

DISCUSSION & REVIEW QUESTIONS:

- Towards the beginning of the video, Ms. Stuckey explains: “Justice is getting what you deserve without favor. Social Justice is getting what you don’t deserve because you are favored. Justice is blind. Social justice is not. Let’s say a man robs a store. Justice demands but one thing: that he be tried in a court of justice, and, if he is found guilty, punished. That is not how social justice works. Social justice doesn’t only ask if the person is guilty. It asks about his economic condition: Is he poor or wealthy? About his upbringing: What kind of childhood did he have? About his race or ethnicity: Is he a member of a group that has been historically oppressed? Justice demands that everyone be equal under the law. Social justice demands that everyone be equal. Period. Economically, socially, and in every other possible way.” Why do you think that the Left is so fanatical about equality that they make it the fundamental and most important value above all others, including freedom? Do you think that the Left purposefully conflating and usurping the Founder’s intentions of actual justice with ‘social justice’ is unjust? Why or why not?
- Ms. Stuckey goes on to note: “Lost in all these social justice considerations is the individual’s own responsibility for what he did. That’s why social justice advocates have abandoned the term justice. They deem justice alone as unfair. And sometimes it is. A man who was beaten by his father and abandoned by his mother is more likely to commit a violent crime than a man raised in a loving home. But those facts cannot and should not determine his innocence or guilt. Why? Because justice is first and foremost about truth: is the person guilty or innocent of the crime?” Why do you think that social justice advocates lessen the importance of or even ignore the notion of one being responsible for one’s own decisions and actions in terms of justice? Do you think that the Left embracing the false notion of truth being subjective rather than objective weakens and invalidates their perspective regarding justice? Why or why not?
- Later in the video Ms. Stuckey points out: “Being a victim, however that is defined, is no excuse for hurting other people. And what about the those who are hurt, the victims of those crimes? Shouldn’t they, and other law-abiding citizens, be society’s first consideration? Social justice advocates say no. They say we need social justice to even things out. And that means favoring the have-nots over the haves- the poor over the rich, the female over the male, and the brown or black over the white.” According to social justice advocate logic, if a minority female commits a violent crime she should not get as harsh a punishment as a white male who committed the same crime... so that justice and society can be ‘evened out’ because she was a ‘victim’ and he was ‘privileged.’ Do you agree with the social justice advocates? Why or why not? What might some of the flaws in the social justice reasoning be, in terms of weighing the importance of the person committing the crime versus the person that is the victim of the crime? Explain.
- Later in the video, Ms. Stuckey asks: “...if social justice is not a Biblical concept, why do so many churches and synagogues promote it? Because many Christians and Jews no longer regard Biblical principles as binding. Because it’s a lot easier to dispense compassion than hold people to a Biblical standard.” Why do you think that so many Christians and Jews value Leftist ideology over Biblical principles? What do you think Ms. Stuckey means, exactly, by her statement of it being easier to dispense compassion than to hold people to a Biblical standard, and why do you think that so many people prefer ‘easier’ to what’s ‘right?’ Explain.

- At the end of the video, Ms. Stuckey concludes: “...Leftism has superseded the Bible in many houses of worship. And Leftism, as a guiding principle, holds that the weak are good and the powerful are bad. That’s why the great battle of our time is between Judeo-Christian values and Leftist values. The former is rooted in justice; the latter is not.” Why do you think that the Left tends to judge people categorically instead of on merit and on a case-by-case basis? Explain. Would you agree that since Judeo-Christian values are just, that they are better and more American than Leftist values? Why or why not? Which value system do you think will prevail in the long run? Explain

EXTEND THE LEARNING:

CASE STUDY: Mumia Abu-Jamal

INSTRUCTIONS: Read the article “One Problem in Abu-Jamal Crusade: He’s Guilty,” then answer the questions that follow.

