BIBLE TALK

This week we are continuing our investigation of the question: Are moral values relative?

<u>Judges 17:6</u>

6 In those days there was no king in Israel; everyone did what was right in his own eyes.

This same statement is made again in chapter 21:25. Think about what this is saying. "Everyone did what was right in his own eyes."

This is the end result of saying "moral values are relative." If there is no absolute truth and everything is relative, then everyone will end up doing what is right in their own eyes. This is a freighting thing.

If there is no definite "right" or "wrong," what would that mean? It means:

- If a man wants to rape a woman, no one has a right to say he's wrong.
- If a man wants to rape an eight year old boy, no one has a right to say he's wrong.
- If a woman wants to drown a crying baby in a bathtub of water, no one has a right to say she's wrong.
- If a woman wants to poison her husband, no one has a right to say she's wrong.

Is this not true? Be honest with yourself. Is it not true that if everything is relative and there are no definite moral values that apply to everyone, then there are no "human rights."

The phrase "human rights" implies there are some things that are right for all people in all nations for all times.

- If a person believes in "human rights," he cannot logically believe moral values are relative.
- If a person believes a man should not ever be allowed to rape a woman, he cannot logically believe moral values are relative.

The World Book Encyclopedia has this to say about the Nuremberg Trials:

Nuremberg Trials were a series of 13 trials held in Nuremberg, Germany, from 1945 to 1949. In these trials, leaders of Nazi Germany were accused of crimes against international law. ... Nearly all were charged with murder, enslavement, looting, and other atrocities against soldiers and civilians of occupied countries. Some were also charged with responsibility for the persecution of Jews and other racial and national groups. (14:455).

