I. FIRST CLASS MEETING SCHEDULE:

A. 1st hour:
   1. Get acquainted
   2. Syllabus
   3. What do you hope to get out of this class (discussion);

B. 2nd – 4th hours:
   1. Lecture 1: Ethics in a Post-Modern World, Rae/Wong, Part 1, 17-83
   2. Readings/Homework Assignments: “The Law of Human Nature” (Lewis) and “The Moral Animal” (Wright) (for discussion in meeting 2).

II. INTRODUCTION: PAST INTEREST IN ETHICS.

A. Past Interest in Ethics.
   1. Up until the end of the nineteenth century, the most important class taught on a college campus was moral philosophy (or ethics).
   2. It was taken in the senior year and taught by the college president himself. Of course, this practice dropped off with time.

B. Renewed Interest in Ethics.
   1. Today, there is a remarkable explosion of interest in ethics:
      a. A recent survey indicates the US offers more than 11,000 courses in applied ethics (business ethics, medical ethics, political ethics).
      b. In addition, there are numerous books on the topic.
      c. Enron, WorldCom, Martha Stewart, Bernie Madoff, Home Mortgage Meltdown, GMC-Chrysler Bailout, etc., crises indicate that business ethics need revamping.
   2. One might gather that this renewed interest in ethics is a good thing.
      a. But as Os Guiness says, "preoccupation with" ethics "is often a sign of illness, not vitality."
b. In other words, if we were ethical people, we would not need to talk so much about it.

C. **Prevention vs. Principled Ethics.**

1. If you will note, the interest in ethics is more in "prevention ethics" than "principled ethics."

2. In other words, ethics consists more of not getting caught or not getting sued than in doing what is right or being a good person.

D. **Social vs. Personal Ethics.**

1. Ethics courses are usually taught from a social perspective rather than a personal one.

2. For instance, the emphasis falls on such things as "what are the ethical expectations for a corporation, hospital, or university?" rather than "what is the responsibility of the individual?"

3. In my estimation, the social perspective is doomed from the start, primarily due to the difficulty inherent in changing the morality of a entire corporation.

4. It can be done, but there are several major obstacles.

   a. David Wells—lowest common denominator

   b. Actually, the danger is that the corporation will change you, bringing home the ethics of the business sphere to the personal.

   c. What we end up with is not business ethics, but business manners.

E. **Personality vs. Character Ethics.**

1. Steven Covey is the author of *The Seven Habits of Highly Effective People.*

   a. He began to do research into success literature published in the United States since 1776.
b. He recognized a pattern in the content of the literature.
   
   (1) The works of the last 50 years were superficial, filled with techniques and quick fixes for situations.
   
   (2) The works of the first 150 years were based on a character ethic as the foundation of success: integrity, humility, fidelity, temperance, courage, justice, patience, and the Golden Rule.
   
   (3) Only after WWI did the focus shift to a Personality Ethic as the foundation of success: public image, positive mental attitudes (Japanese vs. American students), skills and techniques to lubricate the process of human interaction.
   
   (4) Some of these techniques were manipulative and deceptive focusing on how to get people to like you, faking interest in them in order to get what you want, using the "power look" to intimidate people.
   
2. The personality ethic ultimately fails because it has no depth.
   
   a. It also is a quick fix: cram for success, like cramming for grades.
   
   b. Suppose a farmer forgot to plant in the spring and did it all in the fall.
   
   c. What kind of harvest would he have? The biblical principle is true: you reap what you sow.
   
   d. Eventually, the faker is exposed and the manipulator gets manipulated.
   
F. Human Nature and Evil.

1. Ethics are usually taught with a shallow view of human nature and a shallow view of evil within our society.

2. When we think of ethics, how often do we find hypocrisy, selfishness, cruelty addressed?
3. We rarely probe the place of envy in politics, greed in the economy, lust in the fashion industry, and violence in entertainment.
   a. A little greed, deception, lust, and anger never hurt anyone, until greed and deception causes a Martha Stewart, Enron
   b. Or a Worldcom executive decided "to take the money and run,"
   c. Or until lust causes someone to abduct, rape, and kill a little girl
   d. Or anger/hatred causes men to fly airplanes into skyscrapers in order to kill unsuspecting citizens.

