

## CHRISTIAN PERSPECTIVE OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

\***Bassey Samuel Akpan**

Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River, Nigeria

---

*Article History: Received 14<sup>th</sup> October, 2016, Accepted 6<sup>th</sup> November, 2016, Published 7<sup>th</sup> November, 2016*

---

### ABSTRACT

The quest for justice in our society has been a constant problem since inception of the society. Practically every experienced individual can identify naturally what is “just,” and can instinctively distinguish “injustice.” However, definitely characterizing what “justice” implies, or what the idea of justice envelops is not very simple to define. The Social Contractarians had showed that in the state of nature, human had to come together to surrender some of their rights to a sovereignty who is to administer social justice when necessarily, this was because the state of nature was characterized by Social Injustice. Decays after that event, the problem of Social Justice Still evolves. In order to solve the problem, philosophers and scholars through the history of western thought have attempt to expose the problem of what social justice is and how it can be administered. Christianity one of the world foremost religions offers an insight into its problem and solution, even before most western scholars on the issue. This article attempts to take a look at Christian most profound sense of being which it is in its moral imperative “love your neighbor as yourself”. It takes a critical look at the biblical view of social justice while exposing the some misconception inherent.

**Keywords:** Social Justice, Christianity, Social contract, Equality.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Social justice implies right and reasonable conduct or treatment to all individuals in a given society. It alludes to an idea of a just society, where “justice” alludes to more than just the organization of laws. It depends on the possibility of a society which gives people and gatherings reasonable treatment and a fair share of the advantages of society. Distinctive defenders of social justice have created diverse elucidations of what constitutes fair treatment and a just distribution. Social justice is a philosophical issue as well as a big issue in governmental and financial matters. It can be contended that everybody wishes to live in a just society; however diverse political belief systems have distinctive originations of what a ‘just society’ really is. The expression “social justice” itself has a tendency to be utilized by those belief systems who trust that present day society is exceedingly unjust - and these are normally left-wing philosophies, upholding a more broad utilization of pay redistribution, a democratic society. The conservative has its own particular origination of social justice, yet they trusts that it is best accomplished through the operation of a free market, and the advancement of altruism and philanthropy (Young 2006). Christianity also shares a view about social justice and how it should be administered. Kevin Rudd affirms that “the

beginning stage with Christianity is a religious philosophy of social justice...” (Kevin 2006). This Paper is an attempt to unravel the concept of social justice from biblical perspective.

### Social Justice

Social justice is an ethical basic that started in antiquated writing. Today, there are contrasts of assessment about the exact meaning of the expression social justice. However, the general idea is that people and gatherings ought to get reasonable treatment and a fair share of the advantages of society. The term justice began in Judean writing, and it kept on being utilized as a part of the scriptural New Testament. In that capacity, the term has a solid chronicled religious association. The Hebrew expressions for justice are *mishpat* and *sedeq*. *Mishpat* was utilized as a part of old archives to allude to the security of poor people, the dowager, the outsider, and the vagrant, and to acts that achieve justice for their purpose (Ps. 10:17-18) (Tubbs 2006). In the Old Testament, this consideration is all inclusive and is requested from all individuals (Deut. 10:18-19). The Hebrew root word *sedeq* is interpreted as right, honorable, and honesty and can be related into English words like just, justice, just purpose, justification, and justify are fitting interpretations of these three Hebrew words (Tubbs 2006). In the New Testament's book of Romans, the root word for right, noble, and nobility is *dikaio*, which again advance deciphers into the English word justice. The term social originates from the Hebrew word *tzadeqah*, which means justice or nobility. It is

---

\*Corresponding author: **Mr. Bassey Samuel Akpan**, Department of Philosophy, University of Calabar, Cross River, Nigeria

generally used to mean philanthropy but on the other hand is utilized to mean commitment. It depends on the Hebrew word *tzedek*, which means exemplary nature, reasonableness, or justice (Hemphill 2015). At the point when the two words social and justice are combined, this contextualizes the association with the citizen and the world. In the New Testament, the anecdote of the Good Samaritan is a case of social justice, showing the idea that we are every one of our neighbors keepers.

