

Answering Objections to the Moral Argument for the Existence of God

Copyright © 2011 by Harold C. Felder

All rights reserved

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
THE MORAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD	2
OBJECTIONS TO THE MORAL ARGUMENT FOR THE EXISTENCE OF GOD	2
OBJECTION THAT THE MORAL LAW DOES NOT EXIST.....	2
<i>The Moral Law Is Undeniable</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>Our Reactions are Evidence of a Moral Law</i>	<i>3</i>
<i>We Make Excuses for Violating the Moral Law</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>We Could Not Know Injustice Unless We Knew Justice.....</i>	<i>6</i>
OBJECTION THAT PEOPLE CAN BE MORAL WITHOUT BELIEF IN GOD.....	6
OBJECTION THAT MORALITY EXISTS ONLY AS ACCIDENTS	7
OBJECTION THAT MORALITY IS THE RESULT OF EVOLUTION	8
OBJECTION THAT MORALITY IS THE RESULT OF EDUCATION	12
OBJECTION THAT MORALITY IS SOCIALLY DETERMINED.....	13
OBJECTION THAT MORALITY IS INDIVIDUALLY DETERMINED.....	16
OBJECTION THAT SOME PEOPLE DO NOT KNOW RIGHT FROM WRONG.....	16
OBJECTION THAT WE CANNOT AGREE ON MORAL ABSOLUTES	17
CONCLUSION	18
BIBLIOGRAPHY	19

Introduction

I remember when I first started learning about the three great arguments for the existence of God. The first argument is the argument from the universe. It basically goes like this: everything that comes into existence needs a cause, the universe came into existence, therefore the universe needs a cause. The argument goes on to demonstrate, scientifically, that the cause is consistent with the God of the Bible.

The second argument is the argument from design and it basically goes like this: every design requires a designer, life and the universe display design, therefore there must be a designer. The argument then goes on to demonstrate, scientifically, that this designer is also consistent with the God of the Bible.

The third great argument is the argument from the Moral Law written upon the hearts of man. Maybe it was because of the scientific evidence that I initially found the first two arguments more persuasive. That is no longer the case. While I still view the first two arguments as very sound, I have developed a preference for the Moral Argument.

The reason I have come to prefer the Moral Argument is because it tells us what we instinctively already know. In the words of the former Nihilist and now Christian, J. Budziszewski, the Moral Law is "What We Can't Not Know."¹

¹ J. Budziszewski, *What We Can't Not Know* (Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 2003).

The Moral Argument for the Existence of God

The Moral Argument for the existence of God is pretty straight forward. It basically says 1) Every law has a law giver, 2) There is an objective Moral Law, 3) Therefore, there is an objective Moral Law Giver.

This is in the form of a valid logical argument with two premises that, if true, necessarily mean that the conclusion must be true. By the word "objective" in front of Moral Law, I am saying that this law is the same for all people, all places, and all times. And of course, this Moral Law Giver is consistent with the God of the Bible.

Objections to the Moral Argument for the Existence of God

Even though the Moral Argument for the existence of God seems to be intuitive, there are still doubters and of course that should come as no surprise. A lot is at stake. I know personally from my former life as an atheist, that atheism and rejection of the Moral Law go hand in hand. However, the reasons given to explain away an objective Moral Law, all miss the mark. The purpose of this paper is to respond to the common objections to the existence of God based on the Moral Law.

Objection That the Moral Law Does Not Exist

In this objection, morality does not exist, it is an illusion. Remember that if the premises for the argument are correct, then the conclusion is correct. This argument attacks the second premise of the argument that there is such a thing as an objective Moral Law. However, there are various reasons why we know that there is an objective Moral Law:

The Moral Law Is Undeniable

The person who claims that there is no such thing as moral absolutes, would feel wronged if you denied them the opportunity to express their view. In *I Don't Have Enough Faith to be an Atheist* by Norman Geisler and Frank Turek, Geisler recalls an event that he was speaking at in which a woman said "There are no real values. It's all a matter of taste or opinion." Dr. Geisler wrote how he resisted the temptation to tell her to sit down and shut up and that no one wanted to hear her opinion.² If Geisler had told her what he was thinking, the woman would have rightly been offended because she felt that she had a moral right to express her opinion and that others should give her that right. So even in her denial she was affirming the very thing she was trying to deny.

