

Knowledge of God

The Reason For God

Timothy Keller

Relativism and the Amoral

- **Relativism**: a theory that knowledge is relative to the limited nature of the mind and the conditions of knowing
b : a view that ethical truths depend on the individuals and groups holding them
- **Amoral**: a : being neither moral nor immoral; specifically : lying outside the sphere to which moral judgments apply <science as such is completely amoral — W. S. Thompson> b : lacking moral sensibility <infants are amoral>

Free-Floating Morality

- Keller believes young people of our culture have a very finely honed sense of right and wrong, and that many things happening in the world evoke their moral outrage...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. He calls this "Free-Floating Morality"

According to Keller people tend to 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.

Evolutionary Theory of Moral Obligation

This view holds that altruistic people, those who act unselfishly and cooperatively, survived in greater numbers than those who were selfish and cruel. Therefore 'altruistic genes' were passed down to us and the great majority of us feel that unselfish behavior is "right". Moral obligation is thus a product of Evolutionary biology.

Ethical Relativism

Ethical relativism is the theory that holds that morality is relative to the norms of one's culture. That is, whether an action is right or wrong depends on the moral norms of the society in which it is practiced. The same action may be morally right in one society but be morally wrong in another.

Cultural Relativism

Cultural relativism is the idea that a person's beliefs, values, and practices should be understood based on that person's own culture, rather than be judged against the criteria of another. ... Cultural relativism involves specific epistemological and methodological claims. Cultural relativism tends to promote cultural interests and values over human rights.

Human Rights

“Where Do Rights Come From?”, by secular Harvard Law Professor Alan Dershowitz

- From God? If we were all created in God’s image, then every human being would be sacred and inviolable. Dershowitz rejects this because so many people don’t believe in God.
- From nature? No, nature thrives on violence and predation, the survival of the fittest. There is no way to derive the concept of the dignity of every individual from the way things really work in nature
- From us? Many argue it is in the interests of societies to create human rights. But then what happens if a majority decide it is not in their interest to grant human rights? Example _____
 - If human rights are nothing but a majority creation then there is nothing to appeal to when they are legislated out of existence. Their value lies in that they can be used to insist that majorities honor the dignity of minorities and individuals despite their conception of their “greater good”.

On the Violence of Nature

The Argument for God from the Violence of Nature

- Nature is completely ruled by one central principle -- _____
- If violence is totally natural, why would it be wrong for strong human individuals to trample weak ones? _____
 - There is no basis for moral obligation unless we argue that nature is in some part unnatural.
- Use your reasoning: Does the Biblical account of things explain our moral sense any better than a secular view?
 - If the world was made by a God of peace, justice, and love, then that is why we know that violence, oppression, and hate are wrong.
 - If the world is fallen, broken and needs to be redeemed, that explains the violence and disorder we see.
 - If you believe human rights are a reality, then it makes much more sense that God exists than that he does not.
- If a premise (“There is no God”) leads to a conclusion you know isn’t true (“Napalming babies is culturally relative”), then why not change the premise?