All through the western thought, scholars have differentiated on what constitute social justice. Cephalus an old Greek mythology set up the standard speculation of justice. As showed by him justice includes in talking truth and paying one's commitment. Thrasymachus proceeded board to propound his radical theory of justice. He portrays justice as "might is right" (Piper 2005). In interchange words, every man speaks for himself and tries to get what he can; the stronger gets the better part. Glaucon came up and with a view that justice is the shield of the weaker (Fussi 2007). In the primitive phase of society without law and government, man was allowed to do whatever he prefers. The weaker, in any case, understood that they endured more injustice. Confronted with this circumstance they went to an assention and initiated law and government through a kind of social contract and lectured the reasoning of just (Kirwan 1965). Plato rejected them. Plato shows that justice does not depend on a chance, custom or upon outside force. It is the right condition of the human soul by the very methods for man, when found in the totality of his environment. As demonstrated by Plato in his book *The Republic*, Justice is internal as it lives in the human soul (Karasmanis 2006). Plato strikes a relationship between the human living being from one point of view and social living being on the other. Identifying with these three parts in human impulse there are three classes of the social request which are: Philosopher King - overseeing class with reason, who are qualified to control, officers - a class of warriors and defenders of the state and finally artisans who are brokers and business people in the society. For Plato, Justice can only be achieved in a society when everyone minds its own business without interfering in others position. That is, a Philosopher King should rule and not engage in anything else, so as to other specialization. Aristotle assumes that everything has specific point and man's specific point is to accomplish the bona fide satisfaction. He clears up the possibility of justice on the reason of individual life-He says in this field: Justice is in appreciation to individuals, and a justice transport is one in which the relative estimations of things offered contrast with those of the general population accepting it. (Sim 2010) According to Aristotle, justice in individual is the concordance in the human soul, and in the overall population is correspondence and degree in the fulfillment and quality. Justice, to Aristotle as to Plato, is morals, all things considered. Justice infers that every person from a gathering should fulfill his moral duty towards the related people from his gathering. Augustine a Christian thinker devised a scriptural approach to manage social justice. His famous book *City of God* implies the famous passage from the prophet Habakkuk, "the just should live by faith," and Augustine alludes to Habakkuk twice. For Augustine justice begins and completes with religious commitment, the friendship and veneration of God. Where God does not get his due there can

be no justice and no benefit (Dodaro 2004). Against the points of view of Roman statesmen and thinkers, Augustine fights that God is reasonable just through his sign. Subsequently there can be no justice without Christ. Aquinas discusses the justice, in his perfect work of art, the multi-volume *Summa Theologica*. He agrees with Aristotle in inspecting particular justice into two sorts, which he calls "distributive" and "corrective". Aquinas applies this theory of justice to various social issues. He keeps up that ordinary law gives us the benefit to case private property (Lutz-Bachmann 2000). Given this trademark right, thievery and burglary must be abominable, disregarding the way that an exception can develop if the trick and his family are keeping in a circumstance from abundance, in which case, taking is guarded and, completely, not theft or robbery by any stretch of the creative ability.

Social contract scholars incorporating: Hobbes, Locke, Kant, and Rousseau came on board with their views. The idea of social contract hypothesis is that in the first place man lived in the condition of nature. They had no legislature and there was no law to manage them. There were hardships and persecution on every segment of the society. This brought together every individual to look for assurance of their lives and property. As, a consequence of it a society was framed where individuals embraced to regard each other and live in peace and agreement (Fraser 1996). By the second settlement of subjection is, individuals joined and swore to comply with a power and surrendered the entire or piece of their opportunity and rights to a power. The power ensured everybody assurance of life, property and to a specific degree freedom. In this manner, they should consent to build up society by aggregately and proportionally denying the rights they had against each other in the State of Nature and they should permeate somebody individual or gathering of people with the power and energy to authorize the underlying contract. At the end of the day, to guarantee their break from the State of Nature, they should both consent to live respectively under normal laws, and make a requirement component for the social contract and the laws that constitute it. Apparently, the two most compelling modern masterminds about justice are John Rawls and Robert Nozick. In spite of the fact that their speculations of justice are very mind boggling, the key contrast between them is that Rawls favors "justice" as equal results, while Nozick inclines toward "justice" fairness strategies and procedures (Wei 2008). Rawls contended that just standards are those that would be chosen by any individual in a society where they had no learning of their race, sexual orientation, knowledge, capacity, physical qualities, money related circumstance or the position they would involve. He recommended two standards: every individual ought to have break even with rights and fundamental freedoms to the degree that these don't encroach upon another's comparable rights and freedoms; and social and monetary disparities are just justified when (a) they are sensibly anticipated that would be further bolstering everybody's good fortune, and (b) connected to positions and workplaces open to all. Rawls calls this "justice as fairness" (Rawls 1999). It is likewise usually called 'social justice'.