Our Reactions are Evidence of a Moral Law

I imagine most people reading this would find the holocaust and 9/11 morally wrong. But there are those who would probably argue differently. The Muslims committing the act of terrorism on 9/11, for example, might consider the attacks morally justifiable. I also imagine that the Nazis probably would make the same claim for the slaughter of an estimated six million Jews. Does that mean that we operate by different morals? No! Because, if someone from another country flew into a building containing their loved ones, they *would* consider *that* wrong. Neither do I have any doubt that if the Nazis were being exterminated by the Jews, they would consider the actions of their exterminators wrong.

It may be true that people may say that there are no moral absolutes, but their lives give them away. People give away their true beliefs, not by what they say or how they treat others,

² Norman Geisler and Frank Turek, *I Don't Have Enough Faith To Be An Atheist* (Wheaton Ill: Crossway Books, 2004), 173.

but how they react to how others treat them. If someone were to steal from them, they would feel wronged. If their spouse cheated on them, they would feel wronged. Would a relativist be okay with the idea of someone raping or murdering them? Of course not! They know it's wrong. In the words of Geisler and Turek "*the Moral Law is not always the standard by which we treat others, but it is nearly always the standard by which we expect others to treat us.* It does not describe how we *actually* behave, but rather it prescribes how we *ought* to behave."³

We Make Excuses for Violating the Moral Law

No one makes excuses for doing what is right. I've never made an excuse for telling my wife that I love her. I've never made an excuse for obeying the laws of God or country. However, I have made excuses for doing things that I've done that I know are wrong. I make excuses when I am late to a meeting, pulled over for speeding, or for being unprepared to follow up on a commitment.

The same is true for everyone. People make excuses for immoral behavior such as "I was born this way" or "God knows my heart." We make excuses to explain bad behavior because we know that the behavior must be justified, if only to one's self. Excuses are only necessary because we know that we have violated the Moral Law. In the words of J. Budziszewski, "rationalization is the homage paid by sin to guilty knowledge."⁴

For example, on July 23rd 2007, Steven Hayes and Joshua Komisarjevsky performed a home invasion at the residence of William and Jennifer Petit and their two daughters in Cheshire, CT. Upon entering the house, Komisarjevsky hit William Petit in the head with a baseball bat as he lay sleep on the couch. Hayes forced Jennifer to withdraw \$15,000 from their home line of

³ Geisler and Turek, 177.

⁴ J. Budziszewski, 19.

credit. Komisarjevsky then raped their eleven year old daughter Michaela. Hayes raped Jennifer, then strangled her to death. They then tied the two daughters to their beds, dosed them as well as their mother in gasoline and set them and the house on fire. Fortunately, William regained consciousness during the attack and was able to escape. He was the sole survivor. Hayes confessed to the killings.⁵ Anyone who doubts moral absolutes cannot condemn Hayes for what he did. To those who hold this view, raping the eleven year old Michaela would be morally equivalent to helping her pick up her books after she tripped on the side walk. And to anyone who denies an objective right and wrong, I would challenge them to talk to William Petit. Better yet, I would challenge them to have the same morally neutral perspective if this happened to their family.

In the words of C.S. Lewis, “It seems then we are forced to believe in a real Right and Wrong. First, human beings all over the earth have this curious idea that they ought to behave in a certain way. Second, they do not in fact behave in that way. The truth is, we believe in decency so much that we cannot bear to face the fact that we are breaking it, and consequently we try to shift the responsibility.”⁶

Long before I knew of the moral argument, I understood it's connection to God. This is the very reason that I've spent many years of my adult life as a professing atheist. In fact, I can tell you the very day that I renounced God and why. I was 21 years of age. I had just recently joined the Navy and it was my first day being stationed in the Philippines. I walked out the gate of Subic Naval Base and I stood in awe. I saw more beautiful women and more bars than I had ever seen before. At this time in my life I was neither a Christian nor was I an atheist. I believed

⁵"Petit Family Killings", New York Times, http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/petit_family/index.html, [accessed November 23rd, 2011].