G. **University and Moral Knowledge.** The preoccupation with ethics in the university has destroyed the possibility of all moral knowledge. The past 200 years has done us in. Truth is dead and, consequently the possibility of ethics, business or otherwise, is dead.

1. **Pre-Modernism.**
   a. Pre-modern cultures typically have little or no cultural or religious diversity, little social change, and are pre-scientific (Australian aborigines; tribes in Amazon). Medieval Europe, prior to the Renaissance, furnish examples.
   b. One religion (Christian, with some Jews and Muslims), fairly stable as a culture, based on Greek and Christian thought.
   c. Even though the Middle Ages had their problems, by and large, this was a very religious and moral period.
   d. The Renaissance shook this, by seeking non-Christian ways of thinking about the world.
   e. The Reformation shattered the authority of Roman Catholicism (wars began between Catholics and Reformers).

2. **Modernism (Enlightenment).**
   a. The Enlightenment challenged Christianity itself (divine revelation; revealed morality).
b. Rational thought was promoted instead of superstition; Christianity affected—regarded as superstition

c. Rational thought could discover objective truth.

d. God was not rejected by all (Deism).

3. **Postmodernism:** The transition to postmodernism came with Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900).

a. He thought the Enlightenment had removed God, but retained Christian moral principles.

b. He promoted "deicide" (killing of God) but noted the results would be: no meaning, no truth.

c. **Existentialism (making a meaning for self in the midst of chaos) vs. Postmodernism:**

   (1) Edward O. Wilson, founder of sociobiology, contrasts the two movements:

   (2) "Enlightenment thinkers believe we can know everything, and radical postmodernists believe we can know nothing."

d. **Modernism vs. Postmodernism:** Os Guinness illustrates the Modern and Postmodern views with the story of the three umpires.

   (1) The first empire says, "I call it like it is" (modernism).

   (2) The second one says, "I call it like I see it" (mild postmodernism).

   (3) The third said, "It ain't nothing till I call it" (radical postmodernism).

e. **Postmodernism Produces Relativism:**

   (1) What about reparations? Should society today be held accountable for what society did back then?
(2) What about 9/11? Is society at fault?

(3) The scripture designates such ideas as: "In those days Israel had no king; every man did what was right in his own eyes" (Judges 21:25).

H. **Course perspectives:**

1. The perspective of this course is that we must make the individual businessman and businesswoman better people.

2. This course is not going to focus only on questions like "What sort of action I should take?" but on "What sort of person should I be?"

3. I hope this course will improve your business ethics; but that is impossible if you do not become a better person.

4. Dr. Robert Cole of Harvard university asked a young woman why she was dropping out of school. She replied, "I've been taking all these philosophy courses, and we talk about what's true, what's important, what's good. Well, how do you teach people to be good? What's the point of knowing good if you don’t keep trying to become a good person?"

5. Our ethical presuppositions, world view, etc., are the foundation of our ethical practices—"Out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks" (Matt 12:34; Lk 6:45), and “As a man thinks in his heart so is he" (Prov 23:7).

III. **TWO OPTIONS.** For ethical philosophers, there are basically two opinions concerning the origin of ethics: (1) they are placed within the human mind, i.e., in nature perceived by the mind (usually given by God); (2) or they are the product of evolution and society. In this course, we will give attention to both of these theories. The readings posted on my web page for your reading by session 2 are significant. Lewis discusses morality and natural law from the philosophical perspective of their being inherent in human kind. Wright, in “The Moral Animal,” argues for the evolutionary model. I want you to read both in preparation for our discussing and exam in session two. Today we will explore the sociological implications of ethics in a postmodern world, natural law, general and special revelation.

