

Injustice pretending to be ‘Social Justice’

By Jay Wegter

In this article, we will examine the following six points: 1) The meaning of ideological social justice. 2) The mission of ideological social justice. 3) The morality of ideological social justice. 4) The methods of ideological social justice. 5) The misunderstanding of rights by ideological social justice, and, 6) The means whereby ideological social justice opposes the gospel.

I. The meaning of ideological social justice

1) Social justice has come to mean the state’s effort to redistribute advantages and resources to disadvantaged groups in order to satisfy their right to social and economic equality. But, this justice is not the same kind of justice that God requires. Social justice is not about divine justice. According to Holy Scripture, injustice is sin and it is not permitted under God’s moral government.ⁱ When describing the uniform application of justice, Scripture declares: “Learn to do good; seek justice, reprove the ruthless, defend the orphan, plead for the widow” (Is 1:17). “Woe to those who enact evil statutes and to those who constantly record unjust decisions, so as to deprive the needy of justice and rob the poor of My people of *their* rights, so that widows may be their spoil and that they may plunder the orphans” (Is 10:1-2). Note the words above describing the corruption of justice: *ruthless, evil statutes, unjust decisions, deprive, rob, spoil, plunder.*

2) Ideological Social Justice (ISJ) is a more accurate term for this movement than the term social justice.ⁱⁱ The social justice movement is part of classic socialism. Social justice is actually a Marxist phrase which aims at shattering social structure. The real problem with this movement is that there is no moral law that is taught. Today’s social justice advocates haven’t really considered that their ideology contains the seeds of total social disruption (John MacArthur). Since ISJ is not legal justice, it does not address right and wrong, nor the divine justice commanded in the Bible. Social justice has taken the term ‘justice’ and redefined it so that it does not resemble the justice required in Scripture. Here is the actual agenda of ISJ: *everyone has a right to equal upward mobility and resources. Without those privileges, society is unjust, and those without those privileges are oppressed because they lack privilege, power, prosperity, status, and property.*ⁱⁱⁱ

3) The Bible does not demand wealth redistribution or equalization. ISJ actually means equality of outcome (while rejecting such factors as personal responsibility and productivity). ISJ demands equality of outcome, but is blind to the consequences of forced redistribution. Does the Bible require wealth redistribution and equalization? No, the sharing of one’s wealth is always voluntary. Even in the early church, the sharing of goods in the Jerusalem church was based upon voluntarily selling goods in order to meet a need. Though they had all things in common and were selling their possessions to distribute the proceeds, they were distributing that wealth *as any had need* (Acts 5:3-4). The communal activity of the early church was not paradigm for the elimination of private property.^{iv}

4) The main biblical categories related to justice are: a) that which conforms to an ethical or moral standard. b) the legal process of judgment so that it is administered in accordance with the law. This means that it is rendered impartially and proportionately to each person’s due, according to God’s moral standard. “. . . And will He not render to man according to his work” (Prov 24:12b)? The criteria of justice revealed in the Bible is as follows: 1) Justice requires impartiality in the application of law (Deut

1:16-17). 2) Justice requires rendering to each his due (Mt 16:27; Rom 2:6). 3) Justice requires proportionality (there is symmetry between the initial acts and their rewards or punishments) (Ex 21-22; Lev 24:17–21).^v The penalty levied against the perpetrator is proportional to the wrong suffered. By way of example from the Torah, the thief must pay double for what he has stolen (Ex 22:4).

II. The mission of ideological social justice

1) The mission of ISJ starts by identifying disadvantaged groups. But this category of ‘disadvantaged’ is not purely synonymous with minorities. In fact, it’s not really about the individual. Women are considered a disadvantaged group though they make up the majority of the American population. So, in order to fulfill its mission, ISJ assesses group outcomes, assigns blame for disparate outcomes, finds out who is to blame, and then seeks to redistribute power and resources so that disadvantages can be addressed.^{vi} It is difficult to miss the Marxism inherent in this ideology.

