

James A. Blatt

Rogan de Ramirez

PHIL 202-01 FA 19

October 9, 2019

One Page Assignment

ONE PAGE ASSIGNMENT #6

A human being is divisible into three parts: body, mind, and soul. We are a corporeal thing, a tangible existence in our sense of touch but it is our soul that animates our mind through which we perceive. The body as a distinct entity is, in the words of Socrates, "polluted" by the soul, whose prurient impurities drive us to our baser desires. Pleasures of the flesh, and nourishment of the spirit, are mediated by the mind.

Our metaphysical construct of the world is mind based. There is a concept that our mind as apart from our brain is our thing of sensing, perceiving and feeling, and our brain is just a mediator of electrical impulses that cause us to sense, perceive and feel. If the monists have it right, the brain dictates our every action. If the dualists have it right, the brain has an essential life force, the soul, that makes for our very existence, and the brain drives the body. We are hijacked in our human condition by the limitations our body and brain place on the expression of our perfect soul in the mind.

The mind is subject to tampering when medication is added to the body or the brain. Our perceptions of pain are dulled when opioids are ingested, we sense fear less in the presence of benzodiazepines, our blood pressure lowered with a vasodilator, our wakefulness enhanced with caffeine. These drugs exert a scientifically certain effect on the brain that causes the body to respond with a new perception in the mind that our life force, our soul, processes. Our every experience in our soul, felt through our mind, is mediated by the complex interaction between the body and its brain.

In justice, it is presumed that all impositions of sentence are just and that disparity among two equal or similar cases is no cause for concern. In practice, it is commonly seen that indigent defendants plea out to charges moneyed defendants take a walk on solely because it's their fastest way out of jail or they fear they have no choice but to take a plea that could get worse for them given their less experienced, or downright corrupt counsel.

I am a convict, a misdemeanor, and I know from firsthand experience that public defenders' do the absolute minimum when representing an indigent and it is beyond mere speculation that they opt to "give an easy victory" to the prosecutor in a "public case" in favor of trading for their own "easy victory" for their next private pay client against the prosecution. It is not unheard of for public justice to be devastating to the indigent defendant on the basis of their next private pay "having to have paid [me] for something", thus volunteering the poor defendant for the screw to make the prosecution look good and getting something light for their next private pay. This is not an easy system to fix in the United States, and I have given the matter substantial critical thought.

There is no solution to make private and public pay justice less disparate in the United States.