A. **Natural Law:**
1. **Definitions.** Christian theologians usually distinguish between two types of ethical revelation:

   a. **Special Revelation:** This term describes God’s revelation given in Scripture (special revelation). It may consist of information about God's nature and very specific moral precepts given to Jews and Christians.

   b. **General Revelation:** This term refers to God’s revelation given outside of Scripture (general revelation). It is called "general" because of its content (it yields knowledge of a general sort of information about God and morality) and its audience (all humankind). General revelation is commonly referred to as "natural law."

2. **Mediate or Immediate?** The Mode of God’s revelation:

   a. **Mediate (via a “medium”):** Indirect knowledge about God, gleaned from contemplation of the natural world by reasoning from evidence (by a medium).

   b. **Immediate (“immediate,” without a medium; cf. “immoral,” i.e., “without morals”):** Direct, *a priori* knowledge impressed by God upon human consciousness. Some of these ethical demands are revealed through nature and some are implanted in the mind by the creator. Thus, they exist prior to and independent of God’s command in special revelation. Before there was the law of Moses, there was natural law.

B. **Biblical Basis for Natural Law:** Natural law is also attested in Scripture (general revelation).

   1. **Romans 1-2:** Perhaps the clearest statement of this is in Romans 1:1-16, where Paul asserts that all people should be capable of discerning certain facts from nature: God exists, not to worship creation, that such ethical norms as homosexuality are wrong. Both Jews and non-Jews (Gentiles) are affected.

      a. **Eternal power and deity (1:20):** *For since the creation of the world God's invisible qualities--his eternal power and divine
nature-- have been clearly seen, being understood from what has been made, so that men are without excuse.

b. **Mankind is "without excuse" (1:20):** If someone says, "If only I had known," the answer comes ringing back, "There is sufficient evidence."

c. **Morality (1:32):** Although they know God's righteous decree that those who do such things deserve death, they not only continue to do these very things but also approve of those who practice them.

d. **Idea of conscience (2:14-15):** 14 (Indeed, when Gentiles, who do not have the law, do by nature things required by the law, they are a law for themselves, even though they do not have the law, 15 since they show that the requirements of the law are written on their hearts, their consciences also bearing witness, and their thoughts now accusing, now even defending them.)

2. **Oracles to the Nations:** Isaiah 13-27; Jeremiah 46-51; Ezekel 25-32; Amos 1-2 condemn pagan neighbors who did not have the law for many of the things the Israelites, who had the law, were condemned for (injustice, violence, oppression of the poor, genocide). We can conclude that these nations were somehow aware of their crimes; otherwise God could not be just in holding them accountable for their crimes.

C. **Concept of Wisdom:** The idea of wisdom in the OT opens the door for a more general sense of natural law. The wisdom literature suggests two sources of wisdom: natural and revealed.

1. **Fixed Order:** A fixed order governs the natural physical world (Psa 19; Prov 8:22-31; Jer 31:35-36; 33:20-21, 25-26):

a. This is the law of nature (physics, astronomy, chemistry, biology). *Psalm 19* speaks of creation, while *Proverbs 8:22-31* deal with the "Fixed order" of creation.

b. The Jeremiah passages indicate that the commands of God are cut into the universe.

c. "Fixed order" also means law (Lev. 18:4).
d. Thus, wisdom is inscribed and can be discovered by reason. Wisdom in creation (Prov. 8) is prior to special revelation.

2. **Nature:** Moral conclusions drawn from observation: diligence and laziness (ant; Prov. 6:6-11); and same from (lazy man; Prov. 24:30-34).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ultimate Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Revelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immediate Source</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scripture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Conscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Interpreter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wise Sage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Basis of Authority</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Thus says the Lord&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **Limits of Natural Law:** You may be saying to yourself: "you can't base an argument for the reality of general revelation on special revelation." And you would be partially correct. There are some indicators from the world around us and in human nature, the place where the Bible says we should find natural law, that suggest the reality of general revelation. Is it plausible to believe in the existence of God and consequently a moral order?