2) Those identifying themselves as victims are considered members of ‘oppressed groups’: women, the poor, ethnic groups, and LGBTQ. To be a member of any of these aforementioned groups is to be a victim who has to endure ‘hate speech’. These individuals have the ‘right’ to demand social justice, and to put a stop the oppression they claim they have experienced. The more victim categories that one is member of, the more that person is regarded as truthful and authoritative. *Intersectionality* is the term used to describe the number of victim groups one is a member of. Thus, a black, female, transgender person would score highly on the intersectionality index. If one is not a member of one of these victim groups, then he or she has nothing to say. Thus, social justice defines a person by what others have done to him or her. This ideology seeks a sociological fix, usually financial. It is a temporal economic concept of enforced equity—it is a demand for economic ‘redemption’ now, by forced equalization.^{vii}

3) In understanding the ideology of social justice, *disparate* is an important word to define. Disparate means fundamentally different. A disparity of power means that power is concentrated in one group, and not in another. When ISJ sees disparity in terms of resources, it assumes that those who possess the most resources have gained them unjustly. If one is white and has wealth, then it is assumed that the disparity in possessions is evidence of injustice. And, since those resources were ‘gained unjustly’, it is *just* to forcibly redistribute them to those who deserve them—in order to grant power to the powerless.^{viii} ISJ is all about groups. The issue for ISJ is not to actually determine whether your success is legitimately gained, the only question for them is, what group do you belong to? Do you belong to a privileged or an underprivileged groups? An oppressive group, or an oppressed group? ISJ ardently utilizes labeling and various disparity assessment tools at the group level in order to pursue its agenda.

4) ISJ postures as a voice for the voiceless, as care and concern for the poor. It attempts to bring about change by altering and dismantling structures and institutions. But, the change in the structures of society is more of a Marxist idea than the pursuit of actual justice. ISJ opposes Christian worldview, but has borrowed, and then redefined the following terms: *diversity*, *equity*, and *inclusion*. ISJ masquerades as mandatory diversity training, but in reality, it is the indoctrination of their worldview which includes *wealth redistribution*, *political correctness*, *speech codes*, *shaming*, *doxing*, *cancel culture*, etc.^{ix}

5) ISJ is an atheistic postmodern construction in which there is no objective truth; everything is viewed through the lens of power. ISJ’s proponents propose to fix the *power problem* by gaining control of our culture’s dominant narrative—believing that those who can control the story can control the people through emotional appeal. ISJ understands reality as different distributions of power. The worldview of

ISJ is Darwinian, and since there is no universal, absolute truth, ultimate reality is about who has the power. In ISJ's worldview, there is no redemptive aspect of power. And yet, in their self-deception, if they eliminate those in power, they see no problem with becoming the new power elite. But, their philosophy is self-refuting, for if they become the new power moguls, there will be a new group of victims of their power. In Luke 22:24-27, Jesus indicates that the path to influence comes by humble service, and not by unrestrained ambition or revolution: *the one who is the greatest among you must become like the youngest, and the leader like the servant* (v. 26).

6) ISJ is blind to the kind of 'meek' power manifested by our Savior. ISJ's proponents have no concept of Christ's humble power—that the Creator of the universe could actually stoop to wash the feet of sinners (Jn 13:1-5). God is love, power, justice, mercy, holiness and wisdom. And, when He sends His Son as the perfect image of Himself, Christ makes His ultimate statement of meekness, "For even the Son of Man did not come to be served, but to serve, and to give His life a ransom for many" (Mk 10:45). By contrast, ISJ really has no grace, mercy, or forgiveness. For, ISJ's cancel culture doesn't really work, it has no aspect in its worldview for reconciliation (its policies demonstrate the term, 'irreconcilable' in 2 Timothy 3:3). And, by way of example, cancel culture has no problem burning down careers overnight without mercy. Social Media is used as platform for a mob to attack.^x

III. The morality of ideological social justice

1) ISJ regards human nature not as the image of God, possessing inherent value and dignity, but instead, as defined by social forces, by power dynamics, and groups. In ISJ, you are not defined by your status as God's unique creation in His image, you are defined by your group. Individuals are treated as drones or mouthpieces for the larger group. You are placed in the box of your group's label. You are not defined by your deepest convictions; you are a product entirely of your group. This is a reductionist, dehumanizing view of human nature. By contrast, biblical morality and dignity are rooted in our Creator's good and holy character, and in His righteous purposes for us.^{xi}

2) ISJ suggests that if you regard yourself as oppressed, only those in your group will understand your reality and no one else will. Such a narrow reductionist identity means that the individual is stuck in the dark pod of his group identity. This is a formula for maximum disunity, for social disintegration. When God permits social disintegration upon an apostate society, one of the judgments He sends is the collapse of social order. In Isaiah's day, that overturning of order was described in this manner: "Their oppressors are children, and women rule over them. . ." (Is 3:12) (See also Isaiah 3:3-4, 24:1-5). In great contrast to being pigeon-holed by group labeling is the thoroughly biblical idea that God has vested individuals with the ability to make choices that can impact history, and with the uniqueness that can make an incredible mark on the world. Group identity produces a blindness to this biblical reality.^{xii}

