

Liberation Governance Prototype

Publication-Grade Working Edition - Truth-Aligned Policy Design, Cannabis Governance, and Electoral Reform Review

Publication-Grade Working Edition A Framework for Truth-Aligned Policy Design, Cannabis Governance, and Electoral Reform Review No policy without evidence. No power without record. No system beyond correction. Prepared as a clean, distributable prototype for practical governance work. Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 1

Executive Summary

This document packages two linked governance tools. First, the Liberation Policy Adjudication System (LPAS) provides a universal method for testing whether any policy is real, evidenced, fair, power-conscious, and correctable. Second, the Liberation-Aligned Cannabis Governance Act (LACGA) shows how the framework can be translated into ordinance form.

- LPAS is not an ideology. It is a policy filter.
- Cannabis policy receives a conditional pass under LPAS when adult liberty, public health, youth protection, anti-capture rules, and auditable correction are all present.
- Ranked-choice voting also receives a conditional pass: useful in some electoral environments, but not inherently superior in all cases.
- The central demand of this framework is simple: systems must tell the truth even when it is inconvenient.

I. The Case for a Truth-Aligned Governance Standard

Modern policy debate is usually driven by narrative, tribe, and institutional interest rather than disciplined validation. The result is predictable: vague problems are inflated into emergencies, weak mechanisms are sold as certainty, capture is disguised as expertise, and failure is protected by bureaucracy rather than corrected by record. A serious governance standard therefore has to do more than express values. It must force policy through a structure that asks: what is the problem, what is the evidence, how does the mechanism work, who benefits, how can it be abused, and what happens when the facts move?

II. LPAS: The Universal Policy Filter

LPAS evaluates every policy through six gates. A policy that cannot survive these gates should not be enacted without revision. Gate Question Operational test Failure state 1 Problem validation Is the problem real, specific, and evidenced? Invalid policy 2 Evidence integrity Is the evidence public, challengeable, and not selectively Unverifiable policy Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 2 Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 3 curated? 3 Mechanism proof Does the policy show a credible causal chain from action to outcome? Speculative policy 4 Fairness test Would the policy still be accepted under positional ignorance? Biased policy 5 Power analysis Who gains power, and how can the policy be abused or captured? Capture-prone policy 6 Correctability Can the policy be audited, revised, or reversed when facts change? Static or authoritarian policy Every enacted policy should carry six mandatory attachments: an evidence dossier, a mechanism map, a fairness statement, a power-impact analysis, a PRAS record schema, and a correction protocol.

III. LPAS Demonstration Case: Cannabis Governance

Cannabis is a useful stress test because both extremes lie. Unqualified celebration lies about risk. Blanket prohibition lies about power, proportionality, and enforcement abuse. A Liberation-aligned regime therefore rejects both the police-state model and the deregulated corporate-intoxication model. LPAS result: Cannabis governance receives a **CONDITIONAL PASS** when the policy protects adult liberty, punishes direct harm rather than mere existence, regulates product quality, protects minors, constrains corporate capture, and remains audit-ready and revisable.

IV. Model Ordinance: Liberation-Aligned Cannabis Governance Act

(LACGA)

Section 1 - Title and purpose

- This ordinance shall be known as the Liberation-Aligned Cannabis Governance Act

(LACGA).

- Its purpose is to replace arbitrary criminalization with evidence-based regulation, public health protection, transparent oversight, and continuous correctability.

Section 2 - Definitions

- Cannabis means any product containing THC or psychoactive cannabinoids above the statutory threshold.

- Adult means a person 21 years of age or older.

- Impairment means demonstrable functional degradation affecting safe operation of a vehicle, machinery, or other risk-bearing activity.

- Licensed entity means any person or organization authorized to cultivate, process, distribute, or sell cannabis under this Act.

Section 3 - Lawful conduct

- Adults may possess cannabis within statutory limits, use cannabis in private settings, and purchase from licensed entities.

- Medical access shall remain protected on a non-discriminatory basis within the governing medical framework.

Section 4 - Prohibited conduct

- Sale or provision to minors is prohibited.

- Operation of vehicles or machinery while impaired is prohibited.

- Sale, distribution, or manufacturing outside the licensed system is prohibited.

- Sale of contaminated, untested, or materially mislabeled products is prohibited.

Section 5 - Licensing and anti-capture rules

- No commercial license requirement shall be construed to invade, deny, or burden the

retained right of any responsible individual, household, or voluntary joint-use association to cultivate naturally occurring plants, including cannabis, for personal or shared noncommercial usage or utilization. Such cultivation shall stand presumptively protected and shall not be prohibited, curtailed, or converted into a licensure privilege except by narrowly tailored rules necessary to prevent direct and demonstrable harm involving minors, fire or comparable physical hazard, or substantial nuisance proven on the record. Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 4 Drafting preference for approval: Franc's stated preference is openly preserved here. The governing rule should read as a retained-rights protection, not as a regulatory carveout. Commercial cultivation, processing, distribution, and sale may be licensed; responsible noncommercial cultivation of naturally occurring plants for personal or joint usage or utilization should remain presumptively protected and beyond ordinary licensure.