IV. **BASIS IN NATURE FOR NATURAL LAW: ETHICAL ANGLES:** Is it plausible to believe that certain ethical principles are implanted in the human mind and nature? It is one thing to assert it based on the Bible, but it is another to give reasons for accepting it apart from Scripture. We will now explore ethics from that very angle.

A. **Limitations of the Scholastic Proofs for God’s Existence:**

1. These proofs for God’s existence have been refuted by thinkers at various times.

2. Despite this history, the arguments continue to resurface and continue to be refined.

3. None of the arguments listed below alone can stand alone, nor they bring one to the God of the Bible or the ethical system found in the Bible (only revelation can accomplish that).

4. In fact, Thomas Aquinus, one of the major formulators of some of these arguments never called them "proofs."
a. He believed in God because of his revelation.

b. His assumption was that his readers would share his faith, not that he would have to prove it to them (McGrath, *Christian Theology*, 157-8)

B. **Abiding Value of the Proofs:**

1. However, taken collectively, these arguments can serve as a stepping stone to faith.

2. As Nash points out, we should "remember that arguments can be good arguments even when they are not coercive, even when their premises fall short of being the sorts of claims that every reasonable man or woman accepts" (*Faith and Reason*, 158).

V. **COSMOLOGICAL ARGUMENT (ARGUMENT FROM CREATION).**

A. **Explanation of Nomenclature:** The word *cosmological* comes from the Greek words *kosmos* (world) and *logos* (reason).

B. **Basic Statement of the Argument:**

1. Since the universe exists, the universe must have been caused by something beyond itself.

2. This "something" is variously referred to as the First Cause, the Prime Mover, the Necessary Being, or the Sufficient Reason.

3. Two forms of this argument exist:

   a. **The Universe was Caused at the Beginning:**

      (1) The universe had a beginning and that beginning was caused by something beyond the universe.

      (2) Stated negatively, "out of nothing, nothing comes" (*ex nihilo nihil fit*).

   4. **The Universe Needs a Cause for it’s Continuing Existence.**
a. The universe continues to exist.
b. Thus, the universe needs a conserving cause.

C. **Weaknesses of the Cosmological Argument.**

1. **Ambiguity of "First Cause."**

   a. **Temporal First Cause.**

      (1) **Definition.** If God is viewed as the *temporal* "First Cause," this means he is the initiator of a series of causes and effects that brought the world into existence. An example of this would be a chain of thousands of dominoes. Each one knocks down the next. Yet, one domino was the first to be tipped over by a First Cause.

      (2) **Problems.** The existence of a "First Cause" does not necessarily lead us to the God of the Bible.

         (a) **Eternal Nature of First Cause.** The existence of a "First Cause" does not necessarily lead us to the conclusion that the "First Cause" is eternal. Imagine a domino chain so long that it takes 100 years for it to fall. The human first cause will most likely be dead by the time the last domino falls, despite the fact that he was the one who put the fall in motion. Furthermore, since the world is finite, the "First Cause" may be finite as well (e.g. he would have created an infinite universe if he were infinite).

         (b) **A Single First Cause.** There is nothing to prevent the existence of "First Causes" (plural). The biblical claim is that God is one, but this argument does not prove that only one being or element began the chain of cause and effect. The universe could have been caused by several gods or other causes coming into conjunction.

         (c) **Infinite Chain of Cause and Effect.** This argument is not able to prove that an infinite chain of cause and effect is impossible. Even Thomas Aquinas
admitted that an infinite series of causes and effects was impossible to disprove (Nash, 126)

2. **Logical "First Cause."

   a. **Definition.** If God is viewed as the logical "First Cause," this means he is the ultimate or most important being. For instance, the wife of the president is the first lady (importance), but Eve is also the first lady (temporal). Returning to the example of the dominoes, the logical "First Cause" would not be the thing that started the dominoes falling, but the thing that sustained the environment in which the dominoes could fall. The logical "First Cause" allowed for the equal spacing of the dominoes, the level surface on which they stand, the existence of gravity that allows for their fall, and even the existence of the dominoes at all. In short, the logical "First Cause" is the necessary condition for such a world.

