

# JUSTICE



# IS NOT PRETTY



The evidence compiled by prosecutor and defence is the material they gather to support their respective belief in a person's innocence or guilt. The evidence on its own is not necessarily the proof but the way it is presented in court can win or lose a case. Proof relies on the articulate skills of the lawyer presenting the 'facts' and on the cognitive skills of the jury to understand the arguments.

In the courtroom the fate of the individual is in the hands of two teams of lawyers who are each driven by a conviction or belief. The prosecuting counsel believes he is guilty and the defence that he is innocent. Their evidence is presented as an argument to support their belief. Worse, the accused is in the hands of a jury who between them may not have the brightest analytical skills.

In another kind of courtroom, where belief in the existence of God is on trial, there has always been two types of people, those who argue their case for, and those who argue their case against. As in the State courtroom the proceedings for or against the existence of 'something hidden' is driven by a belief based on conviction, which comes first, before evidence is gathered. The conviction of God's existence, of the idea of 'other', that may be supported by a selection of evidence, is presented as a case for or against the belief or conviction. In this courtroom those who believe God does not exist take on the role of a prosecuting council and those who believe he does, take on the role of a defending council or vice versa. Their belief comes

first, then they act on that belief with a case to support their argument based on a selection of appropriate evidence.

Guilt is hidden until it is exposed through confession. God can never be proved in the same way, but those who confess His existence are simply following the confessions of Christ who was condemned in a human court for his confession.

The evidence is always formed out of conviction. It shows there is an a priori conviction or belief behind the lawyer's use of a selection of appropriate material to win an argument that proves as true what he has already imagined to be true. The lawyer is in the business of proving his belief. The underpinning bias of belief is what comes first and what occurs after is a collection of material evidence pieced together to forcefully win over the jury's mind. The 'a priori' belief comes first and the quality, substance, quantity and plausibility of the evidence comes second. A principle of logic is that the predicate comes first.

A defence lawyer could easily lose a case by being sloppy in his research, by failing to pay attention to detail or by default giving more credence to the 'a priori' belief of the prosecuting council to deliver a more convincing argument to the jury. Innocent men and women go to jail in some countries, probably in equal proportion to the guilty getting off scot free, due to a hundred variations of mitigating circumstances like this in a court room. In this respect, the history of justice in the world reads like a psycho drama where everything looks normal and correct on the surface but over the centuries has filled thousands of graveyards with damaged souls. It is a sorry state of affairs often excused by academia as, 'good, but not perfect' when in reality the scale of the situation is truly diabolical.

A high court judge said on BBC Radio 4 recently, *'There is no such thing as justice. It doesn't exist. There is a prosecution and there is a defence. They compare notes with the evidence available at the time and proceed from there to argue for a rational outcome that can be closed with a judgement.'*

Contrary to the sometimes lofty claims made by political theorists about human justice, the phrase **'evidence available at**

**the time'** is a chilling reminder that true justice is not within the grasp of any human court. The sad truth is this. Justice looks concrete and real on the outside but in reality it is a fantasy, a farce. People come out of the courtroom every day bemoaning the fact they have been shortchanged either as victim or over-charged as criminal.

The scale of human misery vis a vis the inadequacy of a human court to secure justice can be seen clearly in the fiasco surrounding the legitimisation of war in Iraq. Most people have the 'a priori' belief that it is evil to kill innocent people but because files are hidden from view by a Cabinet Government, which could provide sufficient raw material for a prosecuting counsel to mount a case against this secret Government for war crimes in Iraq, it is tempting to argue that her Majesty's Government has an 'a priori' belief that as long as the evidence is kept secret it is not evil to slaughter innocent citizens abroad. Justice, in this sense, is a pseudonym for belief, a variation on the theme of religion. Whatever conviction you may have, whether or not you feel the British Government was lying through its teeth when it compiled the dossier to legalise the destruction of life in another country, it is futile to expect justice in the courtroom of this land while senior civil servants, law chiefs and military officers withhold or shred the evidence.

So, what's the point I'm making? It's simply this. The world is governed by people meeting in secret chambers. Secrecy is a symptom of denial and failure. People in power deny the existence of a non-destructive Creator and like their Old Testament counterparts heap judgement upon themselves thinking that political absolutism can be hidden from public view and from God.

Some protagonists in the field of libertarian modern political science hold to a narrative proclaiming the ascent of intelligent thought and the idea of a progressive society but nothing could be further from the truth than this when it comes to talking about 'justice'. Centrist political ideologies boast about the impotency and dislocation of God as a political force in society

but the secret political chamber neuters any hope of a progressive open and fair society ever becoming a reality. In the light of this, the rightness of arguing in secret for the justifiable murder of innocent men, women and children while concealing evidence that might show a weakness in the argument is an indictable, treacherous, contemptible form of righteousness, which denies public access to the due process of law and fails abysmally in articulating public sovereignty. The sovereignty of the public is a very Godly thing.

Wherever raw uncontested political power hatches tyrannies that falsify justice you have a protesting public and an angry God.

In the courtroom of God at the end of time however, when all the laughable systems of human justice are swept away, the only thing God will be looking at is evidence of faith in His love. This is the day when true justice is done since the first murder took place in the garden of Eden. God is visible to people who see the sanctity of human life but He is hidden from makers of destruction.

Seek God now while He may be found. Seek to disprove He exists and you will satisfy your desires - for a short time.

*“I tell you the truth, whoever hears my words and believes him who sent me has eternal life and will not be condemned; he has crossed over from death to life.” Jn 5v24*

Pray this prayer with me. “I come to you Jesus because I know you are the truth. I surrender my life into your hands and ask you to take away my sin and give me your Holy Spirit that I may be empowered to worship God in Spirit and in Truth.”  
Amen