

# Responsive Innocence

AKA Responsive Exoneration. Going beyond asserting innocence by responding to the needs on all sides.

Your first name: **Steph**

Your last name: **Turner**

Likely innocence score: **92%**

Verification process score: **39%**

**strong claim**

Tagline: **Asexual transperson registered for life as a sex offender**

Brief synopsis: Asexual person comes out as transgender in early 90s, gets falsely accused as being a “sexual predator” homophobic stereotype. Convicted without evidence. Must register as sex offender for life. Forced into poverty and homelessness.

Innocence basis: **No crime occurred**

While no one sits above the law, no law sits above the needs the law exists to serve. Need-response complements law enforcement by identifying the needs the law exists to serve. And then to check how well those needs are being served by this legal action, and how well they are getting resolved. Need-response goes further than mere law-based systems to ensure each affected need on all sides are free to resolve. For starters, need-response recognizes natural needs as objective facts. That alone sets us apart.

- 2 **Your current options**
- 3 **Adversarialism or mutuality**
- 4 **Your need-responsiveness alternative**
- 5 **Your responsiveness to all affected needs**
- 6 **Opportunity to solve a problem**
- 7 **Earned legitimacy**
- 8 **Structural improvement**
- 9 **Handling resistance**
- 10 **Engage**
- 11 **Contacts list**

# Your current options

## Choose the best approach for you

**mutuality only: exclusively pursue our mutuality need-responsive process**

### Mutuality only

- use the EIR only for the public

#### Summary

Send your EIR featuring your responsiveness to needs the court neglects. Assert how you will only accept a non-adversarial exoneration. Show your courage to not aid and abet their systemic failures.

#### Pro

You boldly assert the high moral ground of resolving more needs. You challenge the limits of the adversarial judicial process. You demonstrate how your viable innocence claim is backed by your demonstrated responsiveness to needs involved. No more waiting for responses from the unresponsive. You take charge. You own your own life.

#### Con

You may never be fully exonerated. If still under some form of state custody, like prison, you risk remaining under their thumb. Without any reference to the legal process, they may dismiss your full need-responsive efforts out of hand. Worse, they may write you off as some crackpot. You risk burning the very bridges that could result in eventual exoneration.


### Instructions

Fill out the fields below to demonstrate your responsiveness. You may also want to fill out the Estimated Innocence Form (EIF) to keep your options open. Inform each recipient that you could offer the scored strength of your viable innocence claim, only if necessary. Be ready to send the 'PM' to each recipient. Prioritize the high moral ground of your demonstrated responsiveness.

### From adversarial justice to mutuality justice

*If mutuality only*

Whichever you choose, need-response invites you to replace 'adversarial justice' with 'mutuality justice'.



You see how unresponsive the adversarial judicial system can be to your overlooked justice needs. You don't even give them the chance to reject you.

You already shift from adversarial justice to mutuality justice. If the court insists you must use its adversarial process to gain exoneration, need-response stands ready to challenge the legitimacy of its failed systems.

Mutuality justice responds to the needs on sides of a conflict. The more you respond to their needs, the more you incentivize them to respond to yours.

Scroll down to further explore your options. You can change from one approach to another, but that could complicate things.

## Adversarialism or mutuality

Compare both approaches to help you decide if a mutualizing approach is best for you and your situation.

### Adversarialism

Institutional needs of the adversarial process tend to prevail over justice needs. The adversarial judicial system prioritizes convincing the public they're keeping us all safe from violent individuals. Your compelling case for exoneration raises the question who keeps us safe from their state privileged violence.

This starts when the adversarial process exaggerates our differences. These overgeneralized differences easily matter more than the needs of the individuals involved. You're rarely if ever afforded the chance to show your respect for the complainant's needs. The adversarial process artificially pits you and the complainant against each other. Imposing the categorical labels of "complainant" and "defendant" serves their convenience more than both side's justice needs.

The trauma this provokes confirms their belief that you must be some foe to the complainant. Confirmation bias runs afoul. The adversarial process aims to provide some relief for the winner in a court battle. Specific needs rarely get addressed. Defendant and complainant typically remain in pain of their unresolved needs. Bias hinders honestly addressing each other's overlooked needs. Let's consider a better way.

### Mutualizing alternative

Need-response holds institutional needs accountable to the justice needs the institution exists to serve. This mutualizing process initially provides lawyers with the EIR to give their adversarialist approach the benefit of the doubt. But as soon as this presents a lack of minimal standard of mutual regard, NR asserts this higher standard of mutuality.