      (1) **God as Necessary Condition.** God is the necessary condition in two ways:

      (2) **The Necessary Condition for Existence of World.** If God had not created the world, the world would not have existed.

      (3) **The Necessary Condition for Sustaining World.** If God withdrew his sustaining power, the world would cease to exist.

   b. **Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR):**

      (1) Many human beings seek an explanation for the existence of anything, a reason that it exists rather than it does not exist.

      (2) One has no need to explain why something does not exist, but does ponder why something does exist.

      (3) With an atom, four sufficient causes are possible for its existence:
(a) It is an illusion
(b) It is self-created
(c) It is self-existent
(d) It was created by something self-existent (*Classical Apologetics*, 115).

(4) If illusion, what is the cause of the illusion?

(a) Is it self-created, self-existent, or created by something else?

(b) If self-created, then it is an effect (it exercised power upon itself in order to come into existence; it must be before it is).

(c) Of course, chance creation is mathematically possible for it must only happen once and hit the cosmic jackpot (given eternity this is not out of the question).

c. *The Notion of Contingent Being:*

(1) A contingent being is dependant on something else for its existence.

(2) The existence of a non-contingent being is a possibility.

(3) However, so far, nothing has been found except contingent things and beings in our universe.

(4) Volcanoes did not always exist and might cease to exist.

(5) Human beings are contingent, for they came into existence through their parents and are reliant upon water, food, oxygen, and the right temperature.

d. *Combining PSR and Contingent Being:*

(1) Imagine a circle in which the entire universe is enclosed with every contingent being enclosed as well.
(2) Is the whole universe contingent? What then sustains it? (i.e. on whom or what does it rely?). What is its sufficient cause? (i.e. why does it exist?).

(3) In such a case, the world would rely upon a non-contingent being and would exist because of that being.

3. **Advantages Over the Temporal First Cause:**

   a. **No Need to Disprove Infinite Chain of Cause and Effect:**

      (1) A *logical* "First Cause" would be necessary even if an infinite chain of causes and effects did exist.

      (2) For them to exist, a *logical* "First Cause" would have been necessary to provide a proper environment.

   b. **Continued Existence of the "First Cause":**

      (1) The *logical* "First Cause" was necessary not only for the creation of the universe, but also for its continued existence.

      (2) If this "First Cause" had ceased to exist, then the universe would have ceased to exist.

4. **Problems with a “First Cause.”**

   a. **Eternal Nature:**

      (1) This argument attempts to demonstrate the eternity of the "First Cause."

      (2) Yet, other possibilities exist:

         (a) The "First Cause" may have a long life span by human standards, yet not be immortal;

         (b) The "First Cause" may have created a sustaining device to take the place of himself (thus his eternal existence is not verifiable).
b. A Single "First Cause." Why not more than one "First Cause"?

c. The Fallacy of Composition:

(1) The fallacy of composition states that if the parts of a whole have a certain quality, then the whole must also have the same quality.

(2) This is not always true.

(a) A football team may have several excellent individual players, but they may not make an excellent team.

(b) Individual drink machines in the cafeteria have tasty drinks, but if milk, coke, and orange juice are mixed they are not tasty (at least to me).

(c) On the other hand, reasoning from parts to the whole is not always wrong (excellent players sometimes make an excellent team).

D. General Issues.

1. Morality of the "First Cause." Does the "First Cause" have to be moral?

2. Perfection of the "First Cause." Does the "First Cause" have to be perfect?

3. Is God Uncaused? If all effects must have an antecedent cause, God himself must have had a cause. Of course, God is usually defined in such a way that he is not an effect, but only a cause.

E. Conclusions. The cosmological argument falls short of being able to arrive at the God of the Bible. Revelation is needed.

