

*Fr. Perozich comments —*

*So much talk and writing these days has become propaganda in the sense that the speakers and writers are trying to form my thoughts according to theirs, rather than giving me facts to form my own conscience, and not their conscience.*

*Not just democrats as the article says, but all politicians, social educators, media, church men as well are trying to sway me to believe, to act, to vote, to think as they do.*

*They manipulate my spiritual development, in so far as it gets my cooperation with their goals so that they achieve their outcomes with my help.*

*Leaving the political aside, some simple teachings of Jesus from the Bible, incorporating both old and new testaments, help to guide me.*

*Jesus never spoke of central control to attain salvation or to help the disadvantaged. He told individuals to do their part when they had the opportunity; He told us not to rely on earthly power, possessions, prestige and pleasure for eternal life.*

*The Mosaic law is genius in laying out the obligations of those with sufficient means to care for those with less, even allowing the poor to attach himself forever to the one who could provide for the poor man's needs. It did not guarantee any particular outcome, rather just the basic needs of life in exchange for work, not welfare nor equality of power and possessions, yet with dignity for both in obeying God's law.*

*It presumed as did Jesus that both poor and rich would always be here in this world.*

*Jesus offered the opportunity for salvation from sin for good works, from death for eternal life, from isolation to communion with God and with each other.*

*No program from a human mind was promised for earthly sufficiency or for spiritual salvation.*

*British satirical series, "Yes, Prime Minister" gives some tongue in cheek insights into how some church folk want to make you do what they think, even when Jesus did not speak of it.*

*"Politicians want to talk about moral issues, and bishops want to talk about politics." "Theology is a device for agnostics to stay within the church." "The queen is inseparable from the church of England. What about God? I think he's called an optional extra."*

*[https://www.youtube.com/watch?](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qUSTKisEgTo&list=PLs7j-oBppWuABuQZeS3eV6IqTGdJhzSSY&index=3)*

*[v=qUSTKisEgTo&list=PLs7j-oBppWuABuQZeS3eV6IqTGdJhzSSY&index=](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qUSTKisEgTo&list=PLs7j-oBppWuABuQZeS3eV6IqTGdJhzSSY&index=3)*

*3*

*Be discerning in what you hear, measuring it against Jesus rather than relying only on the authority of the office of the speaker.*

# Townhall

## Democrats Define Down Social Justice

**Loyd Pettegrew**

2/1/2020 12:01:00 PM - Loyd Pettegrew

*Editor's note: This column was co-authored by  
Jim McCoy.*

The rhetorician Quintilian warned in his "On the Causes of Corrupted Eloquence," that speakers holding forth, devoid of talent, will offer no more profit from their work than barren soil from a treatise on agriculture. Social justice is just such a corruption, the etymological equivalent of "wet water." We argue that in becoming the hallmark of the progressive left, social justice costs plenty, but offers America nothing.

Luigi Taparelli is credited with first using social justice in 1840 reflecting the teachings of St. Thomas Aquinas. Its meaning has morphed into today's nonsensicality. In the seven Democrat debates for 2020, the term justice (racial, environmental, health, obstruction of, gender and injustice) was used 186 times by candidates.

Ironically, Democrat Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan coined the phrase [“defining deviancy down,”](#) believing American society had been re-defining deviancy from previously stigmatized conduct to be “normal” behavior. This process of “defining down” appears full throttle for today’s social justice warriors (SJWs).

## **Definitional Problems**

Thomas Sowell has cautioned that social justice is redundant to the point of vacuity--by definition, all justice is social. Yet “social justice” has become an ever-present part of the American lexicon, promoted by Democrats, academics, the media and [young people](#). Being an SJW earns one the approbation of being woke.

One of us recently taught an undergraduate senior seminar, “Influencing Public Opinion.” As a thought experiment, students were asked whether they believed in social justice. The entire class responded affirmatively. He then asked each student to define the term as precisely as possible. Ninety-six percent could only define it in the negative--**not** promoting racism, inequality, oppression, sexism, homophobia, income inequality, misogyny--social *injustice*.

Terms defined in the negative are poor word choices according to grammarians. Aspiring attorneys are taught in law school that you can’t prove a negative. Social policy shouldn’t encompass it either, yet Obama-appointed [Federal Judge Allison Burroughs](#) ruled it was more socially just to admit to Harvard an upper middle class black student with a 1250 SAT score and an A- GPA over a low income Asian student with an A+ GPA and perfect SAT score.