Christians believes that the fall of man caused by original sin was the reason for social injustice. Keeping in mind the end goal to comprehend the convention of original sin, it is

important to note that this sin was committed by Adam and Eve the first man and woman (Quinn 2010). Sacred text let us know that “So God created man in His own image; in the image of God He created him; male and female He created them.” (NKJV Genesis 1:27). From Adam's ribs, God made his significant other and partner, Eve. Together Adam and Eve, were given the cherishing blessings of through and through freedom, unique equity and unique blessedness. God gave them the organic products, joys and obligations of tending to the Garden of Eden where they lived in agreement with God, each other and God's manifestations. God cautioned Adam from the earliest starting point (NKJV Genesis 2:17). The Garden of Eden contained two unique trees. The first was the taboo tree of learning of good and awful and the second tree was the tree of everlasting life. The Genesis story lets us know that Adam and Eve ignored God's rule and fell into transgression under the enticements of Satan. They openly opposed God by eating from the taboo tree of good and terrible. The Bible shows us that this first sin of man constituted lost trust in man for God and a misuse of the opportunity of humankind. Since man had ignored their maker and enjoyed sin, man at last knew of malevolent and lost his unique equity and sacredness. Man's special and concordant state in the Garden of Evil was torn into pieces and annihilating results followed. Interestingly, passing went into the world and man was bound to encounter a terminal nature. “In the sweat of your face you shall eat bread” (NKJV Genesis 3:19). Ladies got the torments of labor and where set under the domain of man, “I will greatly multiply your sorrow and your conception; In pain you shall bring forth children; Your desire shall be for your husband, And he shall rule over you.” (NKJV Genesis 3:16). Finally, nature betrayed man, “Cursed is the ground for your sake; In toil you shall eat of it All the days of your life” (NKJV Genesis 3:17-18). Like the social contractarians have opined the longing for social justice in our society is the need for sovereignty who will act as a social justice administration. In relation to this Christians believe that man can only attain adequate social justice as require only if they return full sovereignty to the God, rather than man.

### Principles of Social Justice

While considering what social justice involves, numerous scholars will relate it to equality, fairness, legitimacy, need, and response. Nonetheless, these diverse standards, when connected to particular circumstances as a general rule lead to totally unrelated judgments. Besides, a hefty portion of the ideas might be connected in various ways. In the event that social justice is giving individuals their due on the premise of what is reasonable, then what is their due? It might be reasonable that they get the same pay for the same work. However, if Sam works harder than Tobi, is it not fair that he is paid more? Justice as fairness was a phrase used by legal philosopher John Rawls to describe his specific view of justice. Nevertheless, it is clear that the general concept of fairness is closely related to justice. However, it is not always easy to determine what is and is not fair. For example, just procedures when trying a person for alleged crimes are intended to be fair on the accused and give them every opportunity to defend themselves. However, in many cases, these strict procedures can result in damning evidence being rejected as a result of minor or inadvertent oversights by the

