

Justice

It seems right that everyone is born equal in some way, you can't assume otherwise. To say that it's equal opportunity out there is obviously not true, at least from our relevant understanding. Is it enough that we are all equal, but different at any given point in time?

What people choose to do is attributable to them, and that has individual value. Constraints are imposed on people unequally by others actions.

If we are judging people fairly, it includes the effect that the actions of others have on them, (a sense of both present and past tense), that are attributable to the individuals perpetrating those actions, and are largely completely unknown. Who can account for it all? It seems better to reserve judgement, and to look past all the distractions with your own clarity.

We can attribute value to what/who a person is now, regardless of how it happened, with the insight that it's not the whole story. If you're a shitty person, you're a shitty person, and that does matter, regardless of the idea of blame. Perception of someone may be your false perception, however.

There is an awareness of whether some circumstances stick to people superficially rather than it being their present, true self.

If the real law is more akin to the limits of reality, some insights of which may be hidden, what is societal law? It is a communication of free will, cause and effect.

We communicate what our terms are to each other. If you do this, we'll do that etc. Communication is not "the law", it is not right and wrong exactly, but we should try to represent it as well as possible. That is it's purpose.

There is a collective understanding of what is required to keep the law robust, but a fake law shouldn't hold. And an absence of "communication" does not negate accountability to right and wrong. There are probably criminals in our society that think both.

Everything is accountable, truth is not erased. So how do we communicate better? What do we do if "societal law" is not communicating well on our behalf, or with our input?

If we must say: "I will not allow you to do this, at personal risk of being wrong"?

We encroach on each others freedoms as little as possible, and we stand up for what is right, as best as we understand it. Right and wrong doesn't change, we are surrounded by the reality of it, but we do also ourselves define it, and attribute value to it truthfully via our experience.

The law currently doesn't seem to hold up to these ideals. Too much control, and too much freedom to the wrong people doing the wrong things.

I don't believe in trading freedom for safety, and I don't believe jail is about punishment.

However, we do need longer sentences and better rehabilitation for serious crimes than we currently have, this is realistic.

Some of these types of crimes are exactly the type of thing that would have otherwise gotten them killed in retaliation, how can shorter sentences properly reflect the gravity of that?

That is not about freedom, it is a deliberate and inappropriate denial of consequences. The denial of people's freedom to seek justice.

In order to have longer sentences and proper justice, we must improve the standards of prisons. The prison system, including the "process" can not be about facilitating harm. You cannot expect people to fully support the justice system if you make them complicit in wrong-doing.

It is awful to think that someone will be better off in prison than someone outside of it. That is unacceptable and must be reconciled, but not by making it worse. There has to be some responsibility involved if people want the ability to pass judgement and take away a person's freedom. That is also realistic.

If no one can account for blame accurately how can we hold people accountable? By being realistic and by a sense of justice. We seek justice within the limits of what is right. Like colouring within the lines of true accountability, we do what we can without overstepping. We alleviate some of the burden of unmet justice for victims, and protect against further harm.

If justice and accountability will be done in any case, we can and should seek some for ourselves, we play a role in the method of it's action. There may additionally be a piece of justice that is only ever defined by the one seeking it, who can truthfully attribute to it the personal cost.

I personally have no tolerance for rape. I understand that there are some blurred lines, but the violence of rape will not be denied, and if proven you have proven that you do not understand the horror of what rape is. It is a long way back from there.

The public should have a very low tolerance for risk once proven. This is natural accountability. Even if risk was reduced to zero it would not be right, or justice, to allow a person to walk free without meaningful consequences. This does not mean cruelty.

We ensure that justice is done rather than letting it occur, and take into account circumstances that may have contributed. Remembering that a person going forward is not exactly the same person they were, if they themselves were victimised; accountability may not work in reverse.

If we overstep it is at some personal risk, whether we know it or not. A functioning justice system recognises real harm and deals with it appropriately, and does not create more harm.

Why do we have people currently in prison on remand for extended periods who haven't been found guilty of any crime? I do not know enough about this, but since when is this acceptable? When did we stop hearing about it? What extraordinary circumstances could have possibly occurred to allow this?

My thoughts on the death penalty are that I am personally against it. In a different world it might be the only way to ensure safety. That is different, that may or may not be justified, I don't know if it ever is, but I would agree that there are times that the alternative seems unacceptable. Although, you can't use a logic derived from a hypothetical exactly.

We don't live in that world, and because we have the ability to not use the death penalty, I think we have the responsibility not to, and else we might lose it.

I do not think institutions should be killing people; the potential for corruption is dangerous. There is also no personal responsibility. How can a person's life be taken and no one is responsible for it? A slap on the wrist spread out to a million hands does not seem enough.

There is the risk of killing an innocent person. There is the fact that we don't understand life and death. It is even possible that we just release something back into the world unreconciled.

Is it really justice to meet a swift end? For the victim it may help relieve the emotional burden placed on them, and the burden of seemingly unmet justice.

If a victim really needed to, they do have free will to do it themselves as far as I know, but as a society we cannot allow it to go uncondemned, even if we understand, because of the risk of false justice. In my opinion, only the victim could really take that onto themselves because only they know it truly well enough, and are responsible for it. And even then it may create a further burden.

There is something else to remember: a child's sense of justice. A child's want for someone to "know" what they did was wrong. Suffering doesn't really teach that, especially if the person already knows suffering. Is it something that adults have forgotten? We know right and wrong better, we can process it better, and maybe just want the relief that it is dealt with.