- Who are Danny and Maureen Faulkner, and what happened to them? Who is Mumia Abu-Jamal and what did he do? Why are celebrities and others crusading to ‘free Mumia?’ Why didn’t Mr. Abu-Jamal want a legal defense at his trial? What claim made by social justice warriors about a bullet removed from Officer Faulkner’s body was proven untrue by Mr. Abu-Jamal’s own attorneys? What did one witness say about what Mr. Abu-Jamal did after Officer Faulkner was down? What has Mr. Abu-Jamal said about his actions that day? What has Mr. Abu-Jamal’s brother, who witnessed the scene, said regarding Mr. Abu-Jamal’s defense? What did the federal judge rule regarding the penalty phase of Mr. Abu-Jamal’s trial?
- Why do you think that social justice warriors consider Mr. Abu-Jamal to be a victim? Why do you think that social justice advocates often ignore the facts of a case if those facts don’t fit into their political narrative, or often don’t even bother to gather and to consider all of the facts before making a judgment or taking a side in a case? Explain.
- In the video, Ms. Stuckey states, “Being a victim, however that is defined, is no excuse for hurting other people. And what about the those who are hurt, the victims of those crimes? Shouldn’t they, and other law-abiding citizens, be society’s first consideration?” How do you think Maureen Faulkner would answer that question? What is your response? Do you agree with Ms. Stuckey in the video that ‘social justice’ is not just? Why or why not? Ms. Stuckey also notes that in the Bible, “... compassion follows justice. It doesn’t precede it.” Do you agree with Ms. Stuckey that our society should be the same way? Why or why not? Why do you think that the Left defines justice as equality, rather than differentiating the legal concept from the moral one? Explain.



QUIZ

SOCIAL JUSTICE ISN'T JUSTICE

1. Justice is getting what you deserve without _____.
 - a. punishment
 - b. judgment
 - c. favor
 - d. reciprocity

2. In what way does justice demand that everyone be equal?
 - a. socially
 - b. economically
 - c. under the law
 - d. every possible way

3. Justice is first and foremost about truth.
 - a. True
 - b. False

4. What kind of justice undermines actual justice?
 - a. economic justice
 - b. racial justice
 - c. environmental justice
 - d. all of the above

5. Leftism's guiding principle is that _____.
 - a. everyone should be held to a Biblical standard
 - b. the weak are good and the powerful are bad
 - c. Judeo-Christian values should be the standard
 - d. compassion should follow justice, not precede it



QUIZ - ANSWER KEY

SOCIAL JUSTICE ISN'T JUSTICE

1. Justice is getting what you deserve without _____.
 - a. punishment
 - b. judgment
 - c. favor
 - d. reciprocity

2. In what way does justice demand that everyone be equal?
 - a. socially
 - b. economically
 - c. under the law
 - d. every possible way

3. Justice is first and foremost about truth.
 - a. True
 - b. False

4. What kind of justice undermines actual justice?
 - a. economic justice
 - b. racial justice
 - c. environmental justice
 - d. all of the above

5. Leftism's guiding principle is that _____.
 - a. everyone should be held to a Biblical standard
 - b. the weak are good and the powerful are bad
 - c. Judeo-Christian values should be the standard
 - d. compassion should follow justice, not precede it

<https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2001-dec-21-me-16905-story.html>

One Problem in Abu-Jamal Crusade: He's Guilty

By STEVE LOPEZ
Dec. 21, 2001
12 AM

Maureen Faulkner moved across the country after her husband was shot and killed on a downtown Philadelphia street 20 years ago this month. In Camarillo, she made new friends, started a new job and tried to build a new life.

But the old one keeps chasing after her.

Faulkner's late husband, Danny, was a cop. The man who killed him, Mumia Abu-Jamal, has become an international celebrity and a symbol of everything that's wrong with the American judicial system.

This week, after years of appeals, a federal judge in Philadelphia affirmed the 1982 murder conviction but threw out the death sentence. He ordered that Abu-Jamal either be kept in prison for life or be given a new sentencing hearing.

Maureen Faulkner, who manages a medical office in Camarillo, has been a wreck since the news. The other night, just after dozing off, she bolted up, gasping for air.

"I jumped out of bed and couldn't catch my breath, and the reality hit. Oh, my God! I'm going to have to go back to that courtroom and go through this again."

Having lived and worked in Philadelphia for about 12 years, I happen to know a few things about the murder of Officer Danny Faulkner. I've talked to the prosecutors and to Abu-Jamal attorneys, read the transcripts, studied the appeals and visited the scene of the murder.

And without qualification, hesitation or a shadow of a doubt, I can tell you this:

Mumia Abu-Jamal is guiltier than O.J.

On Dec. 9, 1981, Officer Faulkner made a traffic stop on Abu-Jamal's brother, Billy Cook, who put up a fight. Abu-Jamal happened upon the scene, and shooting began. Faulkner ended up dead, and Abu-Jamal was shot in the chest.