The recipients are then sent the NR version of the EIR to invite their responsiveness. If identified as likely impacting the innocent claimant's situation, they will be involuntarily assessed for their responsiveness to the resulting needs created by their adversarialism. Their personal and professional responsiveness is then assessed and audited.

This sets up the next step for avowing to address the affected needs of all, and then exhaust all legit means possible to fully resolve all such needs in this robust mutuality paradigm. Need-response empowers need-responders to level the playing field, to treat those in power as equally human and imperfect as you.

**7 ways need-responders equalize power relations**

## Your need-responsive alternative

### Shift from reactive 'adversarialism' to responsive 'mutuality'

The adversarial judicial system avoids your specific needs by design. Only need-response identifies and addresses both your overlooked justice needs and the complainant's justice needs. Instead of avoiding pain, we remove cause for pain by resolving the needs. Let's shift from their institutional avoidance to our responsive engagement.

INSTITUTIONAL AVOIDANCE	RESPONSIVE ENGAGEMENT
serve impersonal law	serve personal needs
moralize all pain as bad	respect all pain as warnings of threat
leaving own trauma unprocessed	process trauma by removing cause
being dismissive of each other	engaging one another where they're at
imposing unrealistic expectations	measurably resolve needs
perpetuate alienation	cultivate connections
normalize hyper-rationality	unchosen needs prior to rationality
normalize hyper-individualism	personal & social responsibilities

The adversarial judicial system expects you to remain defensive and guarded during this conflict. Only need-response maintains a path to mutually engage each other's affected needs amidst this orchestrated dispute. Instead of mutual hostilities, we mutually support resolving each other's overlooked needs. Let's shift from their reactive adversarialism to our responsive mutualizing.

ADVERSARIALISM	MUTUALIZING
pit us against each other	bring us together to resolve conflicts
win-lose for winner to relieve pain	win-win to remove everyone's pain
black-and-white thinking	explore nuance in the situation
relieve pain at other's expense	resolve each other's needs
normalize pain of unmet needs	remove cause for pain
self-righteous side-taking	mutual empathy & understanding
provoke mutual defensiveness	incentivize mutual engagement
hinder wellness	improve wellness
exploit fear & anger	expand potential for love

The more you respond to the needs of others, the more others will respond in kind to yours.

## Your responsiveness to all affected needs

Fill out each white field to get this process going. Demonstrate your understanding of each need for which the law reasonably exists to serve. The deeper your empathy, the greater this more responsive 'mutual justice' can ultimately lead to your exoneration.

After you personally message each recipient, you will document here their level of agreement or engagement.

### 1. Empathize with what the complainant actually needed at the time i

I sense she presented a personal struggle with her own emerging sexuality as same-sex attracted. She later came out as lesbian. She appears to be drawn to my transgender sister as someone openly being herself in a way she likely wish she could be. Or at least drawn to explore what this could all mean for her, at a time when LGBTQ+ people were largely marginalized by mainstream society and not readily accepted at home. When caught not at home when confronted by her mother, she could not say that she willingly interacted with such a "deviant" in the neighborhood.

how many fully agree   how many mostly agree   how many give no stance   how many mostly disagree   how many fully disagree   how many never replied

### 2. Identify your own affected needs from this incident i

My dominant need at the time was to come out as transgender without being smeared with popular transphobic or homophobic tropes, such as the widespread belief that we're more inclined to pedophilia than cisgender and straight males. To not be falsely accused of sexual misconduct but instead be accepted as an asexual (demisexual) person. Once accused, to have the preponderance of evidence favoring my innocence to show that I am not guilty of what I am not capable of doing. Once wrongly convicted, to be exonerated. Once sentenced to lifetime sex offender registration, to be removed from that listing with prejudice. Ultimately, to have legal recourse in a system less adversarial and based more on mutually addressing the affected needs on all sides to a conflict.

how many fully supports   how many mostly supports   how many give no stance   how many mostly questions   how many fully questions   how many never replied

### 3. How would you address complainant's apparent needs if you had the chance? i

If the law would allow it, I would affirm her same-sex attraction. And tell her that I do not personally hold any animosity toward her. I hold no grudge against her for falsely accusing me of things I am not capable of doing. I understand her need at the time to not be out to her mother or to her homophobic-presenting stepfather. I understand her motive to accuse my sibling and then me to avoid getting into trouble by her irrate mother, when her mother demanded to know why she was not at home when her mother came home from work. I understand how she was incentivized by the homophobia of the time, that prompted her to shift the spotlight onto us and to then see how the adults would react to other LGBTQ+ people like herself. I appreciate how the reaction toward us would keep her in the proverbial closet for a long time.

how many fully supports   how many mostly supports   how many give no stance   how many mostly questions   how many fully questions   how many never replied

Next, addressing the relevant needs of law enforcement, the prosecutor, the community, the media, innocence advocates, etc.