⁶ C.S. Lewis, *Mere Christianity* (New York: Scribner, 1952), 21.

in a God but I had no relationship with Him. He was the God out there somewhere. However, I did realize that belief in a God would interfere with the way I wanted to live. At that moment I made the decision to be accountable to no one but myself. I decided that I was going to do what I wanted to do with whomever I wanted to do it with. So I renounced belief in God and professed atheism for the next fifteen years of my life. Although I didn't know anything about the Moral Law in a formal sense, even I understood its clear implications.

We Could Not Know Injustice Unless We Knew Justice

The fact that we call something unjust is an indication that we have an idea of what justice should be. How can we call something wrong unless we know what is right. C.S. Lewis used the argument for evil as evidence that there was no God. He eventually realized that this very notion of evil was evidence that God did exist since there had to be some type of objective standard to which he was holding God accountable. Lewis writes "{As an atheist} my argument against God was that the universe seemed so cruel and unjust. But how had I got this idea of just and unjust? A man does not call a line crooked unless he has some idea of a straight line. What was I comparing this universe with when I called it unjust?"⁷ It was this realization that led Lewis to become a Christian. The fact that we make moral comparisons to how things are versus how they should be is a clear indication that we have an objective idea of how things really should be.

Objection That People Can Be Moral Without Belief in God

This objection goes something like this: plenty of atheist are moral; and since their morality is not based on belief in God, God is not required to be moral

⁷ Ibid., 45.

When I worked at NASA as a Software Engineer, I worked with an atheist who was very moral. In fact, he was more moral than I was even though I was a Christian at the time. Clearly he knew right from wrong. He just had no foundation upon which to base his sense of right and wrong.

The point is that there is no reason for the atheist to be good according to their worldview. There is no reason for him to deny himself of purely selfish endeavors. Although plenty of atheists are moral and know the Moral Law, they cannot justify that morality.

Although you don't have to believe in God to be moral, that morality is based on God regardless of whether or not the atheist believes in God. The atheist is still using an objective standard upon which to base their sense of right and wrong and that basis is still God whether they acknowledge that fact or not. In the words of Christian apologist William Lane Craig "*Belief in God is not necessary for objective morality; God is.*"⁸

Objection That Morality Exists Only as Accidents

In this objection, moral laws exist but they exist with no explanation. Moral values such as justice, mercy, love exist without any foundation. They are just there.

In response, laws without a law giver are not laws at all. A command without authority has no mechanism for enforcement, nor can it command a duty or obligation. If I were hiking in a secluded area and I stumbled across a sign written in free hand that said "take your wallet out of your pocket and throw it into a nearby stream." I would feel no obligation to obey its command.

⁸ William Lane Craig, *On Guard: Defending Your Faith with Reason and Precision*, Kindle eBook (Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 2010), 2174.

First of all, I have no idea of who wrote the sign or why. The same can be said of moral laws that just exist. There is no directive since there is no source of the directive.

Second, these are values and values cannot exist outside of people. Non-living matter can neither be morally good nor bad. Moral values are properties of persons. They make no sense in the absence of people.

Third, if these values exist apart from people, then so do vices such as greed, hatred, and selfishness. What would then make one set of values more desirable than another? We would still need some type of standard by which to compare the vices versus the virtues or else there would be no reason for us to prefer love over hate. This objective standard is precisely what we are talking about as being the Moral Law. This objection does not do away with a need for objective moral grounding, it is further evidence for the existence of the Moral Law.

Objection That Morality Is the Result of Evolution

In this objection our sense of morality is just a "herd instinct" developed by evolution. Dictionary.com defines "herd instinct" as: "the impulse or tendency toward clustering or acting in a group, especially the presumed instinct toward or need for gregariousness and conformity." This objection is based on the belief that we act in a group for the benefit of the group and that this instinct developed naturally by evolution like all of our other instincts such as a mother's love, sexual instinct, and the instinct to eat food. Through the process of natural selection, naturalistic forces choose certain behavioral patterns that allow the species to exist.

