



FOUNDATIONS



GOOD AND EVIL

Is there not a standard?

The Modern Secular Problem

Two lines of thought

We live in a world of people that seem to have a universal understanding that some sort of moral standard exists.

Yet we believe that no authority exists outside of ourselves and that we come from an evolutionary process that is only concerned with survival.

Evidence of a common moral standard

The way people fight

“[When people quarrel] They say things like this: ‘How’d you like it if anyone did the same to you?’ – ‘That’s my seat, I was there first’ – ‘Leave him alone, he isn’t doing you any harm’ – ‘Why should you shove in first?’ – ‘Give me a bit of your orange, I gave you a bit of mine’ – ‘Come on, you promised.’ People say things like that every day, educated people as well as uneducated, and children as well as grown-ups. Now what interests me about all these remarks is that the man who makes them is not merely saying that the other man’s behaviour does not happen to please him. He is appealing to some kind of standard of behaviour which he expects the other man to know about. And the other man very seldom replies: ‘To hell with your standard.’ Nearly always he tries to make out that what he has been doing does not really go against the standard, or that if it does there is some special excuse.

Evidence of a common moral standard

The way people fight

He pretends there is some special reason in this particular case why the person who took the seat first should not keep it, or that things were quite different when he was given the bit of orange, or that something has turned up which lets him off keeping his promise. It looks, in fact, very much as if both parties had in mind some kind of Law or Rule of fair play or decent behaviour or morality or whatever you like to call it, about which they really agreed. And they have. If they had not, they might, of course, fight like animals, but they could not quarrel in the human sense of the word. Quarreling means trying to show that the other man is in the wrong. And there would be no sense in trying to do that unless you and he had some sort of agreement as to what Right and Wrong are; just as there would be no sense in saying that a footballer had committed a foul unless there was some agreement about the rules of football."

C.S. Lewis *Mere Christianity*



Moral Feelings

No Justice, No Peace

Does Evolution Give a Foundation for Objective Morality?

Some say no

Furthermore, if there were a morality written up in the sky somewhere but no God to enforce it, I see no good reason why anybody should pay it any heed, no reason why we should obey it. Human beings may, and do, make up their own rules. All existing moralities and all existing laws are human artifacts, products of human society, social conventions.

Morality is not discovered; it is made. - Max Hocutt

What about conflict! Who is to judge?

Does Evolution Give a Foundation for Objective Morality? Some say yes

"Ethics," says Michael Ruse and Edward O. Wilson, "is an illusion fobbed off on us by our genes to get us to cooperate....Ethical codes work because they drive us to go against our selfish day to day impulses in favor of long-term group survival and harmony....Furthermore, the way our biology forces its ends, is by making us think that there is an objective higher code, to which we are all subject."

Does doing the right thing lead to survival?

Humanists Understanding of Morality

If man is the product of evolution, one species among others, in a universe without purpose, then man's option is to live for himself and to discover new areas of significance and achievement.

Paul Kurtz

Still trying to hold moral values

Humanists are not wish to undermine the role of the family, as critics contend. They do advocate basic moral virtues—fairness, kindness, beneficence, justice, and tolerance.

Paul Kurtz

That sounds a lot like what Christians have always said!

Floating Morality

“ A young couple once came to me for some spiritual direction. They “didn’t believe in much of anything” they said. How could they begin to figure out if there even was a God? I asked them to tell me about something they felt was really, really wrong. The woman immediately spoke out against practices that marginalized women. I said I agreed with her fully since I was a Christian who believed God made all human beings, but I was curious why she thought it was wrong. She responded, “Women are human beings and human beings have rights. It is wrong to trample on someone’s rights.” I asked her how she knew that.

Puzzled, she said, “Everyone knows it is wrong to violate the rights of someone.” I said, “Most people in the world don’t ‘know’ that. They don’t have a Western view of human rights. Imagine if someone said to you ‘everyone knows that women are inferior.’ You’d say, ‘That’s not an argument, it’s just an assertion.’ And you’d be right. So let’s start again. If there is no God as you believe and everyone has just evolved from animals, why would it be wrong to trample on someone’s rights?”

Floating Morality

Her husband responded: "Yes, it is true we are just bigger-brained animals, but I'd say animals have rights too. You shouldn't trample on their rights, either." I asked whether he held animals guilty for violating the rights of other animals if the stronger ones ate the weaker ones. "No, I couldn't do that." So he only held human beings guilty if they trampled on the weak? "Yes." Why this double standard, I asked. Why did the couple insist that human beings had to be different from animals, so that they were not allowed to act as was natural to the rest of the animal world. Why did the couple keep insisting that humans had this great, unique individual dignity and worth? Why did they believe in human rights? "I don't know," the woman said, "I guess they are just there, that's all." The conversation was much more congenial than this very compressed account conveys. The young couple laughed at the weakness of some of their responses, which showed me that they were open to exploration and that encouraged me to be more pointed than I would ordinarily have been. However, this conversation reveals how our culture differs from all the others that have gone before. People still have strong moral convictions, but unlike people in other times and places, they don't have any visible basis for why they find some "things to be evil and other things good. It's almost like their moral intuitions are free-floating in midair—far off the ground."