## Opportunity to solve a problem

The adversarial system easily blinds many from awareness of structural problems undermining just outcomes. Those closest to the problem may be the last to see it. Especially if their income depends on them not seeing it. Adversarialism too easily provokes defensiveness and confirmation bias.

Need-response provides a "wellness campaign" to correct these built-in limits of adversarialism. Instead of taking a side against another, you take the side of addressing each other's unchosen needs. And then you oppose hurting anyone. You put unchosen needs ahead of any chosen responses to them.

In five (or four) phases, we work together to address each other's needs. The more you respond to their needs, the more responsive they are to your needs. Including your neglected justice need for exoneration. We complement a cooperative judicial system, but compete if they're uncooperative.

click this image below to learn more about wellness campaigns at [AnankelogyFoundation.org](http://AnankelogyFoundation.org).



wellness warmup	BASE phase	ALLY phase	TEAM phase	GROW phase	GOAL phase
-----------------	------------	------------	------------	------------	------------

The **wellness warmup** orients you to this pioneering alternative to responding to all the affected needs.

The **BASE phase** addresses *personal problems* you should be able to clear up on your own.

The **ALLY phase** starts to address you *interpersonal problems* requiring cooperation with another.

The **TEAM phase** continues to address *interpersonal problems* with a growing team of supporters.

The **GROW phase** addresses *power problems* by inviting impactful powerholders to this alternative.

The **GOAL phase** addresses *structural problems* to transform social norms to improve outcomes.

Click here at the right to learn more online about the **5 phases of your wellness campaign**

### BTW, how prevalent are wrongful convictions according to researchers?



Many academics have tried to estimate the percentage of wrongful convictions. Those working for the adversarial judicial system find arguments to claim the rate could be as incredibly low as 0.0016% of all criminal convictions. Criminologists working outside the adversarial system find arguments to estimate wrongful convictions occur as high as 15.4% of all convictions. Wrongly convicted innocence likely occurs somewhere between these estimates. Explore further in **The Unexonerated**.

# Earned legitimacy

## Impact data

Anyone serving the public needs to know how well their efforts produce the results they seek. Business owners rely largely on their bottom line to know if they're successful. Nonprofit organizations use surveys and outcome measures to demonstrate their program's effectiveness to their funders and stakeholders. Even government entities must rely on some form of impact data to justify to taxpayers their existence and resulting actions.

The greater their efforts result in resolving needs, the greater their legitimacy. The less their efforts produce positive results, the less their legitimacy. Impact data can measure their level of "earned legitimacy". Effective leaders can perform better with the impact data we can provide.

## Need-response distinguishes between "ascribed legitimacy" and "earned legitimacy".

Law enforcement are ascribed as legitimate when the public perceives they are safer now than without them. This subjective form of legitimacy can easily be manipulated. Elites can coerce us into feeling safer than we actually are. If suffering a wrongful conviction, you likely feel less safe around law enforcement after experiencing the damaging flaws of the adversarial judicial system.

Earned legitimacy raises the standard by how well the public is measurably safer. This objective form of legitimacy is less open to elite or other manipulation. Instead of convincing us we are safer, we hold the judicial system accountable to their actual performance. We provide empirical measures of their actual impact on just outcomes, to provide more reliable impact data to substantiate their legitimacy.

Poor outcomes due to their presenting incompetencies can then be readily addressed. Anyone in power does not know what they do not know, nor can know what to rightly ask. We can provide the impact data that points where they need structural improvement to deliver on our underserved justice needs, which we prove essential to maintain their careers. At the end of the day, they need us more than we need them.