3) ISJ has an inconsistent morality that is not based upon a transcendent moral code given by a transcendent Lawgiver (Deut 5:6-21). ISJ sets forth a morality that is borrowed from Marxists in which the individual is not inherently sinful, it is only the power structures that are evil. ISJ's moral code is class based. The wealthy and the powerful are viewed as immoral, and the worker as moral. It is the oppressor versus the oppressed (the corporate oppressor and the underclass victim). But, the West's standard of living has changed remarkably since the oppressive conditions in the industrial revolution. In 1900, 18% of American workers were under the age of 16. Today, the oppressed class is no longer identified as the exploited toiling worker, but as those who are victimized because of race and/or sex, and gender identity. Sexual orientation has replaced economics as the new oppressed class.

4) According to the ISJ worldview, to have power is to be evil, to be an oppressor; but no power equals ‘innocence’. Therefore, it is considered a just cause to fight for the oppressed by fighting against the oppressor. This necessity to fight for ‘social justice’ has become the cause that gives meaning and purpose within their worldview. It’s interesting that those who have never been raised with a Christian worldview are finding a substitute meaning and purpose in the ISJ movement. They feel as if they occupy the moral high ground when they fight for those whom they regard as the oppressed. But, the question not being asked is, “who has authoritatively assigned the identities of the *oppressed* and the *oppressor*?” ISJ’s false life purpose has blinded its proponents to instances in which actual oppression is taking place such as enslavement and torture in regions of China (genocide of Uyghurs), Africa (clitoral mutilation), and parts of South East Asia (sex slavery). For ISJ, group identity overshadows reality, thus, it clouds the ability to see instances in which real oppression is occurring in our world. For the assumption is, if you are female, homosexual, transgender, or a person of color, then you are automatically oppressed.^{xiii}

IV. The methods of ideological social justice

1) ISJ frames the conversation in such a way that you are ungodly and against justice if you dare to disagree. We must address this from the standpoint of worldview. The ISJ narrative of *oppressed* versus *oppressor* demands that equity be perceived as a change in power from the *oppressor* to the *oppressed* by whatever means possible. This clearly flows from Hegel and Marx. It is about power dynamics. Everything is to be seen from that perspective. If you reject that perspective you are an oppressor, and guilty of having internalized your oppression of others. And, so rigid is this framing of the issues, that the scientific method is now being associated with whiteness! An appeal to data as a method to employ quantitative analysis is seen as whiteness. Everything bows to the definition of the group. That has become the ultimate test or metric, not what is true versus not true. ISJ’s worldview rejects the defining events of creation, fall, redemption, and consummation. Instead, for ISJ, truth comes from narrative, from the voice of the oppressed. Truth comes from outside of the hegemony. Truth is not located in verifiable, testable truth claims, but rather in the narratives and stories of the oppressed. That is absolutely absurd and circular, for there is no point of testing outside of its own assumptions. And, since no one wants to be on the side of the oppressors, there is a very emotional appeal in this agenda.^{xiv}

2) The ISJ movement advances its agenda in 3 steps. 1) By *desensitizing*: we are bombarded with the ISJ worldview in media, movies, and education. 2) By *jamming*: a form of brainwashing in which sexual deviancy is normalized, and its acceptance is made a requirement of a just and inclusive society. 3) By *conversion*: people become ‘converted’ to become allies and advocates of LGBTQ by regarding its members as an aggrieved minority. In addition, ISJ has been expanding its oppressed groups to include climate change advocates, illegal immigrants, access to universal healthcare, and access to abortion.^{xv}

3) A significant part of our strategy ought to be showing that the Darwinian evolutionary paradigm gave rise to modern racism. Evolutionary theory taught that the black and white races evolved from different primates. The black race from a robust, smaller brained primate and the white race from a primate with a larger cranium. The subtitle of Darwin’s book on origins is, *The Preservation of Favored Races in the Struggle for Life*. Once the Darwinian mindset became codified in western culture, it resulted in such horrors as eugenics. In urban areas of America today, more black babies are aborted than born. Nationally, blacks make up 13% of our population, but 30% of abortions in America are black children.^{xvi} The following quote from Alveda King (MLK’s niece) alludes to the lingering problem of eugenics inherent in Darwinism. “Abortion and racism are evil twins, born of the same lie. Where racism

now hides its face in public, abortion is accomplishing the goals of which racism only once dreamed. Together, abortionists are destroying humanity at large and the black community in particular.”

