

2010

Social Justice, Part 2
by Bill Lockwood

With our working definition of “social justice” being “the creating of an ‘egalitarian society’” based upon principles of conceived “equality,” practitioners of this philosophy seek to remake society along socialistic lines. Money and wealth will be evenly distributed, job opportunities, educational degrees; even incarceration rates must be “distributed” along racially equal lines. The National Council of Churches have been in this game for more than a century and have made their goal the fundamental “restructuring” of society, giving it a “religious” color. Free-market capitalism is anathema while statism is vogue.

Freedom, as our Declaration of Independence recognizes, is a gift of God to *each individual*. Past generations of Americans knew that “God created man in his own image” (Genesis 1:27) and human life was sacred. Private property, in biblical terms, is an extension of one’s self. This is why theft is wrong (Exodus 20:15). Private property represents, in concrete terms, one’s labor because we pour the essence of our lives into its production. With these concepts in mind, consider reasons why “social justice” is immoral.

First, redistribution of wealth is **theft**. It is with great consternation that we note that the National Council of Churches has urged, since its inception, “the extensive use of taxation to reduce inequalities in income.” Not only is this advocacy contrary to the fundamental principles of the American way of life as well as the Constitutional concept of taxation, but it literally advocates theft! And this in the name of religion! Socialists for ages have called “taxation” their “weapon.” How so? It abolishes private property. “Taxation is, of course, a form of *confiscation*, but we have long been accustomed to it and it makes it possible for the process of confiscation to be stretched over such a long period of time as to make it easy and almost unnoticeable” (Spargo and Arner, *Elements of Socialism*, p. 352).

Second, social justice seeks to “save society,” not individuals. Here a primary fallacy is noted. Dr. Harry Ward had tremendous influence on the formation of the Federal and National Council of Churches. He observed from his “social justice” perspective: “It may fairly be said that one result of social-service activities in the churches ... *is a changed attitude on the part of many church members concerning the purpose and function both of the church and of Christianity.*” Dr. Walter Rauschenbusch declared that he worked for “regeneration, not of the individual, but of ‘society.’” Thus, Jesus, who came to “seek and save the lost” (Luke 19:10), is ignored. This is how it has come to pass that many preachers filling pulpits do not believe the fundamental facts of the death, burial, and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Instead, they have been trained to spend their time running tree-hugging campaigns, saving whales, or becoming Robin Hooded socialistic seed-sowers. Collectivism, not individual salvation is the key.

Third, social justice demands that some individuals exercise uncontrolled power over others. If each individual has been created by God, then the only legitimate *control* that one adult

exercises over another is voluntary. In other words, my Congressmen have certain controls because *we the voters bequeathed it to them*. On the other hand, social justice, by the very nature of the case, requires that some persons will be “in charge” of others and manipulate everything about their lives. Social justice theoretician William Godwin advised a “small group of social decision-makers” control the rest of us bumpkins. These controlling elites will “plan the economy,” “fix all military conflicts,” and decide the direction of our culture. So much for the vaunted “equality.”