## Earned legitimacy levels

**NOTE: adversarialists tend to reach no higher than *substandard legitimacy***

<b>violent illegitimacy</b>	state violence used to selfishly serve own interests at public's expense
<b>substandard legitimacy</b>	provokes mutual defensiveness in hopes to ease pain of unmet needs
<b>standard legitimacy</b>	mutually addresses each other's unchosen needs toward resolving them
<b>competitive legitimacy</b>	demonstrates greater responsiveness than others to unchosen needs
<b>exemplary legitimacy</b>	successfully transforms social structures to fully resolve unchosen needs

Once fully aware of the problem of wrongly convicting the innocent, we distinguish between what anyone can personally do about the problem and what structural improvements appear necessary. That allows anyone involved to be less defensive and more open to our mutual justice approach. The more you can free others, the more others can help free you. We can publicly affirm the positive results these authorities produce with our more loving approach to justice needs. They gain legitimacy. You receive justice.

## Structural improvement

Need-response identifies four levels of human problems.

- 1) **Personal problem** - a problem you should be able to solve on your own.  
E.g., you procrastinate filling out the innocence project 'case form' to avoid reliving the trauma of the wrongful conviction.
- 2) **Interpersonal problem** - a problem you can solve in cooperation with your peers.  
E.g., incentivizing friends and family who support your innocence to review your documents to help verify your claims.
- 3) **Power problem** - a problem solved by one with authority or with some influence over you.  
E.g., the district attorney agrees to revisit your case over several compelling objections by the trial level prosecutor.
- 4) **Structural problem** - a problem only solved by changing social norms or social structures.  
E.g., requiring investigators to videorecord their interrogations of suspects to solve the problem of coerced confessions.

Need-response addresses all four levels. Need-response anticipates resistance from structural barriers baked into the law. Need-response raises the standard from compliance to law to resolution of needs that laws exist to serve.

### Presenting openness to structural improvement

This world consists of reactive "adversarialists" and responsive "mutualizers". Which best describes you?

soft mutualizer: bring opposing sides together when ready to engage needs

As a soft mutualizer, you can appreciate the adversarial stance was necessary for police when confronting a threat. Once subdued in custody, you recognize how mutual understanding can procure far better results. Let's see what this can do for you.

In his book *Rambo and the Dalai Lama: The Compulsion to Win and Its Threat to Human Survival* (1998), Gordon Fellman refers to "adversarialism" as a paradigm to view others as enemies to overcome. He contrasts this to a "mutuality paradigm" based on respect for each other and creating space for more love.

Need-response exists as a professional service to help guide the judicial system's failing adversarialism toward mutuality. With guidance from you and your supporters, we incentivize structural transformation from adversarialism to mutuality. From impersonal laws to engaging each other's unchosen needs.

This shift potentially creates far more value than our current adversarial norms. As Fellman put it, "We can choose to further the development of mutuality institutions." We can help systems of law reach its founding purpose to build a vibrant society. By first resolving needs, including your need for justice in clearing this wrongful conviction.

## Handling resistance

Resistance to this revolutionary change is very likely. Prosecutors denying innocence may put up every roadblock imaginable. Old school innocence litigators may dismiss any alternative to their well-established legal process as a waste of time and energy. We shall embrace these challenges.

We are raising the bar. Of course many will push back. Let them! The more they expose their reluctance to respond professionally to unchosen objective needs, the less legitimate their professional practice. With a compelling case for innocence, we will no longer accept 'no' or 'declined' as an answer.

Need-response asserts the higher implicit authority of mutually resolving needs over the adversarialist paradigm. Our love can melt resistance to our higher standard of resolving needs over offering relief, of removing pain over letting pain simmer, of raising potential over coercing institutional dependence.

Need-response incentivizes responsive judicial powerholders.

Attract tax revenue increase

The more a public institution can create value by demonstrably resolving unchosen objective needs, the more deserving of public coffers. The wellness campaign can support their powerholders to increase necessary tax revenue. And verify how it went to good use.

Need-response penalizes unresponsive judicial powerholders.

Repudiate unscientific methods

Need-response challenges the lack of scientific discipline in our law-based institutions like the adversarial judiciary. In sharp contrast to law enforcement investigators acting on their confirmation bias, a wellness campaign prioritizes testable hypotheses over selfish application of law.

### Enforcing the higher standard of love

Selfishly imposing state power to rationalize powerholders' own preferences over the vulnerable needs of others will no longer be tolerated. The less responsive to our vulnerable needs for justice, the less we can serve their institutional needs to ignore compelling cases of overlooked innocence.