V. The misunderstanding of rights by ideological social justice

1) Negative rights are your rights protecting you against harm. Positive rights would be rights to certain benefits. Properly understood, rights are not the guarantee of something provided for us, but the guarantee that what is justly ours may not be unjustly taken from us. Only negative rights issue from an objective universal fixed standard. Negative rights are timeless. You cannot take my children, my property, my reputation, or my life, unjustly from me. The eighth commandment says, “You shall not steal” (Ex 20:15). Thus, what we mean by *negative rights* is that we have the right to not have our possessions stolen. But, we reject the notion of positive rights: you do not have the right to a car without paying for it, much less the right to my car without paying for it.^{xvii}

2) The problem with positive rights is that they are not merely equal rights, but rights to equal things. Positive rights destroy the very concept of charity. It forces the giver to owe to another the difference in what is possessed. Only negative rights can truly be universal, positive rights cannot be. A person on welfare in America would be very rich in Bangladesh. Can you imagine the nightmare of enforcing a global standard of positive rights? Forced egalitarianism leads to erasing uniqueness. Forced positive rights would not produce a dystopian world. It would make individuals indistinguishable and interchangeable human beings.^{xviii} By way of example, in a recent pole, individuals were asked, what is a woman? The silence and attempted answers were stunning. People have been so brainwashed by ISJ that they could not answer the question, *what is a woman?* There was palpable fear that if they described a woman as different than a man, they would be revealing a politically incorrect bias.

3) Social justice is not biblical justice. Here are reasons why ISJ is not biblical justice. 1) ISJ’s standard is not equal application of justice, but equality of outcome. 2) ISJ asserts positive rights which take from negative rights (I must take from Bob to pay Joe). 3) ISJ defines its activity as *the fair distribution of advantages, assets, and benefits among all members among society*. But the word *fair* implies a moral agent who does the redistributing. This assumes that someone other than God is the distributing moral actor. Problem, when the government shows up to do the redistributing, you are moving toward statism, toward totalitarianism. We must ask the question, what is involved in raising someone’s outcomes or opportunities to match another? Answer: they must be treated differently (we must take from one to give to another). The Bible forbids this partiality. According to biblical criteria, ISJ is really injustice.^{xix} Do you remember what occurred during the 2020 riots? Antifa members chanted, “We are here to take what is ours!” as they marched through neighborhoods. This powerfully illustrates how positive rights are destructive to justice and to the negative rights which belong to true justice.

4) Our obligation to the poor. According to Scripture, helping the poor is a voluntary matter of grace and charity, not justice (Gal 2:10; Eph 4:28). God ordained the state to dispense justice and the church to dispense grace. When the state takes positive rights by force, it will violate negative rights. Scripture is replete with passages on undeserved grace. Grace means that we cannot require the equalizing of inequality. The Bible is clear, that we must not confuse justice with grace. To receive absolute justice is to deserve hell (Rom 11:32; Gal 3:10, 22). Historically, state-enforced wealth redistribution has had disastrous effects (concentration camps, violence, starvation, economic collapse). The state is never to enforce grace and charity.^{xx}

5) The justice which was to be cultivated in ancient Israel was the equal application of justice to all so that the poor were not exploited. Scripture forbids partiality either in favor of or against the poor (Ex 23:3, 6; Lev 19:15). We should administer justice for rich and poor alike. However, we focus on justice for the poor because they are so often victims of injustice. While justice then is never partial to the poor (Ex 23:3), it recognizes that the poor are often vulnerable to injustice. Justice as set forth in Scripture is therefore particularly apt to come to their aid in vindication, justification, or salvation from oppressors (Ps 140:12; Prov 29:7, 14; 31:9; Eccl 5:8; Is 10:2; 11:4; Jer 5:28; 22:16; Ezek 18:17; Amos 5:12).^{xxi} “He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does the Lord require of you but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God?” (Mic 6:8).