Tim Keller - Reason for God

Man is the standard of Morality

We have to validate happiness and moral concern humbly, not theistically. There are good gods and bad gods and we have to choose among them according to whether they pass our moral tests. - Joseph Fletcher

Which Our? Which man's moral tests?

Cultural Relativism

Who are you to say that that little girl in India is wrong for her sincere beliefs. That statue means something to her? How could be so arrogant?

God says idolatry is wrong, that's how we can say it.

Evidence of a common moral standard

Cultural relativism

“There have been differences between their moralities, but these have never amounted to anything like a total difference. If anyone will take the trouble to compare the moral teaching of, say, the ancient Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindus, Chinese, Greeks and Romans, what will really strike him will be how very like they are to each other and to our own. Some of the evidence for this I have put together in the appendix of another book called *The Abolition of Man*; but for our present purpose I need only ask the reader to think what a totally different morality would mean. Think of a country where people were admired for running away in battle, or where a man felt proud of double-crossing all the people who had been kindest to him. You might just as well try to imagine a country where two and two made five. Men have differed as regards what people you ought to be unselfish to—whether it was only your own family, or your fellow countrymen, or every one. But they have always agreed that you ought not to put yourself first.”

Excerpt From: C.S. Lewis. “*Mere Christianity*.”

Happiness model

Lamont says that as long as man "pursues activities that are healthy, socially useful, and in accordance with reason, pleasure will generally accompany them; and happiness, the supreme good, will be the eventual result.

Whose happiness?

We Have No 'Right' to Happiness

...She meant that he had not only a legal but a moral right to act as she did..."

What does "pursuit of happiness" mean? They did not mean that man was entitled to pursue happiness by any and every means – including, say, murder, rape, robbery, treason, and fraud. No society could be built on such a basis.

A good many of Clare's friends, and especially her female friends, often felt –I've heard them say so—that their own happiness would be perceptibly increased by boxing her ears. I very much doubt if this would have brought her theory of a right to happiness into play.

Utilitarianism

the doctrine that an action is right insofar as it promotes happiness, and that the greatest happiness of the greatest number should be the guiding principle of conduct.

You can't control outcome!

You don't know what makes people happy!

What if you are not in the greatest number?!

Bat Man Dark Knight



Purely Situational?

Humanists...are committed to free thought and to the view that ethical values are relative to human experience and needs. ... ethical judgments to some extent may be grounded in reflective inquiry.

Paul Kurtz

How?

Reason is the tool?

Humanists believe that man's conduct should be based on humanity, insight, and reason. He must face his problems with his own moral and intellectual resources, without looking for supernatural aid...

British Humanist Organization

Man's reason doesn't work that way!

The Truth about Man's Reason

"People generally—and I knew I could not exclude myself—seemed to be much less rational and much more selfish than I had ever guessed, not at all the "nice folk" I had always thought them to be. They did not decide to do things because it would be reasonable and moral to act in that way; but because that course of action suited their self-interest. "Afterward, they would find rational and moral reasons for what they had already determined to do.

Foundation for Morality? NONE

“If there is no ultimate basis for “ought,” then there is no basis for determining right or wrong, which means the Hitlers, Stalins, and Maos of the world are innocent of any wrongdoing.

-Understanding the Times.

John Lennon's "Imagine all the People"

Imagine there's no heaven It's easy if you try
No hell below us Above us, only sky
Imagine all the people Livin' for today Ah

Imagine there's no countries It isn't hard to do
Nothing to kill or die for And no
religion, too

Imagine all the people Livin' life in peace, You

You may say I'm a dreamer But I'm not the only one I hope someday you'll join us
And the world will be as one

Imagine no possessions I wonder if you can
No need for greed or hunger A
brotherhood of man

Imagine all the people Sharing all the world, You

You may say I'm a dreamer But I'm not the only one I hope someday you'll join us
And the world will live as one

Marxists understanding of morality

Logically Marx's inquiry begins precisely where Darwin's inquiry ends. - G.V. Plekhanov

Social Evolution's History

The whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes;... the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, nowadays, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class distinction and class struggles.