prosecution, which in turn may cause guilty parties to be acquitted and set free purely on a legal technicality. Thus, fair procedures could lead to an unfair outcome. Fairness may also be considered in terms of equality. Is it not fair that two people who do essentially the same work are paid the same? Is it not fair that everyone pay the same amount of tax? Is it not fair that the law treats everyone the same? It is a typical perspective that social justice requires that all individuals are dealt with similarly under the steady gaze of the law. At the end of the day, similar to cases ought to be taken care of in the same way without admiration for the gatherings included. Be that as it may, if a legislature or tyrant passes enactment that everybody found shoplifting might have their hands cut off, we would appropriately question that this law is out of line! On the other hand, the legislature could enact that all discovered guiltless of shoplifting will have their left hand cut off. In both these cases, the administration or ruler looks to treat everybody similarly, except the outcome is plainly treacherous. Subsequently, obviously unprejudiced nature or non-separation is insufficient to fulfill the requests of social justice. Additionally, equality at one level regularly prompts inequality at other levels (Schmidtz 2006). In any case, treating individuals similarly will deliver unequal results (Nash 2002). This is on account surprisingly are not intrinsically measure up to in character and capacity. All individuals have diverse scholarly capacity, physical qualities and ethics. The main credit basic to all is that we are God's animals, and in this way we as a whole remain as equivalents in our association with God. Despite the fact that there is surely a profound association amongst equity and equivalent treatment, this association does not imply that equivalent treatment essentially suggests approach offers, as egalitarians argue. Egalitarianism infers that we should grasp certain sorts of unequal treatment keeping in mind the end goal to accomplish a more ideal type of equality. As Schmidtz focuses out, populism is not the same as philanthropy (Schmidtz 2006). Philanthropic people are worried with how individuals admission. Egalitarians, then again, are worried with how diverse individuals admission in respect to one another. Indeed, when Martin Luther King declared his “dream” that his kids would be judged “not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character” he was depicting a standard of equity in view of equal treatment and legitimacy, not a guideline in light of *equal shares*. Now, perceive that living in a general public is not a race. In a race, all contenders begin on an equivalent balance in light of the fact that a race is intended to gauge relative execution. Society, then again, is intended to give a safe and satisfying environment in which to live where there is no subjective predisposition or rejection. Keeping in mind the end goal to carry on with a cheerful and satisfied life, individuals require a decent and secure balance, not as a matter of course an equivalent footing (Schmidtz 2006: 117). It is crucial to comprehend that numerous individuals begin with more on the grounds that their folks furnished them with additional: a positive, stable family environment; acquired riches; and unrivaled instruction. These advantages are the endowments of cherishing guardians. They are not out of line in themselves nor are they the aftereffect of low activities. In this way, the objective ought to be to enhance every individual's prospects, not to even out them (Schmidtz 2006: 118). Although numerous egalitarians recognize that accomplishing monetary equality is outlandish, they trust the

answer lies in the regulation of 'equality of chance.' Egalitarians trust that open doors are not genuinely circulated, and those with more riches and influence have numerous progressively and better open doors. In this way, they need government powers to take control and guarantee that there is a level playing field and that everybody gets the same open doors. In spite of the fact that this may appear a sensible stride to take, it is at least a key disavowal of reality. Influence and riches are by all account not the only considerations that outcome increasingly and better open doors. A man's fundamental insight (for the most part a subordinate of their folks' knowledge), their family life and childhood, their place of living arrangement (nation, state or locale), their local dialect, their religion and/or arrangement of qualities, their enthusiastic and mental cosmetics, their physical appearance (stature, excellence, and physical quality), all contribute essentially to the number and sorts of chances accessible to every individual. No measure of obstruction can change these substances. A savvy delightful individual will dependably have more and preferable open doors over a basic ugly individual. The main different choices are to tear down those with regular preferences by some way or another crushing those points of interest, or by dispatching a system of selective breeding where each individual conceived has the same hereditary qualities. Such alternatives, in any case, are plainly awful, also on a very basic level unjust.<sup>19</sup> From the above, unmistakably equity and equality are not the same. In some cases square with treatment or equivalent conveyance is just, however frequently it is most certainly not. Some contend that the presence of individuals in need in a universe of bounty is generally out of line, and that this warrants special treatment for those with the best needs. In any case, it is not under any condition clear why somebody ought to get X in inclination to others essentially in light of the fact that that individual needs X? Should a medicinal school understudy get the evaluation they require or the evaluation they merit? Would anybody wish to experience surgery if it somehow managed to be directed by somebody who passed therapeutic school as an aftereffect of such evaluating, in light of the fact that the specialist was an individual from some destitute, burdened, or minimized gathering? Moreover, on the off chance that we convey or remunerate as indicated by need, we frequently get more need! This is known as an 'ethical peril.' In a race, compensating speed instigates speed. In like manner, remunerating need actuates more need. As Schmidtz puts it: "It diminishes individuals to do what shows require as opposed to what addresses issue" (Schmidtz 2006: 167). In family circumstances, on the off chance that we give more regard for kids in need, we may in reality create more destitute children. It is likewise indistinct how the standard of need will prompt just results. For instance, ladies merit the vote not on the grounds that they are poor or a hindered minority, but since they are equivalent nationals. As Schmidtz focuses out: [I]f we think about need—on the off chance that we truly mind—then we need social structures to permit and urge individuals to do what works. Social orders that successfully address issues, truly, have dependably been those that enable and reward activities of gainful limits by excellence of which individuals address issues (Schmidtz 2006: 167). Correspondence includes returning great in extent to the great we have gotten, and to make compensation for any damage we have done:

The details differ strikingly from place to place, time to time, and every society is profuse with forms. There are rituals of gift-giving, unspoken undertakings between lovers, patterns of family life, expectations among friends, duties of fair play, obligations of citizenship, contracts—all understood as reciprocal. There is an intricate etiquette for it all, and it is connected (both in theory and practice) to prudence, self-interest and altruism, basic human needs, social welfare, notions of desert and duty, justice, and fairness (Schmidtz 2006: 75).

This guideline echoes the Biblical 'moral principle' of Luke 6:31: "Do to others as you would have them do to you." In any case, as Buchanan noticed, the guideline of correspondence suggests that equity must be acquired by the individuals who are equipped for doing favors. However not everybody can reimburse an obligation or some help—particularly in the event that it was not asked for (Schmidtz 2006: 14-17).

### Christian on Social Justice

Numerous Christians are careful about taking part in dialog about social justice in light of a profound established apprehension of being named "secular". They would prefer not to be connected with "secular" developments, and are uncomfortable digging into issues that go past their social safe places, despite Christians believe that Jesus adores everybody, even to the point of dying on the cross for our transgressions. He made special effort to deliberately help particular gatherings of individuals - the estranged, abused, and those facing maltreatment, and Christians should also act in such ways, that is why they are called: Christ Like (Christians). As discussed earlier Christians believe that the only way true social justice can be achieved is if man return sovereignty to God and believe in his son personified Jesus, not just government of mortal being as social contractarian noted. All through the New Testament Jesus was more intricate than we give him acknowledgment for. He deliberately, intentionally, and energetically tended to certain causes. He fundamentally tended to the different and entangled clashes of the time and smashed business as usual. Jesus wasn't simply lecturing a general salvation message for the world, yet he was additionally tending to particular political, social, and racial issues. He was helping the individuals who were being manhandled, disregarded, and abused. They see verses, for example, Galatians 3:28 that states, "There is neither Jew nor Gentile, neither slave nor free, nor is there male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus" (NIV) to mean that nothing else matters beyond our faith in Christ. Christ while on earth offered sight to the visually impaired, freedom to the hostages, and deliverance to the persecuted. In the event that we take a gander at the activities of Jesus all through the Gospels, He did these things both profoundly and physically. Once in a while Jesus met individuals' physical needs before He tended to their otherworldly needs, and different times He tended to their profound needs first. Christ message is a message of Love. Even the Old Testament offers insight to this. Deut. 14:28-29: "At the end of every third year you shall bring out the tithe of your produce of that year and store it up within your gates." And the Levite, because he has neither portion nor inheritance with you, and the stranger and the fatherless and the widow who are within your gates, may come and eat and be satisfied,