6) In ancient Israel, it was common for the poor to be exploited for a bribe as insignificant as a pair of sandals. “Thus says the Lord, ‘for three transgressions of Israel and for four I will not revoke its *punishment*, because they sell the righteous for money and the needy for a pair of sandals” (Amos 2:6). Israel’s governing authorities allowed the poor to be exploited on behalf of the wealthy. The law courts (which were known as the ‘gates’) were to be adjudicated according to Mosaic law. But, through greed, the judges began to take bribes: “For I know your transgressions are many and your sins are great, *you* who distress the righteous *and* accept bribes and turn aside the poor in the gate” (Amos 5:12). This historical background demonstrates that the rule of law in a society has nothing to do with socialism. According to law, everyone received what was their due—not the equal distribution of all things to all.^{xxii}

VI. The means by which the gospel is opposed by ISJ

1) Within ISJ, the prevailing belief is that Western Christianity, having birthed Western civilization, was merely a plan to gain hegemony, that is power over others. ISJ seeks to reverse this by asserting that it is not the oppressors that have the truth, but the oppressed. It is the victims of oppression that have direct access to the truth. From the standpoint of epistemology it is the victim who has the authority, the insight, the knowledge of the truth. It is the victim who sees things the way they truly are. And, since they have the authority, we are to believe the victims and their epistemology.^{xxiii} University students have jumped on this bandwagon in mass. The following is a regular occurrence on college campuses; students do not want to hear a view contrary to ISJ, so they shout down an invited speaker. 18 and 19 year old college students who believe they are oppressed, or represent the oppressed, will invalidate (or ‘cancel’ by shouting) someone who is older and wiser, but who is not ‘oppressed’.

2) Is there a conversation bridge that can be built when evangelizing a person committed to ISJ? We can explain that what is inside of us will work itself out in relationships, families, social setting, and communities. This is true both of virtue and of sin and evil. But, because ISJ sees people as inherently good and not evil, they have an erroneous approach to change—believing that change comes not by changing the person but by changing society’s structure in order to correct its wrong distribution of power. Therefore, according to ISJ, by removing systems and social structures that tend toward inequality, repair will take place. So whether it is laws, social structures, or economics, the fix has to come by changing systems and structures.^{xxiv} By contrast, we stress that only the power of God in the gospel can change what needs to be changed (Rom 1:16-17). A wrong diagnosis of the problem will result in a tragically wrong solution. Jesus describes the real source of man’s problems: “For out of the heart come evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false witness, slanders” (Mt 15:19).

3) ISJ is not a part of the gospel but a serious hindrance to the gospel because its premise is built upon the evasion of personal responsibility. The ISJ ideology dominates minds by blame-shifting and guilt

evasion. This meme recorded in the O.T. 2500 years ago has been revived today, “*the fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children’s teeth are set on edge,*” (Ezek 18:2). Blame-shifting is the continuous default position of this ideology. This mindset of escape from personal responsibility dominates an entire culture at the university level. If one is not a victim, then he or she has nothing to say. And, if one disagrees with the premise of ISJ by suggesting that any one of their disadvantaged groups is not actually oppressed, then you have committed a *micro-aggression* against them. You have become an example of *cultural appropriation* (def. an unacknowledged practice that has been adopted, by which one part of society oppresses another, especially the disadvantaged and minority cultures). And, if you express a view which disagrees with ISJ, your words may be categorized as an act of ‘violence’.^{xxv}

4) Everything in ISJ is shaped by this epistemology of victimhood. The rationale is: *my experience as a victim is why I have truth, insight, and wisdom. My victimization is the tool I use to discern the truth.* But, this is a formula for fragmentation and not unity. How can there be shared common ground without absolute truth? And, since everything is seen as power, even truth gets classified as a power tactic. ISJ proponents normally cannot tell you how they picked up their worldview. They see their worldview as reality, but they cannot stand outside of it in order to scrutinize its truthfulness. Scott Allen notes that since the ISJ worldview is an illusion, it has to borrow from Christian worldview in order to ‘oxygenate’ itself, that is, to find something that resembles morality and meaning. The vast majority of young people within ISJ were fed Darwinism, having been raised on its meaninglessness. ISJ promises to rescue them from a life without purpose and meaning. For, in defending the oppressed from the oppressor, they have found a ‘just cause’, and are ready to enlist in fighting for what is ‘good’.^{xxvi} But, attempts at justice without truth is a farcical dead end, for justice is the application of truth in our human relationships.^{xxvii}

5) ISJ is a hindrance to the gospel because its victim mentality is clearly guilt-evasion. For, there can be no salvation without full responsibility for one’s sin. Ezekiel was a judgment preacher. He preached to the Jewish exiles who were fond of blaming previous generations for their present troubles (Ezek 18:2). Ezekiel’s sermons were not popular, for he pressed home the message of personal sin, personal guilt, and personal punishment by God. If you retreat into blaming others and refuse to repent, know for certain that God will only judge for your own sin (Ezek 18:20). This truth is critical to the gospel.^{xxviii} If the church buys into the social justice perspective by embracing any of the sinner’s excuses, then the blood of their damnation is on the church’s hands (Ezek 3:18-21; 33:6, 8; Acts 18:6).^{xxix} Is it wrong for a true believer to say nothing to those who are apathetic in their sin. It is gross negligence to refuse to warn people of coming judgment and damnation.

