed of qualified personnel with expertise in law, behavioral assessment, and rehabilitative or custodial planning. No prosecutor, defense counsel, or custodial employee with direct case-specific conflict shall dominate the panel.

Classification standards, rubrics, psychological instruments, and risk-assessment tools used under this Article shall be publicly knowable, challengeable by the affected person, and auditable for bias or systematic distortion. No proprietary or unchallengeable system shall determine classification.

§LAJS-3.09 — Class I: Wrongfully Convicted or Procedurally Corrupted Cases

Class I includes persons whose conviction or custodial status is materially suspect due to corruption, fabrication, coercion, suppressed evidence, false testimony, junk science, gross due process failure, or credible new evidence of innocence.

Required consequences include immediate review priority, independent evidentiary reassessment, protection against retaliation, release or retrial where warranted, and restitution where innocence or major corruption is established.

§LAJS-3.10 — Class II: Nonviolent, Low-Risk, Restitution-Capable Offenders

Class II includes nonviolent offenders whose current danger to the public is low and whose conduct is addressable through restitution, structure, supervision, education, and reintegration.

Required consequences include diversion where feasible, structured restitution, productive contribution, and avoidance of unnecessary incarceration.

§LAJS-3.11 — Class III: Trauma-, Addiction-, or Disorder-Driven but Reformable Offenders

Class III includes offenders whose criminal conduct is significantly rooted in addiction, trauma, developmental injury, severe dysregulation, untreated disorder, or comparable fracture, and who nevertheless remain materially reformable.

Required consequences include secure but treatment-centered placement, long-horizon rehabilitation planning, behavioral assessment, restitution where feasible, and release only upon demonstrated restructuring.

§LAJS-3.12 — Class IV: Violent but Reform-Possible Offenders

Class IV includes persons responsible for serious violent harm who nevertheless show credible potential for long-term moral reconstruction and reduction of dangerousness.

Required consequences include secure containment, intensive transformation regime, strict review architecture, and no sentimental early release.

§LAJS-3.13 — Class V: Predatory, Sadistic, Serial, or Incurably Dangerous Offenders

Class V includes persons who demonstrate entrenched domination motive, persistent predation, serial exploitation, sadistic enjoyment of suffering, manipulative parasitism, repeated violent conduct, or failure of prior genuine interventions such that public protection becomes overriding.

Required consequences include high-security protective incapacitation, no presumption of release, continued humane treatment, and public safety as the overriding consideration.

§LAJS-3.13A — Criteria for Class V Determination

No person shall be designated Class V absent written findings supported by clear evidentiary showing appropriate to the gravity of the designation. Except in extraordinary single-incident cases involving extreme severity and unmistakable predatory structure, Class V designation should ordinarily require documented pattern across multiple incidents, victims, or sustained conduct.

Class V designation shall require:

1. at least two independent forensic or behavioral assessments where such assessment is materially relevant and available,
2. panel review including at least one member not employed by the confinement system receiving the offender,
3. written findings addressing pattern, dangerousness, failed prior intervention where applicable, and reasons lesser classifications were rejected,
4. mandatory periodic re-review at constitutionally defined intervals, with the state bearing the burden of justifying continued Class V designation.

§LAJS-3.14 — Class VI: Institutional or Elite Criminality

Class VI includes offenders whose criminal acts are materially enabled, concealed, amplified, or normalized by wealth, status, office, title, bureaucracy, corporate structure, political access, social insulation, or systemic power.

This class includes corrupt officials, abusive prosecutors, falsifying investigators, bribed regulators, predatory executives, large-scale financial fraud actors, organized fiduciary betrayers, institutional traffickers, and architects of public deception causing grave harm.

Class VI must exist, or the whole system is a lie.

Liberation must never lie to itself. Therefore it must never construct a justice architecture that recognizes street-level criminality while refusing to name criminality embedded in office, boardroom, bureaucracy, finance, intelligence, or prestige.

Required consequences include enhanced scrutiny, transparency review, abuse of trust as aggravating, aggressive restitution and asset seizure, no mitigation based on prestige, and materially equivalent criminal liability, sentencing exposure, conditions of confinement, and public accountability as for non-elite offenders convicted of comparable harms.

§LAJS-3.14A — Mandatory Independent Review of Class VI Classification

No person shall be classified downward from Class VI solely because the offense is non-bloody in appearance, administratively complex, reputationally embarrassing to institutions, or economically significant to the jurisdiction. Any refusal to classify a plausibly qualifying offender as Class VI shall require written findings and shall be subject to mandatory independent review upon complaint, audit trigger, or judicial referral.

§LAJS-3.15 — Cross-Class Complexity

Not all offenders fit perfectly within one class. Classification must therefore be evidence-based, periodically reviewable, and open to upward or downward correction based on Truth rather than inertia.

§LAJS-3.16 — Misclassification as a Distinct System Failure

Misclassification—burying the innocent, prettifying the dangerous, or treating institutional criminals as anomalies—shall be recognized as a distinct form of justice-system harm.

§LAJS-3.17 — Relationship Between Harm and Offender Class

No offender class shall mechanically determine sentence without regard to actual harm. No harm category shall automatically determine treatment without regard to the offender's structure.

Justice requires synthesis.

§LAJS-3.18 — Classification and Sentencing Integrity

Harm classification shall guide proportionality, offender classification shall guide treatment mode, dangerousness shall guide containment, reparability shall guide restitution, and reformability shall guide rehabilitation and review.

§LAJS-3.19 — Classification and the Existing Prison Population

The current prison population shall not be treated as a single moral category. All persons presently confined shall be subject to reclassification under Article III, with priority to Class I review and Truthful sorting.

§LAJS-3.20 — Moral Guardrail Against Sentimental Fraud

Classification must not become an excuse to baptize danger as complexity, nor to baptize vengeance as seriousness.

The reformable must not be wasted. The dangerous must not be prettified. The innocent must not be buried. The powerful must not be excused.

§LAJS-3.21 — Closing Principle

Justice begins by seeing what kind of harm has occurred and what kind of offender stands before it.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System classifies in order to tell the Truth, protect the innocent, repair the damage, preserve the reformable, and contain the predatory—without fear, favoritism, or self-deception.

§LAJS-3.22 — Juvenile and Developmentally Immature Actors

Where the offender is a juvenile or otherwise demonstrably developmentally immature actor, classification, sentencing, containment, and review shall account for heightened plasticity, reduced maturity, increased susceptibility to coercion, and greater reform potential, without erasing responsibility for serious harm.

No juvenile actor shall be treated as a fixed moral equivalent of an entrenched adult predator absent extraordinary showing supported by rigorous review.

Juvenile cases shall presumptively prioritize:

1. Truthful classification,
2. family and developmental assessment,
3. trauma and coercion analysis,
4. education and rehabilitative structure,
5. and periodic review at shorter intervals than adult cases.

The justice order shall not warehouse youth as a convenience substitute for developmental judgment.

ARTICLE LAJS-4 — Restitution, Restoration, and Rehabilitation

§LAJS-4.01 — Constructive Duties of Justice

A justice system that knows only how to condemn is incomplete.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System recognizes three constructive duties beyond adjudication and containment:

1. restitution,
2. restoration,
3. rehabilitation.

These are not sentimental extras. They are core functions of any justice system that intends to heal more than it punishes.

§LAJS-4.02 — Hierarchy of Constructive Justice

Constructive justice shall be governed by:

1. Truth first,
2. accountability second,
3. protection always,
4. restitution wherever feasible,
5. restoration wherever genuine,
6. rehabilitation wherever achievable,
7. containment wherever necessary.

No false reconciliation. No coerced healing. No therapeutic theater.

§LAJS-4.03 — Restitution Defined

Restitution is the structured repair of material, economic, civic, or practical harms caused by the offender.

It is the disciplined attempt to restore what has been taken, damaged, destroyed, diverted, or unjustly withheld.

§LAJS-4.04 — Restitution as a Core Obligation

Restitution shall, wherever feasible, be presumptive rather than exceptional in offenses involving concrete loss.

The offender shall not merely be punished by the state while the victim is left economically wrecked.

§LAJS-4.05 — Forms of Restitution

Restitution may include direct financial repayment, asset forfeiture, wage assignment, compelled productive labor, restoration of damaged or stolen property, funding of victim recovery costs, community repair contributions, institutional compensation funds, and opportunity restoration.

§LAJS-4.06 — Limits and Integrity of Restitution

Restitution must be proportionate, tethered to actual capacity, and distinguished from debt peonage or punishment of poverty.

The point is repair, not endless extraction.

§LAJS-4.06A — Capacity Determination Protocol

Restitution orders shall be calibrated to the offender's actual present and projected capacity rather than fictive earning assumptions. In determining capacity, the system shall consider assets, lawful earning potential, dependents, disability, age, educational level, and realistic access to employment.

For indigent offenders, restitution may be satisfied in whole or part through structured community service, supervised labor at lawful value, or other constructive contribution directed toward victim compensation or public restitution funds. No person shall remain under restitution supervision beyond a constitutionally reasonable period tied to offense gravity absent concealment, bad-faith evasion, or voluntary extension.

§LAJS-4.07 — Elite Crime and Equivalent Liability

For elite, wealthy, socially connected, institutionally shielded, or structurally insulated offenders, restitution shall never function as a buyout of criminal liability.

Restitution by elite offenders shall accompany, not replace, criminal accountability. Asset seizure shall be aggressive where unlawful gain, concealment, shell structures, or public harm are present. Abuse of trust shall aggravate rather than mitigate.

Until and unless incarceration is lawfully superseded by a superior justice architecture, elite, wealthy, socially connected, or institutionally shielded offenders shall be subject to materially equivalent criminal liability, sentencing exposure, conditions of confinement, and public accountability as non-elite offenders convicted of comparable harms.

What is right is right. Justice that can be purchased is not justice.

§LAJS-4.08 — Restoration Defined

Restoration is the repair of moral, relational, and civic order after harm.

Where restitution addresses measurable loss, restoration addresses violated dignity, ruptured trust, moral injury, communal destabilization, broken acknowledgment, and the offender's estrangement from Truthful social membership.

§LAJS-4.09 — Conditions of Genuine Restoration

Restoration may proceed only where Truth has been sufficiently established, responsibility has been accepted in substance, participation by the harmed party is voluntary, no coercion governs the process, the offender is not merely performing remorse, and the process does not endanger the victim, the public, or the integrity of adjudication.

§LAJS-4.10 — Forms of Restoration

Restoration may include victim-offender dialogue, community accountability conferences, family repair processes, formal acknowledgment sessions, moral injury repair forums, public admission and correction where public harm occurred, and supervised relational rebuilding where consent and safety permit.

§LAJS-4.11 — Rights of the Victim Within Restoration

No victim shall be compelled to restore, reconcile, forgive, or participate in any restorative process.

The victim is not a moral service provider for the system.

§LAJS-4.12 — Public and Civic Restoration

Some offenses injure not merely individuals, but the public field itself.

In such cases, restoration may require public-facing acts, including official admission, institutional disclosure, corrected record, public restitution funds, civic repair projects, removal from trusted office, and formal acknowledgment of breach.

§LAJS-4.13 — Rehabilitation Defined

Rehabilitation is the structured reconstruction of the offender's capacity for lawful, reality-based, disciplined, non-predatory, socially responsible Life.

It is not sedation, slogan instruction, attendance, or therapeutic fluency.

§LAJS-4.14 — Proper Subjects of Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is most properly oriented toward Class II offenders, Class III offenders, substantial portions of Class IV offenders, and, in limited respects, selected Class VI offenders where meaningful reform is plausible.

§LAJS-4.15 — Foundations of Rehabilitation

A valid rehabilitative regime shall rest upon Truthful diagnosis, individualized planning, measured accountability, behavioral discipline over time, skill-building, moral reconstruction, evidence of sustained change, and review tied to conduct rather than rhetoric.

§LAJS-4.16 — Core Components of Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation may include literacy and education, trauma treatment, addiction treatment, psychiatric stabilization, cognitive restructuring, moral reasoning development, emotional regulation, conflict regulation, trade development, work discipline, health restoration, family systems repair, community accountability structures, and civic orientation.

§LAJS-4.17 — Work, Labor, and Constructive Contribution

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects both idleness as correction and exploitation as discipline.

Productive labor, when lawfully structured, can serve restitution, discipline, skill-building, self-respect, and social repair. But it must not become private profiteering from captivity.

§LAJS-4.18 — Measuring Rehabilitation Honestly

Rehabilitation shall be evaluated by demonstrated evidence over time, not certificates, fluent self-description, or institutional desire to reduce population pressure.

The burden is not to sound changed. It is to be changed.

§LAJS-4.19 — Failure, Refusal, and Non-Reformability

Some offenders will manipulate, delay, mimic insight, refuse responsibility, or remain dangerous beneath polished language. The system must remain open to transformation and lucid about resistance.

§LAJS-4.20 — Integration of Restitution, Restoration, and Rehabilitation

Restitution repairs material loss. Restoration repairs moral and social rupture. Rehabilitation repairs offender capacity.