that the LORD your God may bless you in all the work of your hand which you do." Also Deut 15:7-8: "If there is among you a poor man of your brethren, within any of the gates in your land which the LORD your God is giving you, you shall not harden your heart nor shut your hand from your poor brother, "but you shall open your hand wide to him and willingly lend him sufficient for his need, whatever he needs". Unexpectedly, verses like this could bring about issues of race, ethnicity, and society. The bible claimed that God is a universal God, race and ethnicity does not play in His dealings. Paul claimed that greater part of the social issues connected with Jews, Gentiles, slaves, the free, men, and ladies instead of dismissing them. A religious pioneer came to Jesus and said, "What must I do to enter God's Kingdom?" Jesus answered, "What's composed in the Law and how would you comprehend it?" The man said "Love God and Love your neighbor." Jesus said to Him, "Go and do this and you will have life in God's Kingdom". Yet, the man asked, "Jesus, who is my neighbor?" Jesus said, "There was this person going on an outing and he was thrashed, burglarized, and left for dead. A Bishop strolled by and overlooked him. Professors, doctors and politicians strolled by and overlooked him too. A gay person minister strolled by, saw the man, and showed kindness toward him. She gauzed his injuries and got him a lodging, nourishment and offered cash. Which of these was a neighbor to the man who was victimized?" The religious pioneer answered, "The person who showed benevolence toward him." Jesus replied, "Go and do similarly..." Luke 10:25-28. This story above vividly explains the concept of social Justice in Christian thought. The bible and Christ acknowledges that everyone is not equal economically and it is Christian's task to show unconditional love toward them. In Christ words in Matthew 26:11 saying: "For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always. This corresponds to Deuteronomy 15:11: For the poor shall never cease out of the land: therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy, in thy land. Relating that to the society in which we live in, it is apparent that it is our duty to protect and care for the poor. This is not just merely humanitarian service as often seen in our age. The existing world's philosophy today is that of exploiting the poor, through smart moves and engaging them with cheap labour. It is often called "smart business move", it is against biblical Social Justice as seen in Proverb 22 vs. 22 which states: Rob not the poor, because he is poor: neither oppress the afflicted in the gate. Question like: how is this possible, as profits have to be made and some persons will often have to pay the price? The answer to such question is hidden in Christian Moral Imperative "Love God and Love People" and Matthew 7:12 "So whatever you wish that others would do to you, do also to them, for this is the Law and the Prophets. The truth is in reviewing the history of social justice, it is evident that social justice differs from persons and situations. A theory may not adequately solve the whole massive problem of social justice in any given society. But the biblical imperative of "Love your neighbor as yourself" and "do unto others what is expected to be done to you" is very vital. As human being, we are moral agents and most times we tend to put our interest first: our ambivalent human nature. Something must inform our decision, mind and thinking for the need to act as moral agents. It does not acquire principles of redistribution, in which sometimes when social injustice has already taken place and redistribute of such wealth is on the agenda. Once these imperatives could be applied it will help in solving lots of societal problems. The imperative is logical in a way that, if I love my neighbour as myself, I will tend to act to him in a way I consider acceptable to myself. Since I won't want to hurt myself, then I tend to be fair in my dealings. This correspond to Asouzu complimentary reflection philosophy