VI. THE TELEOLOGICAL ARGUMENT (ARGUMENT FROM DESIGN).

A. Explanation of Nomenclature. The word teleological comes from the Greek words telos (purpose) and logos (reason).
**B. Basic Statement of the Argument:**

1. The universe has a purpose or design, therefore there must have been an intelligent designer.

2. For instance, William Paley (1743-1805) argued that if one found a watch in an empty field, one would deduce that it had been built by an intelligent watchmaker.

3. The more complex the works within the watch, the more intelligent the designer would have been.

4. When one looks to creation, one finds there evidence for complex design from the subatomic level to the cosmic level.

5. For instance, DNA contains an enormous amount of information in a tiny strand.

6. The number of steps involved in successful blood clotting is mind-boggling.

**C. Weaknesses of the Teleological Argument:**

1. *Reliance Upon Analogy.*

   a. *Invalidity of Arguments from Analogy:*

      (1) No argument from analogy can ever provide conclusive proof (Nash, *Faith and Reason*, 136).

      (2) Although two things may be alike in some respects, it does not follow that they are alike in other respects.

         (a) For instance, when one compares the concept of the trinity to three forms of water (an ice cube in a frying pan: ice, liquid, and steam), the analogy falters in that this does not describe a state of being.

         (b) Initially ice alone existed and in the end only vapor will exist.
(3) So much for the perfect trinitarian model.

(4) By definition, an analogy must break down at some point (it is only “like” something else).

(5) The analogy of a watch (with implied designer) may not be exactly like the universe.

(6) The universe is not like a machine in some ways and, consequently, may not require a designer.

b. Other Analogies are Possible:

(1) The argument for design employing the watch in a field is an analogy.

(2) It assumes that the listener will accept the idea that a machine (the watch) is like the universe.

(3) Since machines require a maker, the universe also requires a maker.

(4) But, what if another sort of analogy is employed?

(a) Suppose one argued that the universe were like a living organism such as a plant or a human being.

(b) Plants and animals are not built like a machine, but develop over a period of time in an orderly fashion without any visible designer.

2. Alternative Hypotheses.

a. Natural Selection:

(1) Darwin proposed a hypothesis that, for many scientists, has tremendous explanatory power in accounting for design in nature without the need of an intelligent creator.
(2) This hypothesis was called “natural selection” William Rowe writes:

Since the development of the theory of evolution, the Teleological Argument has lost some of its persuasive force, for we now possess a fairly well-developed naturalistic hypothesis that makes no mention of intelligent design. Briefly put, the Darwinian theory of natural selection purports to explain why nature contains so many organisms whose various parts are so well-fitted to their survival. According to this theory, animals and plants undergo variations or changes that are inherited by their descendants. Some variations provide organisms with an advantage over the rest of the population in the constant struggle for life. Since plants and animals produce more offspring than the environment will support, those in which favorable variations occur tend to survive in greater numbers than those in which unfavorable variations occur. Thus, it happens that over great periods of time there slowly emerge large populations of highly developed organisms whose parts are so peculiarly fitted to their survival (William Rowe, *Philosophy of Religion*, 54; taken from Nash, *Faith and Reason*, 137-8).

(3) **Validity of Evolution.** The proponents of evolution make many leaps of faith themselves since their theory has many gaps.

(4) **Evolution and Teleology:**

(a) Even though I am not an evolutionist, I must note that evolution and theism are not viewed as incompatible for many scientists and theologians.

(b) Rather, they view evolution as the vehicle by which God created and sustains life — theistic evolution.

b. **Lack of Certain Knowledge about Whole Universe:**

(1) The universe may appear to have design in the sector in which we live.
(2) However, how do we know that the remainder of the universe exhibits similar characteristics.

(3) A student may appear in the classroom with immaculate appearance and a well-kept notebook, but may have a dorm room that looks like a tornado hit it.

(4) Likewise, one portion of the universe may seem to be orderly, whereas other parts of it may be chaotic.

3. **Evidence for Lack of Design:**

   a. The teleological argument assumes that evidence for design is a sure sign of an intelligent creator.

   b. Would evidence for lack of design be a sign indicating no creator, or a less-than perfect creator?