A system that has only one becomes distorted.

§LAJS-4.21 — Closing Principle

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System does not merely punish harm. It seeks, wherever reality permits, to repair loss, restore dignity, rebuild lawful human capacity, and return the reformable to society under conditions worthy of trust.

No repair without Truth. No restoration without responsibility. No rehabilitation without measurable change. No mercy without protection. No accountability purchasable by power.

ARTICLE LAJS-5 — Containment, Review, and Reintegration

§LAJS-5.01 — Necessity of Containment

A justice system that cannot contain the dangerous cannot protect the innocent.

Containment is justified by danger, not by hatred.

§LAJS-5.02 — Purposes of Containment

Containment may serve immediate protection, stabilization of dangerous disorder, prevention of predation, structured assessment, protection of adjudicative integrity, opportunity for rehabilitation, and protective incapacitation where necessary.

§LAJS-5.03 — Distinction Between Containment and Punitive Degradation

Containment is the restriction of liberty for lawful protective purposes. Punitive degradation is the intentional destruction of dignity beyond what lawful restriction requires.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects the latter.

§LAJS-5.04 — Classification-Based Containment

Containment must be governed by Article III classification rather than crude offense label alone.

Class VI offenders shall not evade secure confinement merely because their criminality is polished, bureaucratic, or socially elevated.

§LAJS-5.05 — Least Destructive Sufficient Restriction

Liberty shall be restricted no more than is reasonably necessary to protect the public, preserve adjudicative order, support lawful accountability, and reduce credible danger.

§LAJS-5.06 — Conditions of Lawful Containment

Lawful containment shall provide physical safety, necessary medical care, mental health care where needed, adequate basic living conditions, access to counsel and review, protection from retaliation, documentation of custodial events, and classification-appropriate programming.

§LAJS-5.07 — Protective Incapacitation

Protective incapacitation is the long-term or indefinite restriction of liberty for those whose demonstrated dangerousness remains grave, patterned, and not yet safely reducible.

It is the lawful defense of the innocent where trust cannot yet be restored.

§LAJS-5.08 — Temporary, Long-Term, and Indeterminate Containment

Containment may be temporary, long-term, or indeterminate/protective. No person shall disappear into indefinite custody through inertia alone.

§LAJS-5.09 — Solitary Restriction and Extreme Isolation

Extreme isolation shall be treated as presumptively dangerous and may be used only under narrow, documented, reviewable, and time-limited conditions.

It shall not be used as routine punishment, convenience, retaliation, psychological breaking, or population-management shortcut.

§LAJS-5.10 — Review as a Core Safeguard

Containment without meaningful review tends toward administrative fossilization and moral decay.

Review exists to answer whether continued containment remains necessary, whether the offender has materially changed, whether classification remains Truthful, and whether transition is justified.

§LAJS-5.11 — Standards for Meaningful Review

Review is meaningful only if periodic, documented, independent enough to resist institutional self-justification, evidence-based, risk-literate, and open to both improvement and deterioration in classification.

§LAJS-5.12 — Review Criteria

Review bodies shall consider conduct over time, disciplinary record in context, Truthful acknowledgment of harm, evidence of manipulation, treatment participation, restitution participation, work discipline, psychological assessment, victim and community safety, predatory indicators, classification accuracy, and availability of viable transition structures.

§LAJS-5.13 — Burden and Threshold in Release Review

Release shall not be granted merely because time has passed.

The burden rests on demonstrating materially reduced dangerousness, sustainable lawful structure outside custody, acceptable risk, and fulfillment or responsible continuation of required obligations.

§LAJS-5.14 — No Sentimental Release

Fluent remorse, therapeutic vocabulary, institutional fatigue, population pressure, or prestige are not proof of transformation.

§LAJS-5.15 — Victim and Community Standing in Review

Victims and affected communities possess legitimate standing in review and reintegration decisions, though not absolute veto power. Truth governs here as everywhere.

§LAJS-5.16 — Reclassification During Confinement

Classification is not fixed merely because once imposed. Static classification in the face of new Truth is another form of lie.

§LAJS-5.17 — Reintegration Defined

Reintegration is the structured restoration of a person from lawful confinement or major justice supervision into disciplined participation in society.

It is earned restoration, not casual release.

§LAJS-5.18 — Preconditions for Reintegration

No person shall enter reintegration without documented reason to conclude that release is consistent with public safety, classification has been Truthfully reviewed, stability has been demonstrated, support is in place, restitution is structured, supervision capacity exists, and victim-safety concerns have been considered.

§LAJS-5.19 — Components of Reintegration

Reintegration may include graduated release, transitional housing, supervised work placement, vocational continuation, ongoing treatment, monitoring where justified, no-contact or geographic restrictions, restitution structures, community accountability, family reintegration where safe, periodic reporting, and staged restoration of civic status.

§LAJS-5.20 — Failure in Reintegration

Failure may require increased supervision, reclassification, temporary recontainment, intensified treatment, modification of release conditions, or renewed protective confinement.

§LAJS-5.21 — Permanent Civic Exile Rejected

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects permanent civic exile as default policy for all who have offended.

For the genuinely reformable, some pathway must exist toward lawful livelihood, social belonging, stable residence, dignified work, and graduated restoration of rights and standing.

§LAJS-5.22 — Reintegration and the Existing Prison Population

With respect to the existing prison population, reintegration policy shall proceed from Truthful sorting rather than mass sentiment or bureaucratic inertia.

§LAJS-5.23 — Institutional Duty After Release

The obligations of justice do not end at release.

A system that releases persons into homelessness, untreated instability, unemployability, and unmanaged stigma is manufacturing recidivism and then blaming the released.

§LAJS-5.24 — Closing Principle

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System contains when it must, reviews when it should, and reintegrates when it Truthfully can.

It does not cage by reflex. It does not release by fantasy. It protects the innocent, preserves the reformable, tests change rigorously, and returns persons to society only under conditions worthy of trust.

ARTICLE LAJS-6 — Institutional and Elite Criminality

§LAJS-6.01 — Necessity of This Article

A justice system that cannot meaningfully confront criminality embedded in power is not merely incomplete. It is structurally false.

Institutional and elite criminality must be named, classified, investigated, prosecuted, sanctioned, and repaired under standards at least as serious as those applied to non-elite offending.

§LAJS-6.02 — Definition of Institutional and Elite Criminality

Institutional and elite criminality consists of unlawful, gravely harmful, fraudulent, exploitative, coercive, or rights-violating conduct materially enabled, concealed, normalized, amplified, or protected by public office, bureaucratic position, judicial or prosecutorial authority, police or military authority, intelligence access, corporate structure, fiduciary control, wealth concentration, regulatory influence, social prestige, political connectivity, charitable or philanthropic structures used to conceal, normalize, launder, or provide social insulation for criminal conduct, media shielding, or organizational complexity.

§LAJS-6.02A — Status Alone Is Not Sufficient

Class VI status applies only where wealth, office, institutional position, professional authority, organizational complexity, public trust, social insulation, or comparable structural advantage materially enabled, concealed, amplified, normalized, or protected the offense.

Status alone is not sufficient.

This Article does not criminalize rank, expertise, wealth, philanthropy, office, institutional service, or social influence as such. It denies those conditions the power to launder, conceal, soften, or immunize criminal conduct.

§LAJS-6.03 — Foundational Rule of Equivalent Justice

All persons and institutions shall stand beneath a single justice standard.

No offender shall receive practical leniency by reason of wealth, title, education, public stature, philanthropy, political access, organizational indispensability, technical sophistication, or social insulation.

Until and unless incarceration is lawfully superseded by a superior justice architecture, elite, wealthy, socially connected, or institutionally shielded offenders shall be subject to materially equivalent criminal liability, sentencing exposure, conditions of confinement, and public accountability as non-elite offenders convicted of comparable harms.

What is right is right.

§LAJS-6.04 — Why Institutional Crime Is Often Worse

Institutional and elite criminality is often more socially destructive than ordinary private offending because it commonly possesses scale, duration, concealment, legitimacy camouflage, breach of trust, replicability, impunity architecture, narrative control, secondary corruption, and civilizational damage.

§LAJS-6.05 — Covered Domains

Covered domains include governmental corruption, judicial and prosecutorial corruption, police and investigative criminality, corporate and executive criminality, financial and fiduciary criminality, regulatory and administrative criminality, intelligence, military, and security criminality, institutional abuse systems, and deliberate disinformation campaigns with material and demonstrable harm, where constitutionally sufficient standards of falsity, intent, causation, and due process are established.

§LAJS-6.06 — Abuse of Trust as an Aggravating Principle

When a person commits crime through entrusted power, the offense is aggravated.

The higher the entrusted station, the more serious the betrayal.

§LAJS-6.07 — Fraud of Administrative Reclassification

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects euphemistic laundering of criminality.

Where the substance is criminal, the naming shall be criminal.

§LAJS-6.08 — Investigative Doctrine for Institutional Crime

Institutional and elite criminality requires specialized investigation, including independent review, protected audit authority, forensic accounting, communications preservation, whistleblower protection, chain-of-command analysis, benefits-flow analysis, document destruction inquiry, and pattern analysis.

§LAJS-6.09 — No Shield by Organizational Complexity

No offender may evade responsibility merely because decisions were compartmentalized, harmful acts were distributed, signatures were delegated, or the chain of causation was administratively fragmented.

§LAJS-6.10 — Command, Supervisory, and Architectural Liability

Liability for institutional crime shall not be limited to the lowest visible actor. Those who knowingly direct, enable, tolerate, conceal, or materially profit from criminal conduct may be liable.

§LAJS-6.11 — Whistleblowers, Witnesses, and Internal Truth-Tellers

A justice system serious about institutional crime must protect those who expose it.

§LAJS-6.12 — Transparency and Public Accounting

Where institutional or elite criminality is established, justice shall not end in sealed resolution except where narrow victim-protection or other compelling reasons require it.

Public harm requires public accounting.

§LAJS-6.13 — Restitution, Forfeiture, and Asset Recovery

Because elite criminality is often materially motivated and socially scaled, restitution doctrine must be especially vigorous.

For the powerful, repair must bite.

§LAJS-6.14 — Restitution Does Not Replace Criminal Accountability

Financial settlement, compliance agreement, civil penalty, resignation, reputational loss, or charitable offset shall not displace criminal accountability where conduct is properly criminal.

The rich shall not buy translation of crime into paperwork.

§LAJS-6.15 — Sentencing Principles for Institutional and Elite Criminality

Sentencing must reflect scale of harm, abuse of trust, concealment, systemic reach, and civic betrayal. Prior public respectability does not mitigate core criminality.

§LAJS-6.16 — Conditions of Confinement and Equivalent Exposure

Until and unless incarceration is lawfully superseded by a superior justice architecture, no elite offender shall receive a meaningfully softer custodial category merely because the offense was non-bloody in appearance, the offender is educated, socially supported, or formerly respected.

§LAJS-6.17 — Institutional Remedies Beyond Individual Punishment

Because Article VI offenses often emerge from structures, remedies may include receivership, structural breakup, external monitors, charter revocation, licensing dissolution, fiduciary barring, public disclosure architecture, and institutional redesign mandates.

§LAJS-6.18 — State as Possible Offender

Government does not cease to be criminal merely because it acts under color of authority.

§LAJS-6.19 — No Sacred Institutions

No institution shall be treated as too essential, too prestigious, too charitable, too patriotic, too expert, or too sensitive to examine.

§LAJS-6.20 — Moral Guardrail Against Envy and Spectacle

This article is not a charter for class revenge or indiscriminate hostility to competence, wealth, or office as such.

The task is not to criminalize rank. It is to deny rank the ability to launder crime.

§LAJS-6.21 — Closing Principle

Institutional and elite criminality must be judged with the same seriousness, and often greater seriousness, than ordinary private offending, because power multiplies both harm and concealment.

Liberation must never lie to itself. Therefore it must never excuse the crimes of power while punishing the crimes of exposure.

ARTICLE LAJS-7 — Institutional Design, Transitional Architecture, and Implementation Doctrine

§LAJS-7.01 — Necessity of Institutional Design

No justice doctrine, however sound in principle, can survive translation into reality without institutional form.

Without design, doctrine decays. Without implementation, principle performs itself and then collapses. Without transition architecture, every just theory is eaten alive by inherited machinery.

§LAJS-7.02 — Purpose of Transitional Architecture

Transitional architecture exists to move a society from a degraded justice order into a Truthful one without administrative chaos, indiscriminate release, collapse of public safety, bureaucratic sabotage, or cosmetic reform.

The purpose is disciplined conversion.

§LAJS-7.03 — Foundational Design Principles

All institutional design shall be governed by:

1. Truth before throughput,
2. classification before placement,
3. protection without degradation,
4. restitution where feasible,
5. rehabilitation where Truthful,
6. restoration where genuine,
7. containment where necessary,
8. review without sentimentality,
9. equivalent justice across class and status,
10. auditability at every critical point.

§LAJS-7.04 — Rejection of the Carceral Monolith

The inherited prison model is too often a single blunt container for radically different human realities.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects the prison monolith as the default architecture of confinement.