In response, I would first like to present the argument used by C.S. Lewis in *Mere Christianity*. Lewis does not deny that we have instincts, however, the Moral Law is not one of them. He uses the example of seeing a man drowning. You will have two impulses, one to help

which is based on the herd instinct, and the other of self preservation. But Lewis goes on to say that there will be a third impulse which will override your desire to flee and encourage your desire to help the man. That third thing cannot be one of the other impulses since it judges between the two. That third thing is the Moral Law and that law is so strong that it will often tell us to ignore the strongest impulse (self-preservation) and follow the weaker, to risk our life and help a drowning man.⁹

Second, if there is no true morality and if nature is our guide, then why don't we simply accept the mechanisms of evolution such as the survival of the fittest? Why should we consider rape, robbery or murder as wrong? Won't those who perpetrate such acts be ensuring their survival and the propagation of their genes, and isn't that what evolution is all about? Interestingly enough, Darwinist would say that we are not obliged to follow the examples of nature. We are to rise above them and discourage rape, robbery and murder. But why? By doing so we are making a moral judgment about survival of the fittest that is beyond the morality of nature. We are using a standard beyond nature to judge nature, but there cannot be a standard beyond nature in an atheistic world view. There is no moral reason to protect the poor, weak or innocent if there are no absolute rights or wrongs. There is no reason to call rape wrong in an atheistic world view. Rape does exactly what evolution and natural selection prescribes, it promotes the propagation of the species. In fact, would it not be even preferable in a naturalist framework? The fact that someone forces himself upon someone else demonstrates that this person is more willing to take advantage of more opportunities to increase the propagation of their lineage than his peers.

⁹ Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 8-10.

Third, morality via evolution can only describe what we do, it can't prescribe what we ought to do. It can give us no reason to be good tomorrow because that requires an "ought" that evolution cannot provide. Right and wrong is something that we can feel prior to our behavior. Morality is not simply regret, it is an oughtness in doing what is right. Greg Koukl writes "Since morality is essentially prescriptive (telling what should be the case, as opposed to what is the case) and since all evolutionary assessments of moral behavior are descriptive, then evolution cannot account for the most important thing that needs to be explained: morality's "oughtness."¹⁰ As Koukl points out, why shouldn't human beings be selfish? Why should I share with those who do not have? If the evolutionists responds that it helps the propagation of the species, my response is why should I care about the propagation of the species? The suggestion that it is good that the species exists is a moral statement, but true morality is exactly what the evolutionist is trying to deny.

To demonstrate this idea of "oughtness," let me use an example from the time that I am writing this article. After forty six years as the football coach for Penn State University, Joe Paterno is no longer the head coach. He may arguably be the most respected man in college football history. He has won more games than any other college football coach. He led his team to respectably over the decades and earned two national championships in the process.

Mike McQuery, who was a graduate assistant at Penn State, allegedly witnessed the then defensive coordinator for the team, Jerry Sandusky, raping a ten year old boy in the shower in the Penn State locker room. McQuery allegedly reported the incident to Paterno. Paterno in response notified his boss the Athletic Director who in turn told the school Vice President. However nothing was done and Sandusky continued to allegedly rape young boys. Because no

¹⁰ Greg Koukl, *Monkey Morality: Can Evolution Explain Ethics?*, Christian Research Institute, <http://www.equip.org/free/DC753.htm> [accessed April 28, 2003], 6.

one reported the incident to the authorities, the nation became enraged and all involved parties were terminated. The point I want to emphasize here is that the outrage was not because of what they did, but because of what they allegedly did *not* do. McQuery did *not* stop the rape while witnessing the event. Paterno did *not* follow up with authorities once it became clear that the university was going to cover up the incident.¹¹ The nation as well as the board of trustees for Penn State, recognized that these men had a moral obligation to report the incident to the police. We see here the "oughtness" I discussed. We are upset with these men because we know that they ignored their moral responsibility.