A child is more vulnerable to the obnoxiousness of abusers. How does a child signify and define what was done to them?

Maybe only life teaches right and wrong from the perspective of the living. How can a victim gain the relief that the perpetrator might one day truly "know" it was wrong? How can we prevent future harms? Are we thinking only in short terms of our lifespan, when it might not be the only consideration?

What if every human has a flicker of humanity, and for some, even as adults, they are in a form that is the furthest from their reach? No excuses, just the reality that we do not know.

It would not be kind to let them rack up a burden in a world they would wreck havoc in. The risk of that thinking is, of course, encroaching too much.

It might be interesting to think of the idea of fate. Of how we may or may not dodge bullets through our own will, and the grace of the will of others. We think of bad things happening as circumstances that could have been avoided, that it could have so easily gone differently. Maybe we don't understand the workings of that, of how we may already be at the end of our rope. That equation includes what society does, and can successfully make room for.

It may be that if you cannot survive in this world, that it doesn't deserve you; what the best of you represents, not your worst, what your individually amounts to. We do not know why.

I think it might be relevant to define my own basic understanding of why rape is logically wrong, outside of the obvious immediate emotional distress and harm.

I was extremely alarmed to hear that in the USA it has until quite recently been a standard medical practice for training doctors to practice non-consensual pelvic and rectal exams on millions of unconscious patients, women and men.

This is obviously so repulsive and unacceptable, and the lack of fallout that I have heard from this speaks to a level of psychopathic prevalence, and criminal conspiracy, I do not understand the extent of.

If a doctor doesn't understand what rape is they are not fit to practice medicine, they must have the presence of mind. What brainwashing is this? Years of "studying" gives you no authority, and is no particular indication of virtue or intelligence to my knowledge. Bad people can end up in any profession, why would it be a licence for criminals?

Rape is one of the most consequential violations of the right to your own life, freedom, and body. If you don't know how rape is wrong, how can you understand human suffering outside of raw physical pain? Pain is informative, it's purpose is to inform you something is wrong, that damage is being done. Pain is experienced as an expression of wrongness.

The right to one's own physical body is deeply related to your ability to live, and the more intimately that right is violated, the more potentially consequential.

The significance of fertility is deeply intertwined with physical intimacy in women, and physical violation of a person's intimate body, sex and procreation, is deeply consequential for anyone.

Rape is factually wrong, and the truth of that is extremely emotionally burdensome, if not excruciating, with emotion being like pain, a way the body responds and informs. The emotional pain is greater when it cannot be processed well, or reconciled. Like being hit by a train, it may not even be possible to “process” the impact of it fast enough.

Other exacerbating factors are the way sexual abuse affects a persons ability to experience some of the most profound life experiences, aspects of sex, love, procreation, and relationships, and the cost of the value of these experiences being degraded, in the most conflicting way possible, is wrong, and the emotional burden of this extreme wrongness, like physical pain, is inflicted on the victim.

It is never “what you don't know can't hurt you”. Wrongness doesn't go away, emotions can be processed up to a point but the truth remains. A person's ability to respond to it in a true, emotional and informed way does not in any way change the reality and significance of the wrongness of what occurred. That level of rage may even reach a point beyond human capacity to feel.

It is not necessarily less wrong than the worst possible “experience” of it. To think that meaning is an illusion is incorrect.

How wrong the actions of the perpetrator are is also a significant measure. This is about the inescapable burden of injustice placed on someone, emotion is just one of the ways in which we understand it better. Emotions can be a compounding burden, but it is not the source of the burden.

Intimate physical violation doesn't need to be overtly sexualised, it is already sexual in nature by definition of sexual body parts. Losing emotional and sensory sensitivity as a result of abuse is harm being done.

Intimacy and privacy are deeply personal, and when attacked can pose a very real threat and danger to a person's ability to function in a practical world and need protecting. It is as deeply rooted as anything is.

A lot of people understand this intuitively and from their personal experience, but it doesn't seem to be treated with enough seriousness in law.

Physically violating people while they are unconscious is not normal. Neither is cutting people open with a scalpel, actually, but with that there is at least the idea that there is some informed logic behind it, and hopefully a way in which it is possible to be right.

Non-consent by doctors defies basic logic, have they lost their minds? Been stripped of any sense? Do we not understand each others pain? For some involved this must speak to something deeper about existence, humanity, authority and brainwashing, but some of these so called doctors are surely just bad people and rapists. Where are the consequences? Who are these people? What are they doing globally?

First do no harm and personal responsibility, deferment and authority.

What does “first, do no harm” mean to me? I think first do no harm is relevant to everyone, and always has been. It is about the idea of how to act, how to go about your life, how to begin to make decisions. It is about personal responsibility.

How do you know what to do in life? You make decisions based on what you know the best, what has the most relevance to you, and where your responsibility truly lies: your own actions.

It is the conflict of trying to justify outcomes from far away, on matters that you don't understand properly with the idea that it might be “more right” than simply doing the right thing where you are first and foremost. I believe it is everyone's responsibility to “first, do no harm”, to the best of your ability, from the centre of your being, outwards.

How else are “you” calculating or determining? Some balance between how much “self” you have built with your beliefs and experiences, and how well formed and “true” they are, (including via your body and the world around us), along with other “authority”.

When we do not know what is the right thing to do is we defer. We do the best that we can, we try to understand. We hope someone knows what they are doing, we hope we are enough, and we make it so. We recognise when it's not right. We try. We figure it out.