(1) Sometimes scientific laws are not infallible (Bray, *The Doctrine of God*, 71).

(2) This line of argumentation will take us into the problem of evil and suffering, but still constitutes a formidable argument against a designer.

(3) One could end up defending a less-than-biblical view of God based on such an argument unless a good response is found.

(4) Possible explanations of disorder might be accounted for by the Fall (Gen. 3:17; Rom. 8:20-22; Rev. 22:3) or by an orderliness only apparent to God himself.

VII. **THE AESTHETIC ARGUMENT (ARGUMENT FROM VALUE OR BEAUTY).**

A. **Explanation of the Nomenclature:**

1. The word "aesthetic" derives from several words: the German *aesthetisch*, from New Latin *aestheticus*, from Greek *aisthētikos*, "of sense perception," from *aisthanesthai*, "to perceive."
2. "Aesthetic" may be defined as "of, relating to, or dealing with the beautiful; artistic, "a work of pleasing value"; "delightful in appearance"

B. Basic Statement of the Argument:

1. This argument states that quality or value serve as a proof for God’s existence.

2. “Value” is not used in a moral sense here, but in the sense of “worth.”

3. For instance, the decision to value gold over silver is not a moral one, but an aesthetic one.

4. Beauty is not always in the mind of the beholder.

5. When it comes to art or music, the classics are those that adhere to the unwritten, yet rather strict, canons of aesthetics (symmetry, proportion, harmony).

6. In written or oral form, what makes a good sermon, speech, or book?

7. Even considering the beauty in human beings, certain characteristics are more attractive, as a rule, than others.

8. What is the source of aesthetic values?

9. Christians claim they are a part of the created order put there by God for the purpose of reflecting on his glory.

C. Weaknesses of the Argument:

1. Multiple Systems of Value.
   
a. World literature is full of examples of people choosing false value systems.

b. Yet, in order to argue that there are false value systems, one must imply that there are true ones.

2. Ugliness in God’s Plan:
If one argues that beauty proves God’s existence, how do we account for ugliness in God’s plan?

For example, “Why did God create roaches?”

God often runs counter to the standards of human value: Christ (Isa. 53:2), apostles (1 Cor. 4:9-13), Christians (1 Cor. 1:26-29), and preaching the gospel (1 Cor. 1:17-18), are a few examples.

Beauty plays a part, but we must give ugly its due; roaches, and “Dirty Jobs,” are a part of life.

Although certain laws of value exist, there may be several ways of accounting for them.

In connection with value in beauty, evolutionist would argue the humans came to hunt a mate, seeking peculiar characteristics:

1. Female — fertility (large breasts and hips)

VIII. THE AXIOLOGICAL ARGUMENT (ARGUMENT FROM MORAL LAW).

A. Explanation of the Nomenclature:

1. The adjective "axiological" derives from "axiology," which derives from the Greek axios plus the international, scientific vocabulary logy.

2. "Axiology" involves the study of the nature, types, and criteria of values and of value judgments especially in ethics.

B. Basic Statement of the Argument:

1. Humans are conscious of an objective moral law, thus implying a moral lawgiver who implanted knowledge of this law.

2. This argument gained prominence due to the writings of Immanuel Kant.
3. He did not use this as an argument for the existence of God, but as a necessary postulate for moral living (Geisler, *When Skeptics Ask*, 22).

4. Later writers did employ this argument to prove the existence of God.

5. Advocates hold that moral law exists, since people of all times and cultures regard the same sorts of behaviors as wrong (rape, adultery, incest, murder, theft, lying; Geisler, *When Skeptics Ask*, 23; Rae and Wong, pg. 130-131).

6. There is a point at which most people would agree that certain acts were wrong (e.g. the Holocaust or 9/11).

7. Moral law does not describe how things “are” in the world, but how they “ought to be.” Thus, these are laws from beyond the realm of nature.