Fourth, morality cannot exist within an atheistic framework since its existence cannot be empirically verified. We cannot assign a color to it. It has no weight. We cannot produce a pound of love. In an atheistic framework, all that exist is matter. The atheist has no right to assign "right" and "wrong" to any human actions, even when those actions are against them. They certainly can never use the argument of evil as evidence against the existence of God since evil cannot exist in their materialistic world view. As Geisler and Turek writes "For if only material things exist, then murder and rape are nothing more than the results of chemical reactions in a criminal's brain brought about by natural selection."¹²

Fifth, not only is evolution unable to explain morality, the existence of morality is evidence against Darwin's notion of natural selection. I call it "The Problem of Goodness." Charles Darwin said that any character "formed for the exclusive good of another, would annihilate my

¹¹ Dave Sheinin, "Penn State continues to deal with fallout from traumatic week," The Washington Post, http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/penn-state-scandal-school-still-recovering-from-traumatic-week/2011/11/11/gIQARnxfDN_story.html , [accessed December 1, 2011].

¹² Geisler and Turek, 191.

theory, for such could not have been produced through natural selection.”¹³ Natural selection by definition eliminates any trait that entails a reduction in fitness while increasing the fitness of others. Yet we see this all of the time. We see this in people who join monasteries and commit to celibacy. We see this in the actions of the brave fire fighters who lost their lives on 9/11 trying to save others. We see this in acts of heroism during war time. We see this in religious acts of martyrdom. And we see this in the life of others who have dedicated their lives to helping others at their expense with no hope of repayment such as Mother Teresa. Numerous studies have been done that prove that human behaviors of goodness are not due to reasons related to reproduction¹⁴.

Objection That Morality Is the Result of Education

According to this view, we are educated on how to behave within society. We are taught which things are acceptable and which things are not. We are taught which things are right and which things are wrong.

C.S. Lewis also deals with this issue in *Mere Christianity*. The point he makes is that although we may be taught certain behaviors, that does not mean that they exist only because we were taught them. He uses the example of the multiplication table. It exists whether or not a student is ever taught it. The same multiplication exists for a child growing up on a remote island that has never heard of it before. Morals are like the laws of math. We may have been taught them, but they existed independent of our being taught them.

¹³ Jeffrey P. Schloss, *Evolutionary Accounts of Altruism & the Problem of Goodness by Design*, quoted by William A Dembski in *Mere Creation: Science, Faith, & Intelligent Design* (Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press, 1998), 247.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 247.

Objection That Morality Is Socially Determined

According to this argument, morality is culturally based. Evidence for this view is the alleged fact that different civilizations and cultures have different moralities. If this is true, then the Moral Law cannot be objective. It must be based on the culture. For instance, the 17th century Hudson Bay tribes practiced a custom of killing their parents when they had become old and unable to support themselves. Another example is that in India, it is wrong to eat cows, but in the U.S. it is okay. One culture may greet one another with a kiss, while in other countries this would be unacceptable.

But, according to proponents of this view, the argument can be expanded to include our own more recent culture. For example, premarital sex and cohabitation were both once thought wrong by society and are now accepted. These seem to be evidence that morals change based upon societies and cultures.

In response, the "ought" does not change. Morality is prescriptive, not descriptive. What this means is that right and wrong are not based on what people do, but what they ought to do. Just because some things are more acceptable today does not mean that they are right, it just means that more people are doing it. Being right has nothing to do with how many people do something or how socially acceptable things may be. All this objection demonstrates is that people violate the moral laws. We all violate the moral laws in addition to man's laws. Just because we violate man's laws does not mean that those laws do not exist. Similarly, just because we violate moral laws, does not mean they do not exist. Even if the Nazis had won WWII and brainwashed us all to believe that killing Jews was okay, it would not make it right. It would still be wrong. There are more murders in the U.S. today than one hundred years ago, yet murder is still objectively wrong.

Second, if society determined morality, then a country could never do wrong. The Nazis' could not have been wrong in exterminating six million Jews. The U.S. Government could not have been wrong by promoting and endorsing slavery. Whatever the government decides would be right. This would also mean that there could be no disagreement with government policies. If the government decided that rape was okay, then rape would be okay.

I remember a conversation with an atheist in which I asked him how was morality determined. He responded that the government was the ultimate standard of right and wrong. However, his actions betrayed his words. On the front lawn of his home was a sign protesting the war in Iraq. The problem is that the government initiated the war, so by his own beliefs, he had no right to disagree with the government. Since the government was the standard of right and wrong, he was wrong by opposing the government and the war.