imperatives which states that "allow the limitation of your being to be the source of your joy" (Asouzu 2007). As human being we must recognize that we have limitations, this limitation can only be put in check by moral code and principles which should always inform our conscience to often act in a way that is morally acceptable. Despite the above Christian thinks this is not easy to abide with these principles if one is not righteous and totally submits his selfish wills to God. Jim Wallis asserts that "righteousness is often synonymous with justice, and the two words are sometimes used interchangeably." (Jim 1994) When social justice advocates talk about the poor, needy and disadvantaged, they are not just referring to those suffering oppression in the hinterlands. They also have in mind those people in prosperous countries who are less prosperous, even though they have no lack of food, shelter, clothing or government and aid agency support. Brian Edgar claims that Biblical justice is "[a] concept biased in favour of the disadvantaged." (Brian) Unfortunately, he does not present any Scriptural support for his claims and this does not apply to all cases. There may be people naturally in the society who are lazy and just want people to often help. The bible does not acknowledge laziness and even been poor should not be a reason for wrongdoing. The Scripture explicitly prohibits showing bias or partiality in matters of justice to anyone, including the poor. For example, Leviticus 19:15 states: "Do not pervert justice; do not show partiality to the poor or favoritism to the great, but judge your neighbor fairly." Showing partiality to the poor is described as a perversion of justice. Exodus 23:3 states that favouritism should not be shown to a poor man even in a lawsuit. There was also no partiality when Moses took a census and God required an offering of half a shekel from everyone over the age of twenty years (Ex 30:14-15). When one does not have to give it is been understood, God itself searches the heart of men and reward those that gives genuinely: both rich and poor. In 1 Peter 1:17, Peter states that God the Father judges each person's work impartially. In Galatians 3:28, Paul makes it clear that in Christ there is no racial, social or sexual discrimination or favouritism. All people stand equal before God. Similarly, in a church setting, James (2:1-9) warns his readers not to show favouritism. Furthermore, Paul instructed Timothy not to do anything out of favouritism in regard to the handling of the conduct and character of church elders (1 Tim 5:21). The concept of merit and deserts features in the Bible on several occasions. When choosing 'overseers' (1 Tim 3:2-7), they must be above reproach, a veteran Christian, married to only one woman, self-controlled, respectable, able to successfully manage their own family, and have a good reputation with others, among other things. Likewise, deacons must be worthy of respect, blameless, and sincere (1 Tim 3:8-12). The Parable of the Talents (Matt 25:14-30) also captures the notions of merit and desert. The men entrusted with five talents and two talents invested the money and doubled it. They were duly rewarded for their good work. The man entrusted with one talent was lazy and fearful and did nothing with it. He was duly punished for his lack of action. The merit principle that good deeds will be rewarded while evil deeds will be punished is further reinforced by Paul in Romans 2:6-11: God 'will give to each person according to what he has done.' To those who by persistence in doing good seek glory, honor and immortality, he will give eternal life. But for those who are self-seeking and who reject the truth and follow evil, there will be wrath and anger. There will be trouble and distress for every human being who does evil: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile; but glory, honor and peace for everyone who does good: first for the Jew, then for the Gentile. For God does not show favoritism. For faithful Christians, various crowns shall be awarded on the day of reckoning. The Crown of Righteousness

awaits all those who look forward to Christ's appearing (2 Tim 4:8). The Crown of Life is awarded to those who love God (James 1:12). The Crown of Glory awaits those who serve as faithful shepherds of God's people (1 Pet 5:4). Indeed, the very fact that, in the end, some people will spend eternity in Heaven while others will spend it in Hell, demonstrates that, although based more on what Christ has done rather than any merit or desert of our own, this 'ultimate' reward or punishment is still awarded according to our own personal choice to accept Christ or reject Him. As noted above, the principle of reciprocity is found in Scripture in the 'Golden Rule' (Luke 6:31): "Do to others as you would have them do to you." In Colossians 3:25, Paul declares that wrong actions will be repaid regardless of who does them: "Anyone who does wrong will be repaid for his wrong, and there is no favoritism." Likewise, Job 20 describes the fate of a wicked man who oppressed the poor. Lastly it should be noted that God asks us to help those in genuine need. The earlier Church showed this. In the Jerusalem church, adherents "held all things in common" (Acts 4:32). This is a most loved verse for the individuals who trust that redistribution is a focal obligation of the congregation. Be that as it may, read in setting, this expression is a case of overstatement. At the point when there was a need, individuals sold their property to meet it. These devotees perceived that their obligation to their neighbors was more imperative than their responsibility for property. Notwithstanding, in the following part, Peter avowed Ananias' and Saphira's entitlement to their property and to the returns of its deal (Acts 5:4). So the Jerusalem church did not truly "hold all things in common," however liberality was supported and rehearsed. Notwithstanding its consistent altruistic giving, the Church additionally provided for help in crises, for example, the starvation in Jerusalem, for which Paul took up accumulations in Asia Minor and Greece (1 Corinthians 16:1-4).