Fredriech Engels

The oppressed always become oppressors



Inevitability of Revolution

Evolution prepares for revolution and creates the ground for it; revolution consummates the process of evolution and facilitates its further activity."

Joseph Stalin

Morals are just power plays

In what sense do we reject ethics, reject morality? In the sense given to it by the bourgeoisie, who based ethics on God's commandments. On this point we, of course, say that we do not believe in God, and that we know perfectly well that the clergy, the landowners and the bourgeoisie invoked the name of God so as to further their own interests as exploiters.

Vladmir Lenin

Aren't you doing the same thing!

Group Identity Disqualification

Marxists believe, therefore, that the working class is supremely right in its struggle to defeat fascism [fascism in this context is used to define anyone or anything in opposition to communism], and in its struggles to create the necessary conditions for its own emancipation—so right, in fact, that its actions cannot be judged by the criteria that are the ethical expression of the capitalist class.

Selsam

We don't have to be in a certain class to know something is wrong!

Revolution is Unquestionably Moral

With the rest of my generation I firmly believed that the ends justified the means. Our great goal was the universal triumph of Communism, and for the sake of that goal everything was permissible—to lie, to steal, to destroy hundreds of thousands and even millions of people, all those who were hindering our work or could hinder it, everyone who stood in the way. And to hesitate or doubt about all this was to give in to “intellectual squeamishness” and “stupid liberalism” the attribute of people who “could not see the forest for the trees.”

Lev Kopelev

As with Evolution...so with Society

According to the Marxists, those who criticize the elimination of the bourgeoisie for social evolutionary reasons fail to remember the cost in death and suffering caused by biological evolution. Nature accumulates the good and disposes of the bad. The fit must survive both biologically and socially. The unfit, along with their social institutions, must perish.

UT



The role of Education

Critical Race Theory in Schools





The Foundation of Morality

Does a Foundation for Morality exist in Christianity?

ABSOLUTELY

**Psalm 11:7 For the LORD is righteous,
He loves righteousness...**

Psalm 45:7 You love righteousness and hate wickedness...

The Nature of God

Lev. 11:45 For I am the LORD who brings you up out of the land of Egypt, to be your God. You shall therefore be holy, for I am holy.

Genesis 1:31 Then God saw everything that He had made, and indeed it was very good. So the evening and the morning were the sixth day.

The freedom that birthed morality in man

Genesis 2:16a And the LORD God commanded the man, saying...

Genesis 2:16b "Of every tree of the garden you may freely eat; but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil you shall not eat, for in the day that you eat of it you shall surely die."



One way we were not made in God's Image

Genesis 3:22 Then the LORD God said, "Behold, the man has become like one of Us, to know good and evil.

This is the foundation of our understanding of both a moral standard, and our denial of such a standard.

Both knowing the standard and denying the standard

“Supposing you hear a cry for help from a man in danger. You will probably feel two desires—one a desire to give help...the other a desire to keep out of danger.... But you will find inside you, in addition to these two impulses, a third thing which tells you that you ought to follow the impulse to help, and suppress the impulse to run away. Now this thing that judges between two instincts, that decides which should be encouraged, cannot itself be either of them. You might as well say that the sheet of music which tells you, at a given moment, to play one note on the piano and not another, is itself one of the notes on the keyboard. The Moral Law tells us the tune we have to play: our instincts are merely the keys.”

Excerpt From: C.S. Lewis. “Mere Christianity.”

Conclusion

The moral Law...this Rule of Right and Wrong, or the Law of Human Nature, or whatever you call it, must somehow or other be a real thing—a thing that is really there, not made up by ourselves. And yet it is not a fact in the ordinary sense, in the same way as our actual behavior is a fact. It begins to look as if we shall have to admit that there is more than one skin for reality; that, in this particular case, there is something above and beyond the ordinary facts of men's behaviour, and yet quite definitely real—a real law, which none of us made, but which we find pressing on us.

CS. Lewis



1 John 3:4

Whoever commits sin also commits lawlessness,
and sin is lawlessness



1 John 3:5

And you know that He was manifested to take
away our sins.

Romans 7:21-25

I find then a law, that evil is present with me, the one who wills to do good. For I delight in the law of God according to the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members.

○ wretched man that I am! Who will deliver me from this body of death? I thank God—through Jesus Christ our Lord!

Galatians 3:21-25

Is the law then against the promises of God? Certainly not! For if there had been a law given which could have given life, truly righteousness would have been by the law. But the Scripture has confined all under sin, that the promise by faith in Jesus Christ might be given to those who believe. But before faith came, we were kept under guard by the law, kept for the faith which would afterward be revealed. Therefore the law was our tutor to bring us to Christ, that we might be justified by faith. But after faith has come, we are no longer under a tutor.