Interestingly enough, this was the position of the Nazis charged with war crimes of WWII. In their view, they violated no laws, certainly not the laws of Nazi Germany. However, the international community found them guilty none the less. The reason they were found guilty is that the international community recognized that there was a standard of right and wrong beyond the nations themselves; a standard to which the nations themselves were accountable. Without that objective standard, a nation could never be held accountable for actions such as genocide. We judge societies based on an objective standard. We know that some moral ideas are better than others. If not, then we could not criticize the nation of India's practice of Sati, which is the burning a man's wife alive at her husband's funeral. We instinctively know that it is wrong even if everyone in the world practiced it. Additionally, the practice of slavery could not be called into question as being wrong if that society taught that it was right. We know that Sati and

slavery are wrong because we are judging them both by a standard higher than the society which practices them.

Third, in the case of greeting, all cultures agree that it is right to greet someone, but they may differ on how to do that. But the underlying moral principle of showing respect in a greeting is the same. The same thing can be said of cows in India. Indians do not eat cows because they believe they are reincarnated people. They do not want to eat people. We in the U.S. do not want to eat people either, however we eat cows because we do not believe they are reincarnated people. We also see a familiar moral principle in action with the Hudson Bay tribes. This was seen by the children as an act of mercy. It was also seen as a point of honor for the parents to die for the sake of the group. The underlying moral rule is that it is noble to die for the welfare of many.¹⁵ The moral principles displayed here are the same as that of all cultures. Beckwith and Koukl writes "the apparent moral differences arise not because of conflicting values but because of facts pertaining to the common values."¹⁶ They may act out the moral principles differently, but the morals apply none the less.

C.S. Lewis' argues "If anyone will take the trouble to compare the moral teachings 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."¹⁷ In his book *The Abolition of Man*, Lewis lists a number of these moral teachings from their various writing. They are all consistent.

¹⁵ Francis J. Beckwith and Gregory Koukl, *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted in Mid-Air* (Grand Rapid: Baker Books, 2999), 44.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 45.

¹⁷ Lewis, *Mere Christianity*, 5.

Objection That Morality Is Individually Determined

In this objection, each individual's preference is their only guide to what is right or wrong. In the words of Francis Beckwith and Greg Koukl, in this view, "All morality is personal; none is public. Every moral evaluation is a mere opinion, a personal preference."¹⁸

In response, it should be easy to see why this simply could not be the case. If morality was personal then my morality might make it perfectly okay to steal from you, to beat you, to rape you, or to even murder you. If I determine right and wrong then I would consider things right that bring me pleasure, no matter how much pain it may bring others. In this view, there is nothing wrong with the philosophy of adolescent mass murderer Eric Harris who boasted on his website "My belief is that if I say something it goes. I am the law, if you don't like it, you die."¹⁹

As I mentioned earlier, we know right from wrong more from how we want others to treat us than how we treat others. We may be able to justify our infidelity toward our spouse, yet we would want them to have a higher standard regarding their view of our marriage.

Objection That Some People Do Not Know Right from Wrong

In this objection, the case is made that since some people commit horrible crimes without any knowledge of right or wrong, then there must be no such thing as objective right and wrong

In response, the view that some people do not know right from wrong is false. Everyone knows right from wrong. The sociopath who is a mass murderer, knows that it is wrong. There is a difference between guilty knowledge and guilty feelings. Not everyone feels guilty for murder, but everyone knows that it is wrong. Take the example I mentioned earlier of Hayes and

¹⁸ Beckwith and Koukl, 38.

¹⁹ J. Budziszewski, 19.

the heinous Cheshire murders. Hayes admits that he was wrong. During his sentencing hearing, Hayes said "I am deeply sorry for what I have done and the pain I have caused," Hayes also said "My actions have hurt so many people, affected so many lives, caused so much pain. I am tormented and have nightmares about what happened in that house. Death will be a welcome relief".²⁰ He knew it was wrong even while committing the acts.

Second, even if we did come across someone who did not know right from wrong that would not mean that there is no objective standard of right and wrong. It would just mean that person would have a handicap. There would be something wrong with them. I am color blind. Just because I cannot see certain colors does not mean that those colors do not exist; they do. It simply means that something is wrong with my ability to see them.

