

## And then there were none...

1. Crime and punishment: match the term to the correct definition:

Victim	Internal guiding feeling – usually because of guilt or responsibility
Mastermind	Found guilty in a court of law
Justice	An action that is against the law – regardless of morality
Accused	Person against whom a crime is committed
Convicted	A clue that is misleading/fake
Acquitted	A court in England and other countries that applies principles rather than law
Crime	Clever person who designs an entire scheme – often used for criminals
Chancery	Fairness – an outcome people feel is deserved
Red herring	Person who the police say has committed a crime
Conscience	Found not guilty (innocent) in a court of law

In your opinion, is the law always right? Is legal always fair/just? Is there a strict line between right and wrong or can it sometimes vary?

Who gets to decide?

### Quote:

*“My dear lady, in my experience of ill-doing, providence leaves the work of conviction and chastisement to us mortals – and the process is often fraught with difficulties. There are no short cuts.”*

Mark the words that mean:

1. quick ways to do something
2. fate / god(s)
3. finding someone guilty
4. filled
5. punishment

Which sentence best sums up the above statement?

- a) From what I've seen, humans will always get it wrong, so we should let god sort everything out, no matter how long it takes.
- b) From what I've seen, we have to do the hard work and punish people ourselves, there's no other way.

### Summary of the play...

Ten people are invited to a weekend on an island retreat. They do not know each other, or the person who invited them. Once they arrive, they discover they are linked by a dark secret, they are all connected by having killed, or caused the death of, someone else, but were not convicted by a court. One by one, they are murdered, in keeping with a children's nursery rhyme. They all try to identify the murderer, but for many, it is too late.

Different endings?

In the play, two characters survive, the audience is to presume that they were in fact innocent of their crimes.

In the book, all the characters die, and the police arrive to find only a letter from the murderer explaining what and how it was done. The murderer claims that it was their duty to bring all these people to justice.

Which ending do you think better explores the idea of justice? Why?

### **Group debate: Crime and punishment today....**

Agatha Christie wrote in a world before the technology we have today. But how relevant is the main theme of crime and punishment now? Some authors say we are living in a time of electronic vigilante justice (people taking justice into their own hands). Do you agree?

Is it ever ok for individuals to decide on crime, guilt, or punishment? Why is society so fascinated with the idea of delivering justice?

In groups, discuss whether the following are, or should be 'a crime', what the appropriate punishment should be, and who should have the power to deal such punishment out? As you discuss, note the different responses people provide and how that fits with your thinking. Do you think this make the problem harder or easier to solve?

1. A beauty/health influencer who lies about having terminal cancer cured by a 'miracle diet', who causes people stop medical treatment and buy their books and supplements instead.
2. Activists doxxing individuals (putting private information like full name, address, family relationships, etc on the internet) for making racist comments or jokes on social media. Is it different if the individuals were attending a racist rally?
3. A politician who lies about election results and causes people to commit violent crime in protest.
4. A company who lies about the effects of their product even though scientific evidence shows it is dangerous to health or the environment.
5. A person who takes a gun or explosives to attack a location presumed to be the location of a child trafficking ring.
6. A wealthy businessperson who lies about investments and causes people to lose all their money investing with them.

(all of the above cases are true, usually more than once, if you are interested, check out, for example, 1. Belle Gibson (or just type "influencer lying about" into google and let the algorithm find many examples for you); 2. Justine Sacco, Charlottesville rally; 3. USA/Brazil/Côte d'Ivoire, Venezuela, Zimbabwe, Benin, etc; 4. Radium Dial Company, cigarette companies, oil and gas companies (leaded fuel for example), etc; 5. Comet Ping Pong, WestWing furniture company; 6. Ponzi schemes in general - This is a crime only if they have filed incorrect financial documents, the lying is not always a crime)

Follow up:

Divide into groups – and try the case of whether vigilante justice is ever right. You will need researchers, defence attorneys, prosecuting attorneys, a jury, and a judge.

You need to consider: why do we have vigilante justice? Is justice enough? If not why? Is vigilante justice the best way of fixing that problem? Can it go wrong? Etc.