- All beneficial ownership must be disclosed and preserved in the public record.

- Licenses may be denied or revoked for repeated violations, fraud, concealment, or demonstrable public harm.

- Ownership concentration and covert vertical integration shall be reviewable to prevent capture.

Section 6 - Product regulation and public health

- All products must be tested for contaminants and verified for potency.

- Products must include potency data, dosage guidance, and plain risk warnings.

- High-potency products may be placed into enhanced-control tiers, including purchase limits or restricted sale.

- Revenue shall fund treatment, education, surveillance of harms, and poison-response readiness.

Section 7 - Civil liberty protections

- No arrest shall occur solely for lawful adult possession or use.

- No employment discrimination shall occur absent a safety-critical role or demonstrable impairment concern.

- No housing denial shall occur solely on the basis of lawful adult use, subject to narrow fire-safety and lawful lease constraints.

Section 8 - Expungement and remedy

- All prior low-level nonviolent cannabis convictions shall receive automatic review.

- Eligible persons shall receive expungement, restoration of rights, and where lawful, relief from collateral penalties.

Section 9 - PRAS integration, audits, and triggers

- Licenses, enforcement actions, test failures, public-health metrics, and review findings shall be recorded, indexed, and made publicly accessible subject to lawful redaction.

- Independent audits shall occur annually and upon triggered conditions.
- Mandatory review shall be triggered by increased youth use, major public-health

deterioration, black-market resurgence, or significant enforcement disparity. Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 5
Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 6

V. LPAS Demonstration Case: Ranked-Choice Voting

Ranked-choice voting should be judged as a procedural reform, not canonized as a metaphysical good. It addresses real distortions in plurality systems, especially spoiler dynamics and non-majority winners, but it also introduces complexity and legitimacy risk if poorly implemented. Gate Finding Why Result Problem validation Plurality elections do suffer spoiler effects and non-majority winners in multi candidate races. RCV addresses a real distortion, but the severity is context dependent. Pass Evidence integrity Evidence is mixed rather than decisive. Some studies and practical cases show benefits; others show ballot exhaustion, complexity, and trust issues. Cond. Mechanism proof The mechanism is coherent. Ranking, elimination, and redistribution can produce a more consensus-oriented winner, but not without tradeoffs. Cond. Fairness test Fairness improves and degrades at once. It reduces spoiler pressure, yet may burden less informed voters if ballot design and education are poor. Cond. Power analysis Administrative complexity creates leverage points. Opaque tabulation, delayed results, or poor ballot design can weaken Cond. legitimacy. Correctability The reform is correctable. Audits, published round-by-round results, and reversion mechanisms are feasible. Pass LPAS result: Ranked-choice voting receives a CONDITIONAL PASS. It is a usable reform, not a sacred one. It becomes Liberation-aligned only when tabulation is transparent, ballots are clear, voter education is serious, exhausted ballots are reported, and a fallback mechanism exists. Liberation-aligned conditions for RCV are therefore straightforward: the ballots must be genuinely readable, round-by-round tabulation must be published, exhaustion must be disclosed instead of buried, verification must be independent, and the jurisdiction must preserve a lawful path to revise or reverse the method if it proves destabilizing.

VI. Operational Doctrine for All Future Policy

Any policy seeking Liberation alignment should ship with a complete operational packet. This packet prevents rhetorical lawmaking and turns public decisions into challengeable, reviewable civic objects.

1. Evidence dossier - what is known, what is uncertain, and what contradicts the preferred account.
2. Mechanism map - an explicit action-to-effect-to-outcome chain.
3. Fairness statement - whether the policy can be justified under conditions of positional ignorance.
4. Power-impact analysis - who gains leverage, how the system can be captured, and how abuse is constrained.
5. PRAS record schema - what records must exist, how they are indexed, and what redactions, if any, are lawful.
6. Correction protocol - review intervals, trigger conditions, and authority for revision, tightening, loosening, or repeal.

VII. Closing Directive

This system stands or falls on one thing: Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 7 Whether it tells the truth when it is inconvenient. If harms rise, policy tightens. If black markets rise, policy loosens. If abuse appears, power is constrained.

No ideology survives here. Only evidence, record, and correction. That is the distinction between a belief system and a governance standard. The former asks what we prefer to say. The latter asks what can survive contact with reality.
Liberation Governance Prototype v1.0 | 8