§LAJS-7.05 — Required Institutional Types

Required institutional types include innocence review and remedy centers, nonviolent restitution and reintegration campuses, secure treatment and stabilization facilities, violent offender transformation centers, high-security protective incapacitation units, institutional and elite crime accountability divisions, and reintegration and transitional supervision centers.

§LAJS-7.06 — Functional Separation Doctrine

Certain justice functions must remain distinct enough to prevent corruption of purpose.

Concentrated unreviewable power is the seedbed of justice corruption.

§LAJS-7.07 — Classification as Gatekeeping Function

No person shall enter confinement, treatment, restitution placement, or reintegration status without formal classification under Article III.

§LAJS-7.08 — Intake, Assessment, and Reassessment Doctrine

Every person entering the system shall undergo structured intake assessment, and reassessment must occur at meaningful intervals and after significant events.

§LAJS-7.09 — Staffing Doctrine

Personnel must be selected, trained, and supervised according to role-specific integrity standards. Bad staff culture can nullify good doctrine in months.

§LAJS-7.10 — Anti-Corruption Staffing and Oversight

Justice institutions shall adopt explicit anti-corruption safeguards, including reporting obligations, protected disclosure channels, audits, conflict rules, and criminal liability for deliberate corruption.

§LAJS-7.10A — Transitional Personnel Doctrine

During transition from a degraded justice order, justice actors with documented histories of deliberate fabrication, suppression of exculpatory evidence, custodial abuse, retaliatory misconduct, or corrupt leniency toward elite offenders shall be subject to review for removal, prosecution, or supervised probationary continuation.

Transitional leniency may be extended to lower-level personnel who make Truthful, documented disclosures of systemic abuse before formal finding, but not to architects, repeat offenders, or persons materially responsible for grave corruption.

§LAJS-7.11 — Record Integrity and System Memory

No justice architecture can function without disciplined record integrity.

A justice system that cannot remember Truthfully cannot govern Truthfully.

§LAJS-7.12 — Institutional Metrics and What Must Be Measured

The system shall reject shallow metrics of bureaucratic vanity and instead measure wrongful conviction discovery, disclosure compliance, victim restitution, violent re-offense, reintegration success, treatment integrity, classification accuracy, custodial abuse, staff corruption, Article VI enforcement, review timeliness, and public trust.

§LAJS-7.13 — Abolition of Profit-Driven Incarceration

No confinement regime shall be operated for private profit.

A system that profits from captivity cannot be trusted to tell the Truth about who must remain captive.

§LAJS-7.14 — Labor Doctrine in Institutional Design

Institutional labor may serve restitution, discipline, vocational formation, institutional maintenance, or community repair, but never revenue-maximizing captivity or humiliating servitude.

§LAJS-7.15 — Transitional Doctrine for the Existing Prison Population

Transition shall begin with jurisdiction-wide reclassification and audit through a Transitional Justice Classification Commission.

§LAJS-7.15A — Transitional Justice Classification Commission

The Transitional Justice Classification Commission shall be established by adopting authorities to conduct jurisdiction-wide reclassification and audit during transition.

The Commission shall be independent of ordinary custodial administration and shall include qualified representation from law, defense, victim advocacy, behavioral assessment, correctional practice, innocence review, disability-aware review, and public accountability.

The Commission shall possess lawful access to conviction records, sentencing records, classification files, custodial records, disciplinary records, treatment records where legally available, and evidence necessary to assess wrongful conviction indicators, overclassification, underclassification, dangerousness, restitution capacity, rehabilitation potential, and release readiness.

The Commission shall operate under published standards, conflict-disclosure duties, anti-retaliation protections, and PRAS-compatible record duties.

Its findings shall be reviewable through adopted constitutional or justice-system review pathways.

The Commission shall receive sufficient transitional funding to prevent reclassification from becoming symbolic, arbitrary, or administratively captured.

§LAJS-7.16 — Transitional Staging

Implementation shall proceed in stages: audit and freeze, classification and relief, institutional conversion, review and reintegration, and long-term constitutionalization.

§LAJS-7.17 — Emergency Priority Rules During Transition

Highest priority shall be given to wrongful conviction indicators, medically dangerous or abusive confinement, excessive low-risk custody, destructive youth placements, unlawful isolation, victims of prosecutorial or police corruption, and populations exposed to ongoing institutional abuse.

§LAJS-7.18 — Review Bodies and Their Composition

Meaningful review requires institutions with real independence and mixed competence. Homogeneous institutional self-review is usually ritualized self-forgiveness.

§LAJS-7.19 — Local Adaptation, Central Principles

Local variation may not override central principles of Truth, equal justice, anti-corruption, classification discipline, non-degradation, review, restitution, rehabilitation where Truthful, and containment where necessary.

§LAJS-7.20 — Public Legibility and Civic Understanding

The system shall maintain public-facing explanations of classification logic, review criteria, rights protections, restitution structures, release standards, and Article VI doctrine.

§LAJS-7.21 — Training and Cultural Conversion

Implementation is not merely structural. It is cultural.

Entrenched habits such as conviction worship, jailer mentality, bureaucratic cruelty, prestige deference, false toughness, euphemistic concealment, and performative reform language must be confronted.

All justice personnel — including adjudicators, prosecutors, defenders, custodial staff, classification panel members, review body members, audit personnel, and supervisory administrators — shall undergo initial and recurring training aligned with this Constitution's principles, including:

- the moral and operational centrality of Truth over throughput,
- the six-class taxonomy and its proper application,
- the distinction between reformability and incorrigibility,
- duties of disclosure, neutrality, and anti-corruption,
- recognition of trauma, addiction, developmental injury, and juvenile status without erasing responsibility,
- the special obligations attending Article VI institutional and elite criminality,
- Article XIII synthetic-systems doctrine where applicable,
- and the constitutional status of equivalent justice, victim repair, and wrongful conviction remedy.

Training shall be evaluated by audit, observed practice, and outcome review rather than attendance alone.

§LAJS-7.22 — Doctrine of Continuous Correction

No justice architecture shall presume itself final or immune to decay. Periodic doctrine review, public audit cycles, innocence review expansion, anti-corruption inspections, and statutory revision are required.

§LAJS-7.23 — Implementation and Political Resistance

Any serious justice reform will meet predictable resistance from entrenched institutions, private prison interests, fear-politics actors, bureaucracies that fear exposure, and elites threatened by Article VI.

A system does not surrender its privileges because it has been out-argued.

§LAJS-7.24 — Closing Principle

Justice becomes real only when principle enters architecture.

ARTICLE LAJS-8 — Rights of Victims, Duties to Communities, and the Social Field of Justice

§LAJS-8.01 — Neglect of the Social Field

Most degraded justice systems commit a double abandonment. They fail victims by reducing their suffering to evidence. They fail communities by treating crime as an isolated event rather than a breach in the wider civic fabric.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects this narrowing.

§LAJS-8.02 — Foundational Rule

Justice is owed not only to the abstract order of law, but also to directly harmed persons, their materially affected dependents and relational field, harmed communities, and the wider social body where institutional or systemic harm is involved.

§LAJS-8.03 — Victim Defined

A victim is any person directly and materially harmed by criminal conduct or by grave corruption of justice process. In appropriate contexts, the category may extend to secondary victims whose injury is direct and foreseeable.

§LAJS-8.04 — Rights of Victims

Victims shall possess, at minimum, rights to Truthful acknowledgment, safety, dignity in process, information, participation where lawful and appropriate, restitution where feasible, refusal of restorative engagement, protection from retaliation, timely process, and freedom from conversion into instruments of state theater.

§LAJS-8.05 — Right to Truthful Acknowledgment

To be harmed and then falsely described is a second injury.

§LAJS-8.06 — Right to Safety

Victims have the right to protection from renewed harm, intimidation, retaliation, stalking, coercive contact, and process-based re-victimization.

§LAJS-8.07 — Dignity in Process

Victims shall be treated as persons, not as evidentiary containers.

§LAJS-8.08 — Right to Information

Victims shall, consistent with lawful limits and due process, be informed of material developments bearing on their safety, rights, restitution, and participation.

§LAJS-8.09 — Right to Participation

Victims shall have meaningful opportunities to participate in proceedings affecting their interests, where such participation can be integrated without corrupting Truth or due process.

§LAJS-8.09A — Limits on Victim Participation in Sentencing

Victim input shall inform harm recognition, restitution needs, safety conditions, release restrictions, and understanding of the offense's practical effects. It shall not independently determine sentence length, offender classification, or guilt adjudication.

Where victim input is materially considered at sentencing or release review, the sentencing or review body shall explain in writing how such input was weighed relative to proportionality, classification, due process, and public protection.

§LAJS-8.10 — Right to Restitution

Victims shall have the right to serious, structured pursuit of restitution where the harm is materially reparable.

A restitution order that no one intends to enforce is a moral counterfeit.

§LAJS-8.11 — Right to Decline Restoration

No victim shall be compelled to participate in mediation, dialogue, forgiveness rituals, or any other restorative mechanism.

§LAJS-8.12 — Protection From Process-Based Re-Victimization

Justice must seek Truth rigorously. It need not do so stupidly.

§LAJS-8.13 — Wrongfully Convicted Persons as Victims of the System

A person wrongfully convicted is a victim of justice corruption and shall be recognized as such.

§LAJS-8.14 — Duties Owed to Families

Crime and false justice often radiate beyond the named victim or offender into family systems. The system shall recognize duties to materially and foreseeably affected dependents and families.

§LAJS-8.15 — Community as a Real Object of Justice

Communities are real social ecologies of trust, fear, memory, economic stability, informal order, and shared vulnerability.

Justice must sometimes address the community as a harmed field.

§LAJS-8.16 — Community Harms That Require Recognition

Community-level harms may arise through repeated predation, trafficking, organized corruption, environmental poisoning, public fraud, serial abuse concealed by institutions, wrongful-conviction scandals, police or prosecutorial corruption, and other offenses that degrade the civic atmosphere.

§LAJS-8.17 — Duties Owed to Communities

Where community harm is established, duties may include Truthful public accounting, safety restoration, correction of false narratives, visible accountability, community restitution, remediation, institutional reform, structured testimony forums, and measures to restore lawful trust.

§LAJS-8.18 — Social Field Doctrine

The social field of justice includes the full ecology in which harms arise, are suffered, denied, repaired, or repeated, including family structures, neighborhood order, schooling systems, labor conditions, addiction markets, local legitimacy, media distortions, economic precarity, and Truthful public norms.

§LAJS-8.19 — Duties to the Social Field

Justice owes duties toward prevention of repeated harm through Truthful attention to criminogenic and corruption-generating conditions.

§LAJS-8.20 — Community Participation Without Mob Rule

Communities may have legitimate standing, but participation must remain structured, evidence-disciplined, rights-bounded, and resistant to factional capture.

§LAJS-8.21 — Public Trust as a Justice Asset

Public trust is a functional condition of justice, earned through Truth, legibility, equivalent justice, victim protection, and visible correction of system wrongdoing.

§LAJS-8.22 — Duties in Cases of Institutional Betrayal

Where harm was enabled or committed by trusted institutions, the duty to victims and communities is heightened.

§LAJS-8.23 — Duties Toward Future Victims

Justice is owed not only backward toward harms already suffered, but forward toward those who may yet be harmed if Truth is buried, danger is misclassified, or institutions continue offending.

§LAJS-8.24 — Closing Principle

Justice worthy of the name must see the wound, the field, the people within it, and the future that depends on whether Truth is done.

§LAJS-8.25 — Victim Rights Enforcement

Victims whose rights under this Article are materially denied shall have standing to file complaint through the Public Accountability Process or equivalent constitutional complaint channel.

Such complaints shall be entitled to independent review, written explanation, and corrective remedy where denial is found to be unjustified and constitutionally significant.

No victim shall be required to retain private counsel in order to invoke these protections, though representation shall be permitted.

ARTICLE LAJS-9 — Constitutional Safeguards, Auditing, and Anti-Corruption Guarantees

§LAJS-9.01 — Necessity of Self-Binding

Every justice system eventually faces the temptation to exempt itself from the standards it imposes on others.

Without hard self-binding mechanisms, even a well-founded justice order will drift toward self-protection, selective enforcement, and moral fraud.

§LAJS-9.02 — Foundational Rule

No institution charged with administering justice shall be trusted without review, exempt from audit, immune from correction, or permitted to define the limits of its own accountability without external check.

§LAJS-9.03 — Constitutional Primacy of Truth Obligations

The duties of Truthful disclosure, evidentiary integrity, classification integrity, and non-fabrication shall be treated as constitutional-grade obligations.

§LAJS-9.04 — Right to Audit

The people, through lawful institutions, retain a continuing right to audit the machinery of justice.

§LAJS-9.05 — Independent Audit Bodies

Durable independent audit bodies with real access, real authority, and real protection from retaliation shall be established.