Objection That We Cannot Agree on Moral Absolutes

People disagree on what things are part of the Moral Law. For instance, some people believe that abortion is okay and others believe it is wrong. This objection states that because we can't agree on these things, there must not be an objective list of rights and wrongs.

In response, we don't have to agree with every instance of what is right and wrong in order to know that there are rights and wrongs. Scientists do not always agree on how to interpret the same scientific data. For example, should Pluto be a planet or not? The scientific community has debated this but they have never debated whether or not there were planets or a solar system or universe. The fact that we can agree on one universal objective truth such as murder-which is

²⁰Aliyah Shamid, "Steven Hayes sentenced to death in Connecticut home invasion, murders of mom daughters of Dr. Petit," New York Daily News, <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/steven-hayes-sentenced-death-connecticut-home-invasion-murders-mom-daughters-dr-petit-article-1.470958> [accessed November 23rd, 2011].

the deliberate taking of innocent life-is wrong, is enough evidence to demonstrate that absolute moral laws do exist. For in no country or civilization is murder okay.

In the case of abortion, the controversy is over which moral value to apply. Is it the right of the baby to life, or is it the right of the mother to have control over her body? This is the source of the conflict. Also, there are times where there appears to be a conflict because one side suppresses the truth. To deny that a baby in the womb is alive with the right to live should supersede the convenience of the mother is in the opinion of this author, a suppression of the truth.

William Lane Craig writes "I believe what my five senses tell me, namely, that there is a world of physical objects out there. My senses are not infallible, but that doesn't lead me to think that there is no external world around me."²¹ To pretend that love and hate are equal, doesn't mean that they are, it simply means that the person making such a claim is lying or defective.

Conclusion

Although the Moral Argument for the existence of God does not include a lot of scientific evidence, the law is evident. We cannot deny the Moral Law without affirming it. We interact with it every day of our lives. It is self evident. All of the objections fail to explain the existence of objective morals. Morals separate us from other animals. The Moral Law is part of what makes us human. And as the argument for God's existence goes, every law requires a law giver. That lawgiver must be perfect since He would be the standard by which we measure perfection. This law giver is completely and totally consistent with the God of the Bible.

²¹ Craig, 2270

Bibliography

- Beckwith, Francis J, and Gregory Koukl. *Relativism: Feet Firmly Planted in Mid-Air*. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1998.
- Budziszewski, J. *What We Can't Not Know*. Dallas: Spence Publishing Company, 2003.
- Geisler, Norman, and Frank Turek. *I Don't Have Enough Faith to Be an Atheist*. Wheaton: Crossway Books, 2004.
- Craig, William Lane. *On Guard: Defending Your Faith with Reason and Precision*. Colorado Springs: David C. Cook, 2010.
- Koukl, Gregory. "Money Morality: Can Evolution Explain Ethics?" *Christian Research Institute*. November 9, 2011. <http://www.equip.org/free/DC753.htm> (accessed April 28, 2003).
- Lewis, C.S. *The Abolition of Man*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1974.
- . *Mere Christianity*. New York: Scribner, 1952.
- "Petit Family Killings." *New York Times*. October 14, 2011. http://topics.nytimes.com/top/reference/timestopics/people/p/petit_family/index.html (accessed November 23, 2011).
- Schloss, Jeffrey P. "Evolutionary Accounts of Altruism & the Problem of Goodness by Design." In *Mere Creation: Science, Faith, & Intelligent Design*, by William A Dembski, 236-261. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1998.
- Shamid, Aliyah. "Steven Hayes sentenced to death in Connecticut home invasion, murders of mom daughters of Dr. Petit." *New York Daily News*. <http://www.nydailynews.com/news/national/steven-hayes-sentenced-death-connecticut-home-invasion-murders-mom-daughters-dr-petit-article-1.470958> (accessed November 23, 2011).
- Sheinin, Dave. *The Washington Post*. November 11, 2011. http://www.washingtonpost.com/sports/penn-state-scandal-school-still-recovering-from-traumatic-week/2011/11/11/gIQARnxfDN_story.html (accessed December 1, 2011).