A gun registered to Abu-Jamal, with five chambers empty, was on the sidewalk. Four witnesses who saw all or part of the shooting implicated Abu-Jamal. One witness said that after Faulkner went down, Abu-Jamal stood over him and sealed the deal with a bullet through the head.

And yet an international crusade to free Mumia--fueled by endorsements from Hollywood celebrities including Susan Sarandon, Paul Newman, Ossie Davis, Ed Asner, Tim Robbins and Alec Baldwin--has had people marching in the streets from Africa to Asia and beyond.

I've seen "Free Mumia" posters and T-shirts in Canada and Greece. Twenty-two members of the British Parliament called for a new trial, and this month the Paris City Council made Abu-Jamal its first honorary citizen in 30 years. The last was Picasso.

These people believe with all their heart, and very little of their head, that Abu-Jamal is a political prisoner who was framed, scapegoated and railroaded by a racist police force and a hanging judge.

It's true that the 1982 trial was a circus, but that's because Abu-Jamal wanted it to be. His own attorney told me that Abu-Jamal, a Black Panther, considered himself a revolutionary and didn't want a legal defense. He wanted to make a political statement. At times, Abu-Jamal was removed from the courtroom because of his outbursts.

When I lived in Philadelphia, I couldn't begin to make sense of the Abu-Jamal juggernaut until I got a call one day from Los Angeles.

The caller told me he worked in entertainment and had been handed a petition demanding a new trial for Abu-Jamal. Everyone in his office was happily signing up, but he wanted to know more before jumping on the wagon, and someone suggested he call me.

He read me a list of claims about coerced witnesses, suppressed evidence, fabricated evidence and dark conspiracies. And then I understood the Abu-Jamal fever and accompanying dementia.

While there was a grain of truth to some of the claims, many were simplifications, exaggerations or outright lies. For instance, Abu-Jamal supporters scream that a .44-caliber bullet was removed from Faulkner's body but that Abu-Jamal had a .38. In fact, that claim has been debunked by the defense team's own ballistics expert.

Mumia supporters, who tend to work themselves into a lather, have foamed at me for years, and I think I know why I make them so uncomfortable.

I believe there's an unconscionable history of police brutality and frame jobs on minorities in Philadelphia, Los Angeles and the rest of the country.

I believe the death penalty is so disproportionately applied to minorities without adequate legal representation, it ought to be abolished.

And yet I refuse to buy into their political claptrap and help them make a martyr of Abu-Jamal, who shot Danny Faulkner in cold blood and watched him die.

Had Abu-Jamal argued that it was a matter of self-defense, I might have thought differently. But he didn't. For 20 years, in fact, he said absolutely nothing about what happened. You'd think that might set off a few alarms among breathless supporters, but not a chance.

In the absence of an explanation from Abu-Jamal, Hollywood celebrities, racially motivated apologists and other misguided opportunists created their own, pitching half-baked conspiracies and cockamamie tales of mystery killers fleeing the scene.

But here's the topper:

For 20 years, Abu-Jamal's own brother Billy, who was at the scene of the crime, never uttered a word in his defense. What kind of sap buys into Abu-Jamal's innocence when his own flesh and blood lets him stew on death row?

Earlier this year, Abu-Jamal's latest defense team broke the big news that Faulkner was killed by a Mafia hit man, a scenario so ridiculous that the previous attorneys kept it quiet to avoid embarrassment. And Billy Cook finally broke his silence with the blockbuster report that an unnamed acquaintance of his did the job.

These were the developments that apparently inspired Parisians to elevate Abu-Jamal into the realm of Picasso.

This week, when the federal judge ruled that jurors were improperly instructed in the penalty phase of the 1982 trial, neither side was happy.

Abu-Jamal supporters had wanted the judge to throw out the conviction altogether, prosecutors wanted the death sentence to stick, and both sides plan to appeal.

And so it drags on for Maureen Faulkner, who was just 24 when this nightmare began, and wishes the federal judge would have left things as they were.

In past court appearances, she has been spat upon and cursed by Abu-Jamal supporters, for no reason other than her unwavering belief in justice for her husband's killer.

"Now I'll probably have to relive the whole thing once more," she says. "I'll have to hear Mumia supporters screaming at me and pointing their fingers like they're shooting at me. It's been over 20 years now. Is there any regard for the survivors of crime?"

*

Steve Lopez writes Monday, Wednesday and Friday. He can be reached at steve.lopez@latimes.com