Sowell cautioned that the quest for cosmic justice by the judiciary as an agent of change “quietly repeals one of the foundations of the American revolution...reduces a free people to a subject people, subject now to the edicts of unelected judges enforcing ‘evolving standards’.”

## **Social Justice as Inequity**

Arguments of inequity are the foundation of social justice, based on disparity--unequal results across society. Steve Salerno recounts the horribly negative impacts [social justice-motivated](#) programs of the National Education Association and The Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), saying that “they had to de-emphasize excellence in order to achieve the self-esteem benefits that would drive excellence. They regarded this incoherence as just a ‘temporary ‘concession to a paramount goal’...which has resulted in a wholesale celebration of mediocrity.”

Conservative commentator [Ben Shapiro](#) states that politics is widely subverting our use of basic language, and this is one of the key factors in tearing our country apart. There is an assumed meaning of social justice to those leaning left, but precious little precision. The assumption is that if you can end unjust things, you will have attained social justice. Ironically, attempting to terminate social injustice more often causes a panoply of new injustices.

## **The Answer Is Always More Government**

The answer to how social injustice could be ended is always through more government intervention into nearly every aspect of our personal lives. One must analyze critically this progressive shibboleth rather than take it for face value as do politicians, academics and the mainstream media. Such terms can metastasize into a bitter new reality, always bigger and more intrusive government.

## **The Endurance of Social Justice**

Thomas Sowell argues in [The Quest for Cosmic Justice](#) that all justice is inherently social because it is a human construct, requiring rigorous definition which is never given by its advocates. Progressives no longer advocate for a level playing field

of opportunity but mandate a complete leveling of societal outcomes and conveniently use results of social inequity as prima facia evidence of social injustice.

Back in 1980, Milton and Rose Friedman put social justice into a necessary [economic perspective](#), ignored by today's SJWs: "A society that puts equality—in the sense of equality of outcome—ahead of freedom will end up with neither equality nor freedom. The use of force to achieve equality will destroy freedom, and the force, introduced for good purposes, will end up in the hands of people who use it to promote their own interests."

### **Social Justice and Individuality**

In his most recent book, [Discrimination and Disparities](#), Sowell states that the fallacy of uneven distributions of income, employment and other social outcomes prove neither discrimination nor genetic deficiencies. Social justice can't delegitimize luck or human difference as reasons for inequalities in outcome, especially among all classes of people defined by race, gender and sexual preference, nor eliminate deliberate personal choices made, like choosing working for less money for more time off—a choice of many Millennials, Gens X and Gen Zers.

SJWs hope for the elimination of intentional and sanctioned discrimination through government control. But federal mandates like President Obama's gender-neutral bathrooms have already resulted in women having to traverse urinated floors caused by male carelessness, a social injustice for the sake of social justice. Sowell cautions that neither logic nor empirical evidence provide a compelling reason for expecting equal outcomes among individuals, groups, institutions or nations. We are all endowed with different genes, backgrounds, experiences, drive and luck.

### **Unintended Consequences**

Author and political philosopher [John Gray](#) believes history has no lessons for the ‘woke’. Accepting that revolution multiplies injustice would destroy the meaning of their lives. Woke insouciance to their social divisiveness mirrors Lenin’s before the Russian revolution. So what should we expect from more government control of social justice? Professor [Peter Boghossian](#) and researcher [James Lindsay](#) argue the chief attribute of SJWs is ignoring opposing views. If you disagree with them “Chances are, you’ll be insulted and accused of moral failures—participation in systems of oppression, racism or sexism—and the conversation will go nowhere.”

## **The Solution**

True justice requires that we look at each individual in his/her social milieu, more than the boxes ticked on the SJW preference scale. While America has never guaranteed its citizens equal outcomes, it remains the world’s paragon for equality of opportunity. It demands judging the individual and her/his actions, not by race, class, gender or sexual preference, because social justice can often become a form of social *injustice* no matter what progressives say. Removing all inequality in a society is impossible and efforts to do so promise more injustice than progressives claim already exists.

*Loyd Pettegrew is a professor Emeritus at the University of South Florida and Jim McCoy is an Associate Professor Emeritus at Southern Utah University.*