

THE PRINCIPLE OF “OUGHT”

Believers can't deny that some who claim to be “Christians” are odd (said oddities occurring not because of—but in spite of—the Bible). Believers don't have a patent on oddness, however. Atheists partake of an innate strangeness that stems directly from their anti-God, pro-evolution credo.

Among the “new wave” of militant, belligerent infidels is the British Oxford scholar, Richard Dawkins. His 2006 book, *The God Delusion*, boldly aims at converting every believer to his atheism. Obviously, either too few have read it, or he did not do a very effective job. Many millions (whether odd or not-odd) still believe in God.

One of the inherent “odd” components of atheism is its espousal of certain moral and ethical tenets. For example, Dawkins denounces the Muslims for their murderous response to the Danish Mohammed cartoons several years ago (no disagreement there). He labels God as a vindictive, racist, infanticidal, genocidal, bully (and that's just half his list). Further, he points to Abraham's dishonesty about Sarah, Lot's incest, the Levite's dismemberment of his concubine, Jephthah's vow, and other historical records in the Bible, clearly judging such as morally unacceptable (again, no argument).

He obviously believes some things are wrong and others right, but from whence comes his moral outrage? Where do men get their morals? He first suggests a “scientific” (evolutionary) ground for “moral” behavior toward others (which folly a man of his intellect should be ashamed to proffer). A second hypothesis is *zeitgeist* (“the spirit of the age”)—merely another stab at an evolutionary explanation.

Granting for argument's sake that morals arrived via evolution, this merely explains **the way** they got here. How does one explain the inclination to conform to them—the **oughtness** of moral principles? If we are mere soulless combinations of protoplasm, who, against incredible odds, arrived at the “human stage” of evolution through natural selection (still occurring, mind you), how can any behavior be praised or condemned? Why is murder worse than hymn-singing, lying than honesty, or raping than protecting a child? Dawkins at last has nothing to offer besides **personal choice** as his arbiter between good and evil—utter subjectivism.

No behavior can be **abnormal** or **immoral** if there is no transcendental objective moral **standard**. Only in God and the Bible do we have that objective standard and the **oughtness** that tugs at us to obey it (John 12:48; 3 John 11).

—Dub McClish
Denton, TX

[**Note:** I wrote this article for and it was published in the *Denton Record-Chronicle*, Denton, TX, August 8, 2014.]