6) Secular psychology, and in particular Freudian psychology, is the father of the grand excuse for sin, “You are the product of what was done to you.” But, the gospel knows no such alibi. In order to be saved, one must be overwhelmed and crushed by the sin of his own heart. ISJ takes repentance out of the gospel. It offers false comfort by spreading blame to others and to God (Jer 31:29-30). On Judgment Day our works will manifest whether or not our nature is new in Christ by the gospel, or is unregenerate. For, we will be judged by our works, but not saved by our works^{xxx} (Rom 14:10-12; 2 Cor 5:10).

7) We wholeheartedly disagree with ISJ because attempts to fix broken systems cannot avail if the real problem is that we are broken. Only the Christian worldview can get you back to what it truly means to be human, for it is the people who must be changed by the gospel. It is difficult to convince ISJ’s of this truth because their epistemology rejects God’s revelation in creation, conscience, and Scripture. Because ISJ is atheistic, truth is regarded as relative to one’s group and to one’s group experience

(cultural relativism). So ISJ would reject the existence of any metanarrative. Not only would they reject a totalizing worldview, they believe that a proponent of absolute truth is engaging in a power play in order to oppress others. Christian philosopher, R. J. Rushdoony notes that all authority is really ‘religious authority’. In other words, if God’s sovereignty is not acknowledged, something other than God is the ultimate authority. As Douglas Wilson quips, ‘the question concerning one’s worldview is: who is theo?’ (i.e. who or what is the ultimate authority? Who or what is sovereign?) This illustrates why ISJ (like historic examples of Marxism) operates as a quasi-religious system.^{xxxix}

8) When we ask the question, “How is evil overcome?” The Bible starts with God’s authoritative self-revelation, that good and evil are not defined by the state, but are established by God (Ex 20:3-17).

Only the gospel can root out the evil from our hearts so that it is overcome and we are inclined to do what is good and right.^{xxxix} By contrast, the social justice delusion suggests we are basically good—the only bad to be identified is what others did to us. ISJ poses a danger to the gospel because it urges us to affirm victimhood. ISJ is about the validation of victimhood and the evasion of individual responsibility. It’s about people defining themselves by what has been done to them, rather than what they are on the inside in God’s sight (Is 64:6; Heb 4:12-13). He who rejects God’s holy justice will see no need for divine mercy—that person will receive only judgment. ISJ rejects the fact that the person needs to be changed from the inside out by God. By contrast, the gospel has a particular order in how societal change is to take place.^{xxxix} Caring for people is a result of the gospel making men and women new in Christ. It is the behaviors of the ‘new man’ that alone would positively affect relationships, families, communities, and society as a whole (Col 3:5-20).

End Notes:

ⁱ Voddie Baucham, “Social Justice”

ⁱⁱ Scott Allen, “Social Justice,” Disciple Nations Alliance

ⁱⁱⁱ John MacArthur, “Social Justice”

^{iv} Calvin Beisner, *Social Justice: How good Intentions undermine Justice and the Gospel*

^v Ibid.

^{vi} Voddie Baucham

^{vii} MacArthur

^{viii} Voddie Baucham

^{ix} Scott Allen

^x Ibid.

^{xi} Ibid.

^{xii} Ibid.

^{xiii} Ibid.

^{xiv} Voddie Baucham

^{xv} Ibid.

^{xvi} Ibid.

^{xvii} Calvin Beisner

^{xviii} Ibid.

^{xix} Ibid.

^{xx} Ibid.

^{xxi} Ibid.

^{xxii} R. C. Sproul, “Social Justice”

^{xxiii} Scott Allen

^{xxiv} Ibid.

^{xxv} MacArthur

^{xxvi} Scott Allen

^{xxvii} Calvin Beisner in David Noebel, *Understanding the Times*, p. 298

^{xxviii} MacArthur

^{xxix} Ibid.

^{xxx} Ibid.

^{xxxi} Scott Allen

^{xxxii} Ibid.

^{xxxiii} MacArthur