## 2. CONCLUSION

Many scholars and persons don't recognize the diverse implications and subtleties of justice introduced in Scripture. They simply accept that any reference to justice naturally alludes to distributive social equity. Be that as it may, as appeared, this is not the situation, as every body's need may not be the same. Also, Christians who concentrate on promotion for poor people and distressed don't recognize free and liberal giving (which the Bible instructs) and the welfare state subsidized by high tax assessment (which the Bible does not educate). Jesus educates us that social justice is when we "love the Lord our God with all our heart and with all our soul and with our entire mind" and to "love our neighbour as yourself" (NKJV Mark 12:30-31). These instructions are synopses of the Decalogue (Ten Commandments). The initial four instructions identify with adoring God entire heartedly. The staying six identify with adoring our neighbor as ourselves. On the off chance that we cherish our kindred people we will respect our folks, we won't kill or submit infidelity. We won't take from our neighbor, or lie about them. We won't pine for their property. This does not mean that favoritism will be awarded because of the person been poor or rich. Nor does the bible support laziness in the name of allowing the rich takes care of issues. This paper has been able to react to social Justice Issues as it is been advocates today.

## 3. REFERENCES

Asouzu, I. 2007. *Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology*, LITVERLAG GmbH & Co. KG Wien: Berlin.

- Brian Edgar, 2016. "Grace as a Subversive Social Value" Faith and Community".  
<http://www.evangelicalalliance.org.au/Email%20Bulletins/FaithAndCommunity4.htm> Retrieved Oct 26 2016.
- Dodaro, R. 2004. *Christ and the Just Society in the Thought of Augustine..* <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511487668>
- Fraser, N. 1996. Social Justice in the Age of Identity Politics: Redistribution, Recognition, and Participation. *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, (Stanford University (April-May)), 63–7. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2011.05856.x>
- Fussi, A. 2007. Inconsistencies in Glaucon's Account of Justice. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 24(1), 43–69. <http://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-90000107>
- Hemphill, B. 2015. Social Justice as a Moral Imperative. *The Open Journal of Occupational Therapy*, 3(2). doi:10.15453/2168-6408.1150
- Jim, W. 1994. *The Soul of Politics*. New York: The New Press, 193.
- Karasmanis, V. (2006). Soul and body in Plato. *International Congress Series*, 1286, 1–6. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ics.2005.09.061>
- Kevin, R. 2006. "Values, policy and public life" *ABC Radio: Saturday Extra*, November 4, <<http://www.abc.net.au/rn/saturdayextra/stories/2006/1780398.htm>>
- Lutz-Bachmann, M. 2000. The Discovery of a Normative Theory of Justice in Medieval Philosophy: On the Reception and Further Development of Aristotle's Theory of Justice by St. Thomas Aquinas. *Medieval Philosophy and Theology*, 9, 1–14. <http://doi.org/10.1017/S1057060800091015>
- NKJV (1984) *The Bible. The New King James Version*. Nashville: T. Nelson.
- Piper, M. 2005. Doing Justice to Thrasymachus. *Polis: The Journal for Ancient Greek Political Thought*, 22(1), 24–44. <http://doi.org/10.1163/20512996-90000068>
- Quinn, P. L. 2010. Sin and Original Sin. In *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion: Second Edition* (pp. 614–621). <http://doi.org/10.1002/9781444320152.ch72>
- Rawls, J. 1999. *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press. Retrieved from <http://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=kvpby7HtAeOC&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=A+Theory+of+Justice&ots=ti7rv7Bba-&sig=btIO9jsUFUVo0hFNpQbn50PUIGE>
- Ronald, N. 2002. *Social Justice and the Christian Church*. Lima, Ohio: Academic Renewal Press, 36.
- Schmidtz, S. 2006. *Elements of Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 14-15.
- Sim, M. 2010. Rethinking virtue ethics and social justice with Aristotle and Confucius. *Asian Philosophy*, 20(2), 195–213. <http://doi.org/10.1080/09552367.2010.484954>
- Tubbs Jr, J. B. 1996. Paul Ramsey: Agape, "Covenant Fidelity," and Moral Rules. In *Christian Theology and Medical Ethics* (pp. 54–95). Retrieved from [http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-015-8654-2\\_3](http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-015-8654-2_3)
- Wei, X. 2008. From Principle to Context: Marx versus Nozick and Rawls on Distributive Justice. *Rethinking Marxism*, 20(3), 472–486. <http://doi.org/10.1080/08935690802137720>
- Young, I. M. 2006. Responsibility and Global Justice: a Social Connection Model. *Philosophy and Social Policy*, 23(01), 102–130 <http://doi.org/10.1017/S0265052506060043>

\*\*\*\*\*