We hold everyone accountable to honor the objective needs of others as they would have them honor their own. Accountably, measurably, toward empirically documented wellness for all. No self-serving excuses.

We exist to monitor the impact of institutions and help them to support empirically measurable wellness levels. Any resistance may warrant any legitimate means necessary to compel responsiveness to your unchosen needs resulting from overlooking your compelling case of innocence.


Nobody requires anybody's permission to breathe. You don't exist for authority; authority exists for you and your publicly exposed needs. Including the need for your compelling innocence case to promptly result in your full exoneration. Injustice in the name of justice is no justice at all. Love prevails over law.

### Engage

With our mutuality imprint, we expect resistance only from the fringes of the unwell. We anticipate most judicial powerholders to eventually embrace the mutuality of the wellness campaign over adversarialist dysfunction. We expect them to gladly shift from limiting adversarialism to mutually engage each other's affected needs. And from impersonal alienation to personally engage your compelling innocence.

## Engage

Your wellness campaign features the need-responsive standard to "engage" all the identifiable needs in a conflict. In sharp contrast to adversarial systems, you learn to identify needs to solve problems. From your need for exoneration to their need to keep the public safe, you learn to apply these four steps.



1. **Identify** the unchosen needs on all sides to a conflict. Your unchosen needs persist as objective facts. So does theirs.
2. **Distinguish** these unchosen needs from chosen responses to them. What we do to relieve those needs can be adjusted.
3. **Report** how each other's chosen responses impact each other's unchosen needs. Do we needlessly provoke more needs?
4. **Adjust** changeable responses to optimally address unchosen needs on all sides. We solve more problems by resolving more needs.

1. How well did you identify the unchosen needs involved in the situation resulting in the wrongful conviction?
2. How well did you distinguish between unchosen needs and chosen responses to such needs?

The next step works best as a social exercise. You contact all sides of this conflict to invite their feedback.

Some of your unchosen needs:

- \* personal freedom
- \* reputation restored
- \* ease emotional pain

Your chosen response to such needs:

- \* stay internally free, maintain hope for justice
- \* request help from Innocence Project
- \* overeat to cope with disappointment & despair

Some of prosecutor's unchosen needs:

- \* economic security
- \* trust in own efforts
- \* public confidence in them

Prosecutor's chosen response to such needs:

- \* strive for high conviction rate
- \* institutional need for authority
- \* highlight successes, deny wrongful convictions

### Inviting prosecutor to mutually engage needs using the PNP format

> **POSITIVE:** "I support your need to gain the public's confidence."

> **NEGATIVE:** "I question how denying my innocence can rightly earn the public's confidence."

> **POSITIVE:** "I offer my compelling case of innocence to give you opportunity to improve the public's confidence in your commitment to justice."

You then assess their responsiveness to your responsiveness to their unchosen needs. You set the standard for them to respond to your unchosen needs. You reach each powerholder to mutually engage each other's unchosen needs.

## Contacts List

Identify impactful powerholders and start collecting their contact information. Invite your peers also.

### Invitees

No.	First Name	Last Name	Email address	Phone#	Role
1.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
2.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
3.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
4.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
5.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
6.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
7.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
8.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
9.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
10.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
11.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
12.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
13.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:
14.					
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:

# Anankology Foundation

<b>15.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>16.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>17.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>18.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>19.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>20.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>21.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>22.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>23.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>24.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>25.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>26.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>27.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>28.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>29.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>30.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
<b>31.</b>						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	

# Anankology Foundation


<b>32.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>33.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>34.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>35.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>36.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>37.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>38.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>39.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>40.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>41.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>42.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>43.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>44.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>45.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>46.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>47.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		
<b>48.</b>							
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:		

# Anankelogy Foundation

49.						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	
50.						
Date 1:	intro:	Date 2:	PM:	Date 3:	follow-up:	


Need-response applies the new social science of anankelogy. Anankelogy understands how your needs specifically functions. Anankelogy recognizes your natural needs (like water, food, sleep, companionship, freedom) as objective facts no one can change. Need-response

You can learn more about anankelogy in book *You NEED This, introducing anankelogy, the study of need*. Or go to the [AnankelogyFoundation.org](http://AnankelogyFoundation.org) website to explore further.



You're invited to offer suggestions how to improve this to better suit your particular needs.

**Remember to click 'Enable Editing' to use this tool.**



to top of document