C. Weaknesses of the Argument:

1. Ambiguity:
   a. Although most people would admit that right and wrong exist in some sense, defining the finer points of it are more difficult.
   
   b. The similar ethical beliefs of Europeans and Americans seem to confirm this notion.
   
   c. However, Europe and America have shared the ethics of the Bible and classical writers for centuries.
   
   d. Compare the ethics of the West with those of the Middle and Far East.
   
   e. People do not believe the same way about right and wrong on all matters.

2. Changing Views in the Bible:
   a. Is divorce wrong according to the Bible? Moses allowed divorce (Deut. 24:1-4), but Jesus forbade it except in cases of sexual sin (Matt. 19:8-9).
b. If the moral law was ingrained in the human psyche by God from birth, how does this moral law adjust to changes in legislation?

3. **Is God the Necessary Postulate for Living Ethically?**
   
a. Atheists claim that one does not have to postulate a God in order for one to live ethically.

b. Plato argued for an ethical norm, while at the same time rejecting the Greek gods.

c. In Greco-roman philosophy, religion did not have to play a part.

d. However, one must admit that the fear of divine punishment or reward does reinforce good ethical behavior.

**IX. CONCLUSIONS** The cumulative picture is that some being began the universe, designed the universe, was a moral being, and was a being interested in beauty.

A. **The Moral Argument:**

1. **Real Moral Obligation is a Fact:**
   
a. Not subjective, but fact.

b. Why do adulterers "slip around"? There must be shame and guilt (even in a culture like ours that conditions us to commit adultery).

2. **Either the Atheistic view of reality is correct or the “religious” one:**
   These are the two choices.

3. **But, the Atheistic view of reality is incompatible with there being moral obligation:**
   
a. The atheistic view holds that we are the chance production of matter.

b. Matter is blind to morality, thus there can be no basis for a real right and wrong in this system.
Therefore, the religious view is correct. Moral obligation is grounded in the creator.

B. **Subjectivist:**

1. Many believe they are consistent subjectivists.

2. But, at some point they will make an ethical judgment and give up their position.

3. Most frequently, this is when they feel they have been done wrong (objective values). Look for this in the Lewis handout.

C. **General.** This view does not necessarily bring you to the God of the Bible, but to a general theistic position.

X. **STUDY QUESTIONS.**

A. **Lewis:**

1. **Law of Human Nature.**
   a. What sort of everyday argument does Lewis make for the existence of natural law (i.e. a standard of right and wrong)?
   b. How does Lewis respond to the claim that the law of nature is not uniform, for it depends on the beliefs of different cultures at different times?

2. How does he deal with those who claim there is no right or wrong?

3. What two points are made at the end of section one? Do you agree with them?

4. **Some Objections**
   a. What problems does Lewis find with herd instinct? What makes you choose one instinct (to help the herd) over another (self-preservation)? What tells you which to choose? If it is a matter of nature, why is the stronger impulse sometimes set aside?
b. What problems does he find with the proposal that it is social convention? How can a stronger impulse be set aside?

5. **The Reality of the Law**: What does Lewis mean when he says the Law of Human Nature "tells you what human beings ought to do and do not?"

6. **What Lies Behind the Law?**
   a. What are the two possibilities for what is behind the law?
   b. According to Lewis, what is the role of science? What are its limitations?
   c. What is the Life-Force philosophy and what are the problems with it?

7. **We Have Cause to be Uneasy.**
   a. Why is it fallacious to view religion as setting the clock back (=going back to the Middle Ages)?
   b. What two clues do we have about the Somebody behind the universe?
   c. Why is it that the Moral Law gives us no ground for thinking the Somebody is “good”? What does he mean when he calls “goodness” either the great safety or the great danger?

B. **Summarize the major arguments of “The Moral Animal.”**

C. **Defend the premise of R/W (p. 17):** "Ethics that emanate from a divine source may also enhance a moral commitment, contribute to a deeper sense of moral identity, and address the 'moral motivation' (why be good?) question in a more compelling fashion."