

In the matter of Marcus Brutus, herein charged with first-degree murder in the killing of Julius Caesar:

In examination of the statute pertaining to first-degree murder, it becomes clear in closing arguments that very few of the elements of the statute pertain to Brutus's situation, with one exception

A.4, relating to the offer of something of value as an incentive to commit murder.

It seems plainly apparent from a reading of both the text and subtext that Brutus is clearly of the understanding that he and those around him have something to gain from the death of Caesar - namely, elevated power which, whether used for good ends or otherwise, is power nonetheless, and therefore of value.

However, in its case, the prosecution chose to examine two witnesses - namely, Portia and Marc Antony - who were unable to offer direct testimony establishing the presence of this incentive, simply because neither of them were present at any point during discussions directly related to the murder.

In addition, during the cross-examination of Cassius and Brutus in the defense portion of the trial, lawyers for the prosecution did not question in a such a way as to establish, in a direct and firsthand sense, the presence of a quid pro quo arrangement, which is to say the exchange of the crime of murder for elevated power.

In any case, the burden of proof falls on the prosecution, and even though the defense was perhaps disingenuous in their closing statement that no element of the code applied to Caesar, the law still stands on its own. If the prosecution had established the clear presence of an exchange or offer of something of value - in this case, elevated political power, then the verdict would be a clear one. However, in the absence of direct testimony by corroborating witnesses, we the jury find the defendant, Marcus Brutus, NOT GUILTY of murder in the first degree. So say we on this day, the 11th of January, two-thousand-nineteen.