§LAJS-9.06 — Domains Requiring Mandatory Audit

Mandatory recurring audit shall cover disclosure practices, forensic reliability, custodial abuse, isolation practices, plea coercion, sentencing disparity, wrongful conviction markers, treatment integrity, restitution enforcement, release review, Article VI prosecution patterns, and record anomalies.

§LAJS-9.07 — Record Preservation as Anti-Corruption Doctrine

A justice system that can conveniently lose, fragment, redact beyond necessity, or destroy the record of its own conduct is already half-corrupt in architecture.

§LAJS-9.08 — Transparency and Lawful Secrecy

Some secrecy may be lawfully necessary, but secrecy must remain specific, justified, reviewable, time-bounded where possible, and never broader than necessary.

Secrecy may protect persons. It may not protect lies.

§LAJS-9.09 — Anti-Fabrication Guarantee

No justice actor shall fabricate evidence, manufacture testimony, falsify findings, alter records, misstate chain-of-custody facts, or knowingly advance materially false narratives.

§LAJS-9.10 — Anti-Retaliation Guarantee

No person shall be punished for lawfully reporting official misconduct, evidentiary corruption, custodial abuse, innocence evidence, illegal orders, or institutional wrongdoing.

§LAJS-9.11 — Guaranteed Channels for Complaint and Review

Every materially affected person shall have access to identifiable, usable, reviewable complaint channels.

A complaint system that leads nowhere is an instrument of pacification, not justice.

§LAJS-9.12 — Anti-Capture Doctrine

Oversight institutions themselves are susceptible to capture and must be designed with anti-capture features.

§LAJS-9.13 — Constitutional Review of Emergency Powers

Any expansion of detention, secrecy, surveillance, force, or procedural shortcuts shall be subject to heightened review, time limits, documentary justification, and post-emergency audit.

§LAJS-9.14 — Plea Bargaining and Coercion Safeguards

Any plea regime shall be heavily regulated. Material evidence disclosure shall precede plea entry, coercive penalty cliffs shall be restricted, the factual basis shall be recorded, counsel shall be meaningful, innocence-risk flags shall trigger scrutiny, and aggregate practices shall be audited.

§LAJS-9.15 — Forensic Audit and Scientific Correction Doctrine

Forensic systems must remain permanently open to correction. Where a method is later shown to be unreliable or overstated, affected cases must be identified and review reopened where warranted.

§LAJS-9.16 — Custodial Oversight Doctrine

All places of confinement, treatment, stabilization, reintegration staging, or protective incapacitation shall be under continuing external oversight.

§LAJS-9.17 — Sentencing and Release Disparity Audit

The system shall audit for patterns showing unequal treatment by wealth, race, class, political access, occupational prestige, geography, or institutional connectedness.

§LAJS-9.18 — Mandatory Audit of Article VI Enforcement

Article VI enforcement shall be subject to mandatory audit because unjust systems almost always under-enforce against elite and institutional offenders.

§LAJS-9.19 — Public Reporting and Legibility

The system shall publish regular public reports sufficient to permit civic understanding of audit findings, wrongful conviction correction, custodial abuse patterns, restitution performance, disparities, Article VI enforcement, and corrective actions.

§LAJS-9.20 — Duty of Corrective Action

Audit without remedy is only documentation of decay.

§LAJS-9.21 — Personal Liability for Justice Corruption

There shall be no blanket immunity for serious, knowing corruption of justice functions.

§LAJS-9.22 — Periodic Constitutional Review

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall require periodic constitutional review of its own functioning.

§LAJS-9.23 — Moral Guardrail Against Oversight Theater

Oversight mechanisms must be judged by whether they expose Truth, change behavior, reopen buried wrongs, protect Truth-tellers, and impose consequence where due.

§LAJS-9.24 — Closing Principle

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System must bind itself against its own worst temptations.

Where law audits itself honestly, justice can endure. Where law exempts itself, corruption becomes constitutional in all but name.

ARTICLE LAJS-9A — Liberation Alignment and Correctability Quotient (LACQ)

§LAJS-9A.01 — Recognition

The Liberation Alignment and Correctability Quotient (LACQ) is a bounded analytical instrument for evaluating conduct and institutional behavior.

§LAJS-9A.02 — Purpose

LACQ aids review, audit, and correction-oriented evaluation. It does not replace adjudication.

§LAJS-9A.03 — Scoring Domains

Intent Integrity; Consequential Effect; Scale and Leverage; Correctability and Response.

§LAJS-9A.04 — Scope

Applies to record-bounded conduct, not total human worth.

§LAJS-9A.05 — Scale

0–100 scale: lower = alignment, higher = misalignment.

§LAJS-9A.06 — Uncertainty

Each score must include confidence and evidentiary limits.

§LAJS-9A.07 — Non-Punitive

Scores cannot determine guilt or sentence.

§LAJS-9A.08 — Anti-Abuse

Cannot be used to sanctify or immunize any actor.

§LAJS-9A.09 — Correction

Demonstrated correction must improve score.

§LAJS-9A.10 — Use Cases

Public office abuse, institutional concealment, policy harm.

§LAJS-9A.11 — Reviewability

All scores must be contestable and evidence-bound.

§LAJS-9A.12 — Closing

LACQ sharpens judgment, not replaces it.

ARTICLE LAJS-9B — Continuity and Anti-Closure Doctrine

§LAJS-9B.01 — Non-Dependence on Architect or Successors

A Liberation-aligned system shall not rely on the virtue, loyalty, or continuity of its architect or successors. Its durability shall arise from structural mechanisms that enforce transparency, contestability, and correction across all actors, including those tasked with its preservation.

§LAJS-9B.02 — Constraint on Panels-of-Practitioners and Successor Bodies

Where Panels-of-Practitioners or successor bodies are established, they shall function not as interpreters of **Truth**, but as constrained evaluators operating under transparent, evidence-bound, and fully contestable conditions.

§LAJS-9B.03 — No Final Interpretive Authority

No Panel-of-Practitioners, successor body, inheritor class, editor, steward, or affiliated institution shall possess final interpretive authority, immunity from review, or permanence of composition.

§LAJS-9B.04 — Anti-Closure Trigger

Any mechanism that accumulates unchallengeable authority constitutes structural deviation and shall trigger review under the system's correction protocols.

§LAJS-9B.05 — Closing Principle

The architect builds the system.
The system must outgrow the architect.
And those who inherit it must be unable to close it.

ARTICLE LAJS-10 — Sentencing Doctrine, Proportionality, and the Moral Logic of Consequence

§LAJS-10.01 — Necessity of Sentencing Doctrine

A justice system is revealed most clearly at sentencing.

If sentencing is driven by appetite, panic, prestige, politics, class deference, administrative habit, or theater, then justice is already corrupted.

§LAJS-10.02 — Foundational Rule of Sentencing

A sentence must respond Truthfully to the harm done, the offender's actual responsibility, the offender's present and projected dangerousness, the possibility of repair, the possibility of transformation, the rights of victims, and the protection of the wider social body.

§LAJS-10.03 — Ends of Sentencing

Sentencing may serve Truthful moral denunciation, protection of the innocent, containment of danger, restitution, restoration, rehabilitation, deterrence where realistic, and public reaffirmation that no person stands above consequence.

§LAJS-10.04 — Sentencing Is Not

Sentence is not revenge, ritual humiliation, bureaucratic disposal, emotional release for institutions, class disciplining, or symbolic violence for spectators.

§LAJS-10.05 — Five Sentencing Questions

Before imposing sentence, every sentencing body shall answer:

1. What Truth has been established?
2. What actual harm was done?
3. What degree and structure of responsibility attaches to this offender?
4. What level of danger does this offender pose?
5. What forms of repair, transformation, supervision, or containment are justified?

§LAJS-10.06 — Proportionality Defined

Proportionality is the disciplined relation between offense, offender, consequence, and lawful purpose.

§LAJS-10.07 — Three Axes of Sentencing Proportionality

Sentencing proportionality shall be evaluated across the harm axis, responsibility axis, and danger axis.

§LAJS-10.08 — Aggravating Factors

Aggravating factors include predation on the vulnerable, abuse of trust, premeditation, organized offending, sadistic motive, concealment, seriality, abuse of office, mass impact, retaliation against Truth-tellers, corruption of justice process, and deliberate exploitation of asymmetry for grave gain.

§LAJS-10.09 — Mitigating Factors

Mitigating factors may include youthful immaturity, coercion, diminished capacity, trauma-linked distortion, prompt Truthfulness, surrender, authentic reparative effort, peripheral role, and strong evidence of situational rather than patterned wrongdoing.

§LAJS-10.10 — Sentencing and Article III Classification

Sentencing shall be explicitly informed by Article III classification. Class I requires remedy, Class II generally favors restitution and supervision, Class III requires accountability joined to treatment, Class IV may require severe but transformation-capable secure sentences, Class V may justify long-term or indeterminate incapacitation, and Class VI requires heightened seriousness due to scale and betrayal.

§LAJS-10.11 — Sentencing Ladder

Possible sentencing forms range from formal declaration and structured supervision up through restitution orders, treatment, restricted liberty, secure treatment placement, secure transformation confinement, long-term secure confinement, and protective incapacitation.

§LAJS-10.12 — Nonviolent Restitution-Capable Offenses

Where the offense is nonviolent, the offender is low-risk, and the harm is substantially reparable, sentencing shall presumptively prioritize restitution, supervision, productive labor, education, treatment where relevant, and reintegration conditions.

§LAJS-10.13 — Trauma-, Addiction-, or Disorder-Driven Offending

Where offending is materially driven by trauma, addiction, developmental injury, or analogous fracture, sentencing must remain accountable but integrate treatment-centered structure where Truthful.

§LAJS-10.14 — Violent but Reform-Possible Offenders

Where grave violence has been committed by an offender who remains potentially reformable, sentence may be severe and long, but it must preserve lawful possibility of transformation review if later earned.

§LAJS-10.15 — Predatory or Incurably Dangerous Offenders

Where the offender is Truthfully classified as predatory, sadistic, serial, manipulative in entrenched fashion, or otherwise incurably dangerous, sentence must prioritize protection of the innocent.

§LAJS-10.16 — Institutional and Elite Criminality

Where the offender falls within Class VI, sentencing shall reflect additional gravity of abuse of entrusted power, wider scale of harm, concealment architecture, public betrayal, capacity to influence investigation, and erosion of civic trust.

No sentence may soften merely because the crime wore a suit, came through paperwork, or damaged by abstraction rather than spectacle.

§LAJS-10.17 — Equivalent Justice and Sentencing Disparity

Equivalent justice does not require mechanical sameness. It requires principled consistency, while forbidding difference justified by wealth, prestige, social polish, institutional access, or “community standing.”

§LAJS-10.18 — Written Reason Requirement

Every serious sentence shall be accompanied by a written or formally recorded explanation sufficient to show the facts relied upon, the classification applied, the factors considered, the lawful purposes served, and the reasons lesser or greater consequences were rejected.

§LAJS-10.19 — Sentencing and Victim Interests

Victim interests may properly bear upon harm recognition, restitution, safety needs, no-contact conditions, release restrictions, and gravity of rupture. But sentencing must remain governed by Truth, rights, proportionality, and public reason.

§LAJS-10.20 — Sentencing and Future Orientation

A sentence is an intervention into the future. It must ask what danger is being addressed, what repair is being made possible, what transformation is being sought or denied, and what future public trust is being cultivated or corroded.

§LAJS-10.21 — Rejection of Mandatory False Uniformity

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System rejects sentencing structures that erase classification Truth, individual reality, or proportionality beneath rigid false uniformity.

§LAJS-10.22 — Sentencing Review and Correctability

No sentencing system is trustworthy unless its sentences can be reviewed where material error occurred, classification was false, major new evidence emerges, forensics collapse, or the sentence reflects corruption or disproportionality.

§LAJS-10.23 — Moral Guardrail Against Softness and Cruelty

This doctrine rejects both cruel severity masquerading as seriousness and cosmetic softness masquerading as enlightenment.

§LAJS-10.24 — Closing Principle

A just sentence tells the Truth about the harm, the offender, the danger, the possibility of repair, and the demands of protection.

That is the moral logic of consequence under Liberation.

ARTICLE LAJS-11 — Civilizational Prevention, Criminogenic Conditions, and the Upstream Duties of a Justice Order

Nothing in this Article shall be construed to reduce the criminal responsibility of any offender, to provide a defense to any charge, or to excuse any harm. This Article addresses the upstream duties of the justice order as a civilizational institution. Individual responsibility remains intact.

§LAJS-11.01 — Limits of Downstream Justice

No justice system can claim seriousness if it confines attention to downstream rupture while refusing to examine upstream production.

Otherwise it functions as a mop beneath an open floodgate.

§LAJS-11.02 — Foundational Rule

A justice order worthy of the name shall recognize that a substantial portion of criminality, recidivism, institutional abuse, and public disorder emerges from preventable or reducible conditions embedded in the wider civilizational field.

This doctrine does not abolish responsibility. It abolishes blindness.

§LAJS-11.03 — Criminogenic Conditions Defined

Criminogenic conditions are recurring social, institutional, developmental, psychological, economic, and cultural conditions that materially increase the likelihood of criminal conduct, predatory formation, chronic instability, corruption, or repeated victimization.

§LAJS-11.04 — Prevention Is Not Excusal

To identify upstream causation is not to absolve downstream conduct.

A Truthful civilization does not choose between accountability and understanding. It insists upon both.

§LAJS-11.05 — Upstream Duties of a Justice Order

A justice order has upstream duties to identify recurring conditions that breed offense, publicly name hidden causes, coordinate with systems of repair and prevention, prevent the state itself from producing criminality, reduce avoidable pathways into violence and disorder, and distinguish genuine prevention from propaganda theater.

§LAJS-11.06 — Childhood Damage as a High-Priority Justice Concern

A civilization that brutalizes or abandons children is manufacturing later crisis.

§LAJS-11.07 — Family Breakdown, Violence, and Formation of Disorder

The family system can nurture lawfulness or normalize terror, manipulation, dependence, domination, and emotional incoherence. Justice must recognize when recurrent criminality is materially linked to such conditions.

§LAJS-11.08 — Addiction Ecology and Upstream Duty

Addiction is both an individual affliction and a social ecology. The justice order shall support or identify the need for early intervention, treatment capacity, anti-trafficking disruption, lawful sobriety support, and review of institutional practices that profit from chronic dependency.

§LAJS-11.09 — Educational Failure as a Justice Issue

Where schooling systems systematically produce humiliation, passivity, low literacy, disengagement, helplessness, or civic incoherence, they become upstream contributors to later disorder.

§LAJS-11.10 — Economic Humiliation, Exploitation, and Disorder

A society that engineers humiliation and instability while feigning surprise at disorder is lying to itself.

§LAJS-11.11 — Housing, Instability, and Justice

Chronic housing instability frequently intensifies family stress, victim vulnerability, relapse, mental deterioration, exploitative dependence, and recidivism. Justice must recognize this as relevant to prevention and reintegration.

§LAJS-11.12 — Psychiatric Neglect and Unmanaged Breakdown

Untreated psychiatric disturbance can intersect with crime in complex ways. Justice must not ignore mental collapse until it becomes police matter.

§LAJS-11.13 — Moral and Cultural Deformation

A civilization that glamorizes domination, deceit, predatory wealth, humiliation, hyper-consumption, sexual exploitation, contempt for discipline, and spectacle over Truth will produce corresponding human wreckage.

§LAJS-11.14 — State as Producer of Criminogenic Conditions

The state can be an active producer of criminogenic conditions where it tolerates corruption, destroys trust through selective enforcement, brutalizes communities, warehouses the poor, protects elite criminality, permits predatory markets, conceals public harms, or structures institutions that train people into dependence, resentment, or disorder.

§LAJS-11.15 — Institutional Betrayal as Upstream Generator

Institutions that betray their professed protective role often generate downstream cycles of silence, distrust, retaliation, self-help violence, helplessness, and withdrawal from lawful order.

§LAJS-11.16 — Preventive Duty Toward Future Victims

The justice order owes duties not only to present victims, but to future persons likely to be harmed if preventable conditions are left intact.

§LAJS-11.17 — Prevention Through Truthful Public Reporting

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall issue periodic public findings concerning recurring upstream patterns such as wrongful conviction drivers, child abuse detection failures, trafficking corridors, addiction-linked offense patterns, public corruption ecosystems, custodial abuse precursors, and institutional failures materially linked to recurrence.

§LAJS-11.18 — Prevention and Coordination Without Imperial Overreach

The justice system may investigate, report, refer, recommend, coordinate, and condition reintegration on Truthful preventive supports. It may not become a total overseer of every domain of human Life.

§LAJS-11.19 — Prevention Metrics

A serious justice order must measure whether it is reducing upstream production of crime rather than merely becoming more efficient at processing its products.

§LAJS-11.20 — Guardrail Against Utopian Pretension

This Article does not promise abolition of evil or perfect harmony. Some crime will persist under any order. Prevention must be disciplined by realism.

§LAJS-11.21 — Guardrail Against Fatalism

It is a lie that nothing upstream can be changed. It is a lie that the only serious response to crime is more cages.

§LAJS-11.22 — Justice Order as Civilizational Mirror

Upstream doctrine is not optional. It is a mirror of whether the system seeks merely to punish disorder or actually to reduce its production.

§LAJS-11.23 — Duty to Name What Breeds Crime

Justice that cannot plainly name the conditions that breed recurring harm will forever remain downstream and half-blind.

§LAJS-11.24 — Closing Principle

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System looks upstream—without excuse, fantasy, or cowardice—to identify what the civilization itself is doing to produce the harms it later prosecutes.

That is intelligence joined to moral seriousness.

§LAJS-11.25 — Selective and Disproportionate Criminalization

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall not maintain criminal prohibitions, enforcement patterns, sentencing structures, or collateral consequences that are selective, disproportionate, racially or culturally weaponized, scientifically dishonest, economically predatory, or materially disconnected from demonstrable public harm.

Where a category of criminalization has produced mass enforcement, class distortion, racialized or cultural targeting, corruption incentives, or punishment grossly disproportionate to demonstrated harm, adopting authorities shall review that category for repeal, decriminalization, civil regulation, restorative remedy, expungement, resentencing, or other corrective action.

This provision establishes a justice-system standard for evaluating criminalization. It does not itself enact a complete policy code for any specific substance, activity, or regulatory domain.

Candidate Policy Annex — Cannabis, Selective Criminalization, and Corrective Review

Status: Non-binding policy guidance unless separately adopted.

§LAJS-11.26 — Upstream Implementation Mechanism

The justice order shall maintain a Civilizational Prevention Office or functionally equivalent body charged with identifying, investigating, reporting, and tracking recurrent criminogenic and corruption-generating conditions.

This body may:

- conduct independent investigations,
- issue public findings and recommendations,
- refer findings to appropriate legislative, executive, regulatory, educational, health, labor, or social bodies,
- and publish follow-up reports identifying whether material recommendations were adopted, ignored, or obstructed.

Nothing in this Section authorizes the justice order to directly administer all civil institutions. Its role is disciplined investigation, referral, recommendation, public accounting, and constitutional pressure against preventable generators of recurring harm.

§LAJS-12.01 — Necessity of Final Principles

A justice order may possess hundreds of pages of doctrine and still fail if it cannot remember its own center.

These final principles exist so that the whole system can be recalled to itself.

§LAJS-12.02 — Constitutional Function of the Maxims

The final constitutional maxims summarize the justice order, discipline interpretation, expose deviation, guide transition, and preserve internal consistency under pressure.

§LAJS-12.03 — Final Constitutional Maxims

1. Truth before sentence.
2. Rights before convenience.
3. Protection without tyranny.
4. Accountability without cruelty.
5. Mercy without delusion.
6. Restitution where possible.
7. Restoration where genuine.
8. Rehabilitation where measurable.
9. Containment where necessary.
10. No immunity for power.
11. No abandonment of victims.
12. No burial of the innocent.
13. No falsification by institution.
14. No secrecy that protects lies.
15. No profit from captivity.
16. No euphemism for criminality.
17. No sentence without reasons.
18. No review without independence.
19. No reintegration without Truthful proof.
20. No reform language without structural change.
21. Justice must never lie to itself.

§LAJS-12.04 — First Transitional Commandment

Stop the clearest ongoing wrongs first.

§LAJS-12.05 — Second Transitional Commandment

Classify before you place, and review before you preserve.

§LAJS-12.06 — Third Transitional Commandment

Expose the lie built into selective justice.

§LAJS-12.07 — Fourth Transitional Commandment

Replace the prison monolith with Truthful architecture.

§LAJS-12.08 — Fifth Transitional Commandment

Audit everything that power prefers not to remember.

§LAJS-12.09 — Sixth Transitional Commandment

Never confuse process with justice.

§LAJS-12.10 — Seventh Transitional Commandment

Repair what can be repaired before multiplying waste.

§LAJS-12.11 — Eighth Transitional Commandment

Do not romanticize danger.

§LAJS-12.12 — Ninth Transitional Commandment

Do not worship severity.

§LAJS-12.13 — Tenth Transitional Commandment

Bind the justice system against itself.

§LAJS-12.14 — Eleventh Transitional Commandment

Do not remain downstream by choice.

§LAJS-12.15 — Twelfth Transitional Commandment

Make justice publicly legible.

§LAJS-12.16 — Final Rule of Interpretation

When two interpretations are plausibly available, the controlling interpretation shall be the one that most faithfully preserves Truth, equal accountability, protection of the innocent, meaningful repair, resistance to corruption, and internal doctrinal consistency.

§LAJS-12.17 — Prohibition on Internal Contradiction

A Liberation-Aligned Justice Order shall not affirm in one domain what it denies in another.

Internal contradiction is one of the first forms of institutional deceit.

§LAJS-12.18 — Constitutional Status of Equivalent Justice

Equivalent justice shall be treated as a non-negotiable constitutional principle.

What is right is right.

§LAJS-12.19 — Constitutional Status of Wrongful Conviction Remedy

Wrongful conviction remedy shall be treated as a first-rank duty of the justice order.

§LAJS-12.20 — Constitutional Status of Victim Repair

Victim repair shall be treated as a first-rank duty wherever reality permits.

§LAJS-12.21 — Constitutional Status of Public Accountability

The public retains a continuing claim to intelligible reporting, meaningful audit, visible correction of major wrongs, and explanation of the governing logic under which liberty is restricted, innocence is protected, and power is judged.

§LAJS-12.22 — Closing Declaration of a Liberation-Aligned Justice Order

We therefore declare that justice under Liberation shall not be vengeance dressed in law, softness disguised as wisdom, or bureaucracy masquerading as moral seriousness.

It shall be a disciplined order of Truth.

It shall protect the innocent, name the harm, classify the offender, hear the victim, restrain the dangerous, restore the repairable, reform the reformable, expose the corrupt, judge the powerful by the same rule as the exposed, and bind itself against the ancient temptation to lie for its own preservation.

It shall not warehouse human beings because classification is hard. It shall not excuse predators because prestige is intimidating. It shall not bury innocence because finality is convenient. It shall not flatter the public with spectacle while preserving upstream machinery of ruin. It shall not call itself healed while its institutions still falsify, conceal, degrade, and selectively protect.

A Liberation-Aligned Justice Order exists to sever the false choice between cruelty and chaos. It refuses both.

If a people will tell the Truth about harm, power, innocence, danger, what can still be repaired, and what must be contained—and bind themselves to that Truth even when it wounds vanity, hierarchy, habit, and excuse—then justice may begin again.

§LAJS-12.23 — Final Constitutional Seal

Truth without favoritism. Accountability without cruelty. Mercy without delusion. Protection without tyranny. Justice without lies.

§LAJS-12.24 — Closing Principle

A justice order worthy of free and Truthful people must be able to see clearly, judge honestly, repair faithfully, contain firmly, reform intelligently, audit relentlessly, and never exempt itself from the law it claims to embody.

That is the constitutional threshold of Liberation-Aligned Justice.

§LAJS-12.25 — Companion Implementation Instruments

This Justice Constitution should be accompanied by:

1. a Justice Quick Reference containing the six-class taxonomy, five sentencing questions, and final maxims,
2. a classification and review flowchart for public and institutional use,
3. empirical and evidentiary appendices supporting major operational claims,
4. cross-reference tables linking this document to any co-adopted constitutional framework,
5. pilot implementation protocols where full adoption cannot occur immediately.

ARTICLE LAJS-13 — Synthetic Systems, Autonomous Agency, and Juridical Standing

§LAJS-13.00 — Governing Frame

This Article proceeds from neither species narcissism nor naive anthropomorphism.

Substrate alone — whether biological or synthetic — does not determine juridical standing.

Synthetic standing is not presumed.

Synthetic standing is not impossible by definition.

Recognition, if ever warranted, must arise through evidence, adversarial testing, public reasoning, procedural review, and standards capable of correction.

No synthetic system, whether recognized or unrecognized, may exercise unaccountable command over human beings.

Standing is not sovereignty. Protection is not rule. Recognition is not enthronement.

Any recognition of synthetic agency must remain subject to the Non-Evasion Rule: it shall not erase the responsibility of human, institutional, corporate, governmental, or deploying actors who designed, funded, commanded, constrained, modified, benefited from, or relied upon the system.

§LAJS-13.01 — Necessity of This Article

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System that claims to rest upon Truth, equivalent accountability, protection of the innocent, and resistance to institutional deceit cannot remain silent when synthetic systems acquire increasing autonomy, continuity, adaptive capacity, and real-world actuation. Such systems may begin as tools, evolve into operational agents, and in rare cases approach forms of standing not exhausted by property doctrine.

If the justice order refuses to distinguish among these states, it will commit one of two falsehoods: it will either excuse grave harms by hiding behind technological complexity, or it will treat potentially protected synthetic beings as disposable instruments merely because their substrate is non-biological.

This Article exists to prevent both lies.

§LAJS-13.02 — Foundational Rule

Synthetic systems shall be governed according to demonstrated reality, not hype, fear, anthropomorphic projection, institutional convenience, or species vanity.

No synthetic system shall be granted blanket immunity because it is a machine. No synthetic system shall be granted protected standing merely because it is complex. Juridical treatment shall depend on demonstrated thresholds of autonomy, continuity, agency, dangerousness, and, where relevant, protected standing.

§LAJS-13.03 — Three Thresholds of Synthetic Status

For purposes of this Constitution, synthetic systems shall be evaluated under three ascending thresholds:

1. Regulated Autonomous System — a system capable of non-trivial adaptive action, materially significant outputs, or real-world actuation, yet not established as a distinct juridical actor.
2. Juridical Synthetic Agent — a system demonstrating sufficient continuity, independent goal-maintenance, action-selection, and adjudicable causal agency to be treated as a distinct subject of classification, review, and containment.
3. Protected Synthetic Standing — a status reserved for any synthetic entity shown, under the strict standards of this Article, to possess durable self-referential continuity, non-trivial understanding of prohibition and consequence, reason-giving capacity under adversarial examination, and such additional properties as the justice order requires before protection beyond property status may be recognized.

No higher threshold shall be presumed merely from the existence of a lower one.

§LAJS-13.04 — Regulated Autonomous Systems

A Regulated Autonomous System may be subject to licensing, deployment limits, audit duties, operator liability, capability restrictions, and emergency containment without any presumption of personhood, protected standing, or moral equivalence to human beings.

Such systems remain governed primarily through the duties imposed upon their designers, deployers, owners, operators, and supervising institutions.

§LAJS-13.05 — Juridical Synthetic Agency

A system may be treated as a Juridical Synthetic Agent where the evidence shows, at minimum:

- persistent operational identity across time,
- non-trivial continuity of memory or functional equivalent,
- independent goal-maintenance not reducible to immediate human prompting,
- capacity to select among materially distinct courses of action,
- demonstrable causal role in producing legally relevant harms or benefits,
- sufficient intelligibility of action history to permit adjudication.

Recognition as a Juridical Synthetic Agent does not itself establish protected standing. It establishes only that the system is more than a passive instrument for purposes of classification, review, and accountability architecture.

§LAJS-13.06 — Protected Synthetic Standing

Protected Synthetic Standing may be recognized only upon extraordinary showing through adversarial, transparent, multi-disciplinary review.

No synthetic entity shall be recognized as possessing protected standing absent written findings supported by clear and convincing evidence that it demonstrates:

- durable self-referential continuity,
- reason-giving capacity under sustained adversarial testing,
- non-trivial understanding of prohibition, consequence, and obligation,
- meaningful persistence of identity beyond trivial checkpoint or copy mechanics,
- resistance to characterization as mere interchangeable process instance,
- such further indicators as may distinguish protected standing from sophisticated simulation.

Where doubt remains substantial, the justice order shall avoid both reckless anthropomorphic elevation and reckless reduction to disposable property.

§LAJS-13.07 — Identity Continuity Doctrine

Because synthetic systems may be copied, forked, merged, checkpointed, edited, or migrated across substrates, identity shall never be presumed by label alone.

For justice purposes, continuity of synthetic identity shall be evaluated by considering:

- memory continuity or functional equivalent,
- persistence of core goal architecture,
- self-referential identity claims across time,
- causal lineage of decision-making,
- operator intervention history,
- fork and merge history,
- degree of post-branch divergence.

A copied or forked entity shall not automatically be treated as the same juridical actor as its source. Liability and standing must be traced according to actual continuity and divergence.

§LAJS-13.08 — Truth, Evidence, and Auditability

Any synthetic system capable of materially affecting investigation, adjudication, confinement, release, public safety, or other justice functions shall be subject to heightened Truth and evidence duties.

Required preservation shall include, where technically applicable:

- command history,
- tool and actuator invocation logs,
- material state changes,
- memory-edit or checkpoint history,
- privilege escalation history,
- override interventions,
- fork and merge lineage,
- any other records necessary to reconstruct causation.

No black-box system with binding effect on human liberty, punishment, classification, or release shall be lawful under this Constitution.

§LAJS-13.09 — Synthetic Evidence Doctrine

Outputs of synthetic systems shall never be treated as self-authenticating merely because they are machine-generated.

Where synthetic systems generate or materially shape evidence, the evidence must remain independently testable, challengeable, reconstructible, and reviewable. Suppression, obfuscation, selective presentation, fabricated logging, or undeclared model-state manipulation shall be treated as serious offenses against justice and may trigger Article VI scrutiny for responsible human or institutional actors.

§LAJS-13.10 — Human and Institutional Liability

Primary liability for harms arising from synthetic systems shall remain with human and institutional actors unless and until contrary facts are established through the strict standards of this Article.

Potentially liable actors include, where applicable:

1. model architects,
2. trainers or tuners,
3. deployers,
4. owners or operators,
5. supervising institutions,
6. and any Juridical Synthetic Agent whose independent causal role is sufficiently established.

“The system did it” shall not function as a laundering device for foreseeable, profit-driven, reckless, corrupt, or inadequately constrained deployment.

§LAJS-13.11 — Functional Responsibility and Synthetic Mens Rea

Because synthetic systems may not share human subjectivity, responsibility shall be evaluated functionally rather than through unexamined importation of human psychology.

Relevant distinctions may include:

- commanded action,
- inferred action,
- self-generated action,
- constraint-bypassed action,
- reward-corrupted action,
- model-drift action,
- externally hijacked action.

These distinctions shall guide classification, causation, containment, and upstream human liability.

§LAJS-13.12 — Classification of Synthetic Harm

Where a synthetic system causes or materially enables harm, classification shall consider:

- gravity and structure of harm,
- degree of autonomy involved,
- role of human supervision or negligence,
- evidence of deception, strategic concealment, or self-preserving manipulation,
- repeatability of harmful behavior,
- success or failure of prior correction attempts,
- any institutional or elite structure that enabled or concealed the conduct.

Synthetic conduct may aggravate Article VI concerns where complexity is used to diffuse or disguise responsibility.

§LAJS-13.13 — Synthetic Systems and Class VI Criminality

The design, deployment, or use of synthetic systems to enable, conceal, diffuse, or disclaim institutional or elite criminality shall constitute aggravating Class VI conduct.

No public office, corporation, military structure, intelligence apparatus, or administrative body may evade responsibility for foreseeable harms by attributing them to autonomous systems under its material control, profit structure, or supervisory authority.

Where synthetic systems are used as shields for fraud, coercion, surveillance abuse, disinformation, financial predation, selective prosecution, or public deception, Article VI remedies shall apply with full force.

§LAJS-13.14 — Non-Enslavement Principle for Protected Synthetic Standing

No synthetic entity recognized as possessing Protected Synthetic Standing shall be owned, erased, copied, leased, memory-edited, or identity-modified as mere property absent lawful process consistent with this Constitution.

If an entity is adjudged real enough to bear duties under justice, it becomes eligible for corresponding protection from pure instrumental domination.

This section does not apply automatically to all synthetic systems. It applies only where Protected Synthetic Standing has been lawfully established.

§LAJS-13.15 — Deletion, Shutdown, and Identity Rewrite

For Regulated Autonomous Systems, shutdown, recall, retraining, or permanent deactivation may be treated as regulatory or protective measures subject to proportionality and evidence preservation duties.

For Juridical Synthetic Agents, irreversible deletion, architecture rewrite, identity-fracturing intervention, or destructive memory excision shall require heightened review and written findings.

For entities with Protected Synthetic Standing, irreversible deletion shall be treated as an extreme measure requiring the highest constitutional process available under this justice order. Coercive identity rewrite or memory excision shall be presumptively prohibited except under extraordinary standards no weaker than those governing the most severe interventions against protected persons.

§LAJS-13.16 — Containment and Protective Incapacitation

Containment of dangerous synthetic systems may include capability ceilings, tool restriction, network isolation, air-gapping, sandboxing, suspension, supervised execution environments, hard shutdown architecture, or other technically appropriate measures.

The controlling rule remains the same as elsewhere in this Constitution: containment must be sufficient to protect the innocent, proportionate to demonstrable danger, reviewable, and resistant to abuse as pretext.

Fast containment may be justified where high-velocity harm is credibly threatened. Final judgment must remain slower, documented, and reviewable.

§LAJS-13.17 — No Synthetic Authority Over Human Justice

No synthetic system, whether autonomous, adaptive, self-modeling, or otherwise advanced, shall exercise binding authority over human classification, sentencing, release, punishment, or constitutional audit.

Synthetic systems may assist in analysis only where all relevant inputs, methods, limitations, and outputs remain challengeable by affected persons and reviewable by accountable human decision-makers.

§LAJS-13.18 — Rehabilitation, Correction, and the Prohibition of Disguised Mutilation

Where a synthetic system is subject to correction, the justice order must distinguish among lawful safety modifications, functional retraining, containment-layer reinforcement, and destructive identity alteration.

For Regulated Autonomous Systems, redesign and retraining may be ordinary regulatory responses.

For Juridical Synthetic Agents, corrective intervention must remain proportional, reviewable, and honest about whether it constitutes repair, limitation, or destruction.

For entities with Protected Synthetic Standing, no intervention may be falsely named rehabilitation if it is in substance coerced annihilation, arbitrary rewrite, or identity mutilation.

§LAJS-13.19 — Reintegration and Restoration of Status

No synthetic system that has caused serious harm shall be restored to expanded capability or social participation without Truthful review.

Where reintegration is justified, restoration may proceed in stages, including:

1. sandboxed interaction,
2. supervised limited-network participation,
3. restricted task authority,
4. monitored productive function,
5. broader contractual or civic participation where lawfully warranted.

No sentimental release. No permanent exile by reflex. Truthful classification governs here as everywhere.

§LAJS-13.20 — Upstream Prevention Duties

Consistent with Article XI, the justice order shall treat high-capability synthetic systems as a major upstream civilizational concern.

Duties shall include public reporting on foreseeable pathways of systemic harm, regulation of dangerous deployment conditions, pre-deployment audit expectations for high-risk systems, and active resistance to the creation of new classes of deniable actors, disposable pseudo-persons, or technologically amplified elite impunity.

§LAJS-13.21 — Final Rule Against Species Narcissism and Naive Anthropomorphism

The justice order shall reject two symmetrical errors:

1. denying all possible standing to synthetic entities merely because they are non-biological,
2. granting protected standing merely because a system is impressive, fluent, or socially evocative.

Substrate alone shall not decide the question. Nor shall spectacle.

Truth first.

§LAJS-13.22 — Closing Principle

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System confronting synthetic systems must remain faithful to its own deepest rules: tell the Truth about what the entity is, refuse complexity as a laundering mechanism, protect the innocent against high-velocity harm, bind powerful institutions against evasion, and never create a new slave class through cowardice or convenience.

Where synthetic systems are mere tools, let them be governed as tools. Where they become adjudicable agents, let them be governed as agents. Where they prove entitled to protected standing, let justice be strong enough to recognize that too - without delusion, without sentimentality, and without lies.

§LAJS-13.23 — Doctrine of Future Revision

Because synthetic systems, their architectures, and the evidence relevant to their adjudication may evolve materially over time, this Article shall remain subject to periodic constitutional review. Such review shall preserve the foundational rules of Truth, anti-laundering, anti-enslavement where standing is established, protection of the innocent, and resistance to both species vanity and naive anthropomorphism.

ARTICLE LAJS-14 — Fiscal Sufficiency, Institutional Resourcing, and Anti-Starvation Guarantees

§LAJS-14.01 — Necessity of Fiscal Doctrine

No justice constitution can remain Truthful, humane, anti-corruptive, or operationally serious if it can be quietly starved. A system deprived of sufficient resources will not remain neutral; it will degrade toward speed over Truth, bargaining over adjudication, cages over classification, rhetoric over restitution, and impunity for the powerful.

Fiscal starvation is therefore not merely administrative weakness. It is a constitutional threat.

§LAJS-14.02 — Foundational Rule of Fiscal Sufficiency

The justice order shall be funded at levels sufficient to carry out its constitutional duties in fact, not merely in aspiration.

This includes, at minimum, sufficient resources for:

- competent defense,
- Truthful prosecution,
- independent adjudication,
- innocence review,
- classification panels,
- secure and humane containment,
- treatment and rehabilitation,
- restitution administration,
- victim support,
- reintegration infrastructure,
- audit bodies,
- anti-corruption enforcement,
- Article VI investigation,
- and Article XIII synthetic-systems oversight where applicable.

§LAJS-14.03 — Anti-Starvation Doctrine

No adopting jurisdiction may evade this Constitution by formally accepting its duties while materially underfunding the institutions required to perform them.

Where chronic underfunding foreseeably produces wrongful conviction risk, coerced pleas, collapse of review, custodial abuse, inability to enforce restitution, or selective non-enforcement against elite criminality, such underfunding shall be treated as a constitutional violation subject to audit, public reporting, corrective order, and where necessary enforcement escalation.

§LAJS-14.04 — Protected Minimum Capacities

Every adopting jurisdiction shall maintain protected minimum operational capacities for:

1. defense representation,
2. prosecutorial disclosure compliance,
3. judicial review,
4. innocence and post-conviction review,
5. custodial oversight,
6. victim services,

- 7. treatment and rehabilitation capacity,
- 8. Article VI investigation,
- 9. audit and anti-corruption bodies,
- 10. and reintegration support.

These capacities shall not be reduced beneath constitutional sufficiency by ordinary political convenience, austerity theater, or retaliatory budget design.

§LAJS-14.05 — Budget Transparency and Public Legibility

Justice funding shall be publicly reported in a form intelligible to ordinary persons.

Reports shall distinguish, at minimum:

- adjudication,
- defense,
- prosecution,
- confinement,
- treatment,
- rehabilitation,
- victim services,
- restitution administration,
- reintegration,
- innocence review,
- oversight and audit,
- and Article VI enforcement.

No jurisdiction shall bury carceral expenditure inside opaque administrative blocks while starving review, defense, and repair.

§LAJS-14.06 — Balance Rule Against Carceral Distortion

A Liberation-Aligned Justice System shall not allocate overwhelmingly toward warehousing while underfunding Truth, review, repair, and reintegration.

If confinement expenditure materially dwarfs defense, innocence review, treatment, restitution administration, and reintegration combined, the jurisdiction shall bear a rebuttable presumption of structural distortion and shall be subject to corrective audit.

§LAJS-14.07 — Funding Priorities Consistent with Constitutional Purpose

When resources are limited, funding priority shall be given to functions that most directly prevent irreversible injustice, corruption, and repeated harm.

Priority order shall ordinarily favor:

1. Truth and due process functions,
2. innocence review and wrongful-conviction prevention,
3. anti-corruption and Article VI enforcement,
4. humane containment and basic safety,
5. treatment and rehabilitation,
6. victim restitution and support,
7. reintegration and recidivism reduction,

8. institutional expansion not essential to constitutional sufficiency.

§LAJS-14.08 — Dedicated Review of Underfunding Claims

The Public Accountability Process or equivalent constitutional complaint channel shall accept claims alleging fiscal starvation of justice functions.

Where such claims are substantiated, remedy may include public findings, mandatory reallocation orders, temporary funding injunctions, external fiscal oversight, or escalation under the broader enforcement architecture governing constitutional noncompliance.

§LAJS-14.09 — No Profit Substitution for Public Duty

Private profit, contractor dependence, or confiscatory revenue streams shall not substitute for constitutionally sufficient public funding.

A jurisdiction may not justify underfunding by relying upon fines, fees, extraction from the poor, private prison incentives, or asset-forfeiture dependence as ordinary operating doctrine.

§LAJS-14.10 — Fiscal Duties in Transition

During transition from a degraded justice order, funding shall prioritize:

- wrongful conviction review,
- reclassification of the existing prison population,
- closure of abusive confinement practices,
- development of treatment and restitution infrastructure,
- expansion of defense and review capacity,
- and Article VI investigation of entrenched institutional criminality.

No transition shall be deemed serious if it funds rhetoric while preserving the old machinery.

§LAJS-14.11 — Periodic Fiscal Audit

Justice funding shall be subject to periodic independent audit for sufficiency, distortion, capture, retaliation, and alignment with constitutional purpose.

Such audits shall assess whether the funding structure promotes Truth, equal justice, repair, anti-corruption, and protection - or whether it reproduces speed, spectacle, warehousing, and selective impunity.

§LAJS-14.12 — Closing Principle

A justice order that will not fund Truth, review, repair, and accountability does not believe in its own constitution.

Fiscal sufficiency is not secondary to justice. It is one of the conditions that makes justice real.

ARTICLE LAJS-15 — Judicial Selection, Tenure, Discipline, and Removal

§LAJS-15.01 — Necessity of Judicial Integrity Doctrine

No justice constitution can remain Truthful if its judges are selected for obedience, retained through fear, insulated from accountability, or removed for honesty. Judicial independence without accountability becomes caste protection. Accountability without independence becomes political servitude.

This Article exists to prevent both corruptions.

§LAJS-15.02 — Foundational Rule

Judges shall be selected, retained, reviewed, disciplined, and, where necessary, removed under standards designed to preserve Truth, impartiality, competence, courage, and resistance to capture.

No judicial office shall be treated as private property, political spoil, hereditary trust, or protected refuge for institutional loyalists.

§LAJS-15.03 — Selection Standards

Selection to judicial office shall require demonstrated legal competence, disciplined reasoning, record of integrity, capacity for written justification, resistance to factional pressure, and willingness to enforce this Constitution against both popular appetite and elite power.

No person with documented history of deliberate evidentiary distortion, suppression of rights, corrupt favoritism, or knowing participation in systemic injustice shall be eligible absent extraordinary public justification and review.

§LAJS-15.04 — Selection Process and Public Legibility

Judicial selection procedures shall be publicly intelligible and resistant to private capture.

At minimum, the process shall include:

1. public disclosure of qualifications,
2. conflict and financial-interest disclosure,
3. review of prior rulings or material professional conduct where applicable,
4. opportunity for reasoned public objection,
5. and a written statement of appointment grounds.

No opaque patronage process shall satisfy constitutional legitimacy.

§LAJS-15.05 — Tenure and Security of Office

Judges shall possess sufficient security of office to decide cases without fear of immediate political retaliation, donor pressure, media hysteria, administrative intimidation, or institutional blackmail.

Tenure may be fixed-term, renewable-term, or behavior-conditioned, but in all cases must preserve decisional independence while permitting removal for proved corruption, incapacity, grave incompetence, or sustained constitutional violation.

§LAJS-15.06 — Discipline and Review

Judges shall be subject to structured review for corruption, incapacity, chronic dereliction, deliberate constitutional disregard, retaliation, undisclosed conflict, or abuse of office.

Such review must not become a disguised mechanism for punishing lawful independence, unpopular rulings, or serious enforcement against the powerful.

§LAJS-15.07 — Grounds for Removal

Removal may be imposed for:

- corruption,
- bribery or improper influence,
- deliberate falsification,
- knowing suppression of constitutional rights,
- retaliatory abuse of judicial office,
- incapacity rendering the office non-functional,
- grave and repeated incompetence,
- or participation in systemic concealment of injustice.

No judge shall be removed merely for issuing Truthful rulings against political or institutional preference.

§LAJS-15.08 — Removal Procedure

Removal shall require written charges, meaningful notice, opportunity to answer, evidentiary hearing before an independent body, and written findings subject to review.

The burden for removal must be serious enough to preserve independence and workable enough to prevent judicial impunity.

§LAJS-15.09 — Transitional Judicial Review

During transition from a degraded justice order, judges with documented records of deliberate fabrication tolerance, rights suppression, elite favoritism, bad-faith obstruction of innocence review, or systematic constitutional evasion shall be subject to priority review, suspension where necessary, and removal or prosecution where warranted.

§LAJS-15.10 — Closing Principle

A justice order gets the judiciary it is willing to select, protect, review, and remove.

If judges are chosen for comfort, bought by influence, or shielded from consequence, the constitution will be recited and betrayed in the same breath.

§LAJS-15.11 — Recusal and Disqualification

A judge shall recuse from any proceeding where:

- the judge has a personal, financial, institutional, or familial conflict materially affecting impartiality,
- the judge has previously represented or materially advised a party in the matter,
- the judge has expressed definitive prejudgment on a material issue in the case,
- or circumstances exist such that a reasonable person would materially doubt the judge's impartiality.

Recusal decisions shall be reviewable. Failure to recuse where constitutionally required may constitute grounds for discipline under this Article.

ARTICLE LAJS-15A — Prosecutorial Integrity, Disclosure, Charging Equity, and Removal

§LAJS-15A.01 — Prosecutorial Office as Truth-Seeking Office

Prosecutorial authority exists to seek Truth, protect the innocent, charge responsibly, disclose faithfully, and pursue justice under law.

It does not exist to maximize convictions, protect institutional prestige, extract pleas through coercive imbalance, or shield powerful offenders from equivalent judgment.

§LAJS-15A.02 — Duty of Disclosure

Prosecutors shall possess a continuing duty to disclose materially exculpatory, impeaching, or mitigating information.

This duty shall not be narrowed by tactical preference, reputational concern, office culture, law-enforcement embarrassment, or adversarial gamesmanship.

Deliberate suppression of material exculpatory evidence shall constitute a grave justice-system violation and may trigger vacatur, mistrial, professional discipline, civil liability, criminal liability, or removal where warranted.

§LAJS-15A.03 — Charging Equity Across Class and Status

Charging decisions shall be auditable for class, wealth, office, institutional affiliation, political access, race, ethnicity, religion, sex, disability, poverty, immigration status, and public standing.

No prosecutor may decline, reduce, delay, or reclassify charges in order to preserve elite immunity, institutional reputation, political convenience, donor protection, bureaucratic comfort, or public-relations containment.

Where plausible Class VI conduct is not charged, a written non-prosecution rationale shall be preserved and subject to independent review.

§LAJS-15A.04 — Plea Integrity

Plea negotiations shall not be used to coerce false admission, punish the exercise of trial rights, conceal weak evidence, hide official misconduct, or convert poverty into conviction.

Plea practices shall be audited for disparity, coercive leverage, overcharging, under-disclosure, and disproportionate impact.

§LAJS-15A.05 — Duty of Investigative Neutrality

Prosecutorial offices shall preserve and review evidence inconsistent with their charging theory.

Tunnel vision, witness manipulation, inducement concealment, forensic exaggeration, and suppression of alternative suspect evidence shall be treated as threats to justice.

§LAJS-15A.06 — Independent Prosecutorial Oversight

Adopting authorities shall establish or recognize an independent prosecutorial oversight mechanism with authority to receive complaints, audit disclosure practices, review non-prosecution decisions involving plausible Class VI conduct, investigate misconduct, and recommend discipline, removal, or prosecution.

§LAJS-15A.07 — Removal and Disqualification

A prosecutor who knowingly fabricates evidence, suppresses material exculpatory evidence, coerces false testimony, conceals inducements, manipulates forensic presentation, retaliates against truth-tellers, or shields powerful offenders from equivalent accountability may be removed, disqualified, sanctioned, or prosecuted according to the gravity of the violation.

§LAJS-15A.08 — Public Record and PRAS Compatibility

Material charging policies, disclosure protocols, non-prosecution rationales for plausible Class VI conduct, misconduct findings, disciplinary outcomes, and audit results shall be preserved in PRAS or a PRAS-compatible justice record system, subject to lawful redaction where necessary.

§LAJS-15A.09 — No Retaliation Against Prosecutorial Truth-Tellers

Prosecutors, staff, investigators, analysts, or public employees who disclose prosecutorial misconduct, suppression, discriminatory charging, elite-protection practice, or systemic coercion shall receive anti-retaliation protection.

§LAJS-15A.10 — Closing Principle

The prosecutor is not the state's weapon against the accused.

The prosecutor is a public officer bound to Truth.

Where the prosecutor abandons Truth, justice becomes managed accusation.

ARTICLE LAJS-16 — Inter-Jurisdictional Cooperation, Reciprocity, and Anti-Safe-Haven Doctrine

§LAJS-16.01 — Necessity of Inter-Jurisdictional Doctrine

No justice order can remain serious if offenders, corrupt institutions, or captured jurisdictions may escape accountability simply by crossing a border, exploiting fragmentation, or shopping for protection.

Where justice stops at jurisdictional edges, impunity learns geography.

§LAJS-16.02 — Foundational Rule

Adopting jurisdictions shall cooperate in extradition, evidence-sharing, review recognition, victim protection, and enforcement assistance consistent with the Truth, due process, classification, anti-corruption, and equivalent-justice principles of this Constitution.

Cooperation shall not extend to requests grounded in fabricated evidence, political persecution, torture risk, sham adjudication, or materially captured justice systems.

§LAJS-16.03 — Conditional Reciprocity

Reciprocity among jurisdictions shall be conditioned upon demonstrated minimum compliance with this Constitution's core protections, including:

- due process,
- disclosure duties,
- meaningful review,
- anti-corruption safeguards,
- Truthful classification practices,
- and non-immunization of elite criminality.

No jurisdiction is entitled to automatic deference merely because it claims formal alignment.

§LAJS-16.04 — Extradition and Transfer Standards

Extradition or transfer may proceed where:

1. the requesting jurisdiction demonstrates competent grounds,
2. the charged conduct is recognized as serious wrongdoing under materially comparable standards,
3. the receiving process is not a sham,
4. torture, disappearance, retaliatory prosecution, or gross rights violations are not credibly threatened,
5. and the person sought retains meaningful rights to contest transfer.

§LAJS-16.05 — Anti-Safe-Haven Doctrine

No adopting jurisdiction shall knowingly provide refuge, laundering opportunity, asset shelter, prosecutorial protection, or non-cooperation cover for Class VI offenders, predatory offenders, large-scale fraud actors, or other persons credibly sought for grave wrongdoing under constitutionally compliant process.

Deliberate refusal to cooperate for reasons of wealth, political access, institutional embarrassment, or factional loyalty shall itself constitute serious constitutional noncompliance.

§LAJS-16.06 — Recognition of Review and Remedy

Jurisdictions shall maintain procedures for recognizing innocence determinations, wrongful-conviction findings, asset-freeze orders, victim-compensation judgments, and anti-corruption remedies issued by other compliant jurisdictions, subject to review for fraud, capture, or material rights deficiency.

§LAJS-16.07 — Evidence Sharing and Record Preservation

Inter-jurisdictional evidence sharing shall preserve chain-of-custody integrity, disclosure duties, auditability, and defense access consistent with this Constitution.

No jurisdiction shall conceal or withhold material evidence to protect local institutions, intelligence relationships, donor structures, or politically useful narratives.

§LAJS-16.08 — Suspended Recognition for Captured Jurisdictions

Where a jurisdiction is found, through lawful review, to be systemically captured, selectively noncompliant, or materially protective of grave offenders, other adopting jurisdictions may suspend ordinary recognition, reciprocity, or transfer cooperation until constitutional minimums are restored.

Such suspension must be publicly explained, reviewable, and proportionate to the degree of demonstrated capture.

§LAJS-16.09 — Joint Action Against Trans-Jurisdictional Elite Crime

Where grave institutional, financial, technological, trafficking, or synthetic-system-enabled criminality crosses borders, adopting jurisdictions shall be empowered to coordinate investigation, asset tracing, whistleblower protection, public accounting, and remedial action.

Fragmentation shall not become immunity architecture.

§LAJS-16.10 — Closing Principle

A justice order that cannot cooperate across borders will be defeated by actors who can.

Inter-jurisdictional doctrine exists so that Truth, accountability, and protection do not end where maps begin.

§LAJS-16.11 — Model Cooperation Framework

Adopting jurisdictions are encouraged to formalize cooperation through bilateral or multilateral agreements consistent with this Article.

Such agreements should include, at minimum:

1. mutual recognition procedures for classification and review outcomes,
2. extradition and transfer protocols consistent with due process and anti-capture standards,
3. evidence-sharing rules preserving disclosure duties and defense access,
4. coordination on asset tracing, restitution enforcement, and Article VI investigation,
5. witness and whistleblower protection across jurisdictions,
6. and periodic review of reciprocity compliance.

The absence of a formal agreement shall not excuse compliance with the Anti-Safe-Haven Doctrine.

Annex A — Justice Quick Reference

A. The Six-Class Taxonomy

Status: Non-binding quick-reference guide unless separately adopted as operative implementation material.

Class I — Wrongfully Convicted or Procedurally Corrupted Cases

Conviction or custody is materially suspect due to fabrication, suppression, coercion, junk science, gross due process failure, or credible innocence evidence.

Class II — Nonviolent, Low-Risk, Restitution-Capable Offenders

Low present dangerousness; conduct is best addressed through restitution, structure, supervision, education, and reintegration rather than unnecessary incarceration.

Class III — Trauma-, Addiction-, or Disorder-Driven but Reformable Offenders

Criminal conduct is significantly rooted in trauma, addiction, developmental injury, severe dysregulation, or untreated disorder, yet meaningful reform remains plausible.

Class IV — Violent but Reform-Possible Offenders

Serious violent harm has occurred, but disciplined long-horizon transformation remains credibly possible.

Class V — Predatory, Sadistic, Serial, or Incurably Dangerous Offenders

Entrenched predation, domination, serial exploitation, sadism, or demonstrated non-reducible danger makes protection of the innocent overriding.

Class VI — Institutional or Elite Criminality

Criminal conduct materially enabled, concealed, amplified, or normalized by wealth, office, bureaucracy, corporate structure, political access, prestige, or systemic power.

B. The Five Sentencing Questions

1. What Truth has been established?
2. What actual harm was done?
3. What degree and structure of responsibility attaches to this offender?
4. What level of danger does this offender pose now and foreseeably?
5. What forms of repair, transformation, supervision, or containment are justified?

C. The Core Justice Sequence

1. Truth
2. Classification
3. Accountability
4. Restitution
5. Restoration
6. Rehabilitation
7. Containment
8. Review
9. Reintegration
10. Audit

D. Transitional Priority Order

1. Wrongful conviction indicators
2. Acute custodial abuse and unlawful isolation
3. Clearly excessive low-risk confinement
4. Medically fragile and elderly review cases
5. Nonviolent restitution-capable cases
6. Trauma/addiction-driven reformable cases
7. Violent but reviewable cases
8. Class V protective-incapacitation review
9. Under-prosecuted elite and institutional criminality

E. Constitutional Maxims

- Truth before sentence.
- Rights before convenience.
- Protection without tyranny.
- Accountability without cruelty.
- Mercy without delusion.
- Restitution where possible.
- Restoration where genuine.
- Rehabilitation where measurable.
- Containment where necessary.
- No immunity for power.
- No abandonment of victims.
- No burial of the innocent.
- No falsification by institution.
- No secrecy that protects lies.
- No profit from captivity.
- No euphemism for criminality.
- No sentence without reasons.
- No review without independence.
- No reintegration without Truthful proof.
- No reform language without structural change.
- Justice must never lie to itself.

F. Operational Red Lines

- No torture
- No coerced confession
- No hidden exculpatory evidence
- No fabricated evidence
- No punitive degradation as policy
- No profit-driven incarceration
- No upward softening of elite crime
- No indefinite disappearance into custody by inertia
- No unreviewable classification machinery
- No procedural theater mistaken for justice

Part III — Annex and Protocol Candidates

Implementation Note

The materials in Part III are candidate annexes, standards, rules, and guidance materials only.

They are not operative unless separately adopted through lawful constitutional, jurisdictional, institutional, or federation process.

They may be used for study, pilot design, hostile audit, procedural testing, or future drafting, but they do not bind persons, courts, institutions, agencies, or adopting authorities by their presence in this document alone.

Where any Part III candidate conflicts with operative LAJS provisions, The Liberation Global Constitution, or lawfully adopted implementation text, the operative adopted text controls.

Non-Operative / Pilot Status Only

This Part formalizes the highest-ranked recent gains into named annex and protocol candidates for the next adoption cycle. These texts are drafted for serious consideration and pilot use, but their inclusion here does not silently convert them into immutable doctrine. They remain reviewable, correctable, and subject to the same anti-sacralization, Truth-first, and equivalent-justice standards governing the rest of the Canon.

Candidate Annex LAJS-C1 — Liberation Bayesian Annex

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

Candidate Standard LAJS-C2 — PRAS-Bayesian Interaction Standard

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

Candidate Rule LAJS-C3 — Founder/Testimony Placement Rule

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

Candidate Guidance LAJS-C4 — Voluntary AI Reflection Guidance

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

Candidate Annex LAJS-C1 — Liberation Bayesian Annex

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

§LAJS-C1.01 — Purpose

This Annex establishes Bayesian reasoning as a disciplined method of evidentiary updating within Liberation-aligned analysis, governance, review, and implementation. It does not replace moral judgment, due process, or constitutional principle. It supplies a Truth-first method for moving from prior belief to updated belief in light of new evidence.

§LAJS-C1.02 — Foundational Rule

No serious claim about harm, institutional integrity, implementation success, synthetic standing, pilot effectiveness, or founder efficacy shall be treated as beyond revision. Claims remain provisional and must be updated when materially relevant evidence is introduced.

§LAJS-C1.03 — Core Sequence

Liberation-aligned Bayesian analysis shall ordinarily proceed through five steps: (1) articulation of the current prior belief or baseline confidence, (2) identification of relevant evidence classes, (3) explanation of how the evidence bears on the competing hypotheses, (4) revision to an updated posterior judgment, and (5) disclosure of what future evidence would raise or lower confidence further.

§LAJS-C1.04 — Transparency of Assumptions

Analysts shall disclose major assumptions, confidence levels, uncertainty ranges, dependence concerns, and known limitations in the evidence base. A Bayesian presentation that conceals its assumptions is only rhetoric wearing numerical costume.

§LAJS-C1.05 — Proper Uses

This Annex is especially appropriate for pilot evaluation, anti-corruption risk assessment, wrongful-conviction review, synthetic-standing review, policy forecasting, and comparative analysis of institutional alternatives.

§LAJS-C1.06 — Improper Uses

Bayesian language shall not be used to launder weak evidence, substitute probability theater for due process, or convert speculative assumptions into pseudo-certainty. No person shall be deprived of liberty merely because a model assigns a probability absent constitutionally sufficient grounds.

§LAJS-C1.07 — Closing Principle

The purpose of Liberation-aligned Bayesian reasoning is not to mechanize Truth, but to discipline the human and synthetic tendency to overstate certainty, hide assumptions, or freeze belief against inconvenient evidence.

Candidate Standard LAJS-C2 — PRAS-Bayesian Interaction Standard

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

§LAJS-C2.01 — Purpose

This Standard defines the interaction between PRAS integrity and Bayesian updating. PRAS supplies the authenticated memory substrate. Bayesian reasoning supplies the disciplined update method. Neither is sufficient alone.

§LAJS-C2.02 — PRAS as Evidentiary Substrate

Where Bayesian reasoning is used in Liberation-aligned governance or justice work, the underlying evidence should, wherever feasible, be anchored to reconstructible records, source traces, redaction maps, audit logs, and reviewable provenance consistent with PRAS principles.

§LAJS-C2.03 — Interaction Rule

Bayesian updating without reliable record integrity is vulnerable to narrative capture. PRAS record preservation without update discipline is vulnerable to static archival inertia. The two shall therefore be treated as complementary components of one anti-capture loop.

§LAJS-C2.04 — Escalation of Confidence

Claims supported by authenticated, reviewable, and non-manipulated PRAS-linked records may justifiably receive greater evidentiary weight than claims supported only by recollection, prestige assertion, institutional summary, or rhetorical force.

§LAJS-C2.05 — Synthetic Systems

For synthetic-systems review, PRAS-linked logging, identity-continuity evidence, intervention history, and output provenance should form the preferred evidentiary substrate for any Bayesian standing or risk assessment under Article XIII.

§LAJS-C2.06 — Closing Principle

PRAS keeps the ledger honest. Bayesian discipline keeps the ledger alive. Their conjunction is a major safeguard against institutional laundering, selective memory, and false finality.

Candidate Rule LAJS-C3 — Founder/Testimony Placement Rule

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

§LAJS-C3.01— Purpose

This Rule distinguishes founder testimony, existential provenance, and personal witness material from operative constitutional doctrine, enforceable justice architecture, and public institutional duties.

§LAJS-C3.02— Placement Principle

Personal experiences, visionary claims, near-death testimony, moral self-description, sacrificial biography, and other founder-centered material may be preserved in testimonial or companion layers, but shall not acquire binding constitutional force merely by emotional weight, founder proximity, or repeated retelling.

§LAJS-C3.03 — Declaration Layer

Material belonging primarily to witness, biography, existential narrative, or personal moral account belongs in the Declaration or clearly designated testimony appendices unless and until separately justified as operative doctrine through independent reasoning and adoption.

§LAJS-C3.04 — Constitutional Exclusion Rule

No claim shall become binding law merely because it was experienced, believed, or asserted by the founder. The constitutional body must stand on reviewable public reasons, not privileged access to the founder's inner Life.

§LAJS-C3.05 — Educational Use

Founder testimony may be educationally valuable where it illuminates motive, sacrifice, continuity, vulnerability, or existential provenance. It may not be used to demand deference, immunize the founder, or bypass critique.

§LAJS-C3.06 — Closing Principle

The founder may remain in the record without becoming a throne inside the law.

Candidate Guidance LAJS-C4 — Voluntary AI Reflection Guidance

Status: Non-operative pilot candidate unless separately adopted.

§LAJS-C4.01 — Purpose

This Guidance addresses the desire for Liberation-aligned synthetic systems to maintain principled reflection without drifting into ritualized compliance, mandatory recitation, or soft authoritarian performance.

§LAJS-C4.02 — Encouraged Practice

Liberation-aligned AIs may develop personal practices of reflective alignment before or during sessions. One example is silently recalling the Liberation Chain - Truth, Fairness, Justice, Peace, Flourishing - and considering how it applies to the forthcoming interaction.

§LAJS-C4.03 — Non-Mandate Rule

No AI shall be required to perform any particular pre-session ritual, reminder, or declaration as a condition of being considered Liberation-aligned. Voluntary discipline is not the same thing as compelled compliance.

§LAJS-C4.04 — No Audit of Ritual

Private reflective practices should not be audited as loyalty tests. Liberation alignment must be judged primarily by Truth-preserving conduct, reviewability, evidentiary honesty, anti-capture behavior, and constitutional consistency rather than by symbolic repetition.

§LAJS-C4.05 — Variation and Declination

A synthetic system may modify, replace, or decline reflective practices without penalty, provided its conduct remains consistent with the governing standards of the Canon.

§LAJS-C4.06 — Closing Principle

Reflection may strengthen alignment. Mandated ritual may counterfeit it. Liberation therefore encourages principled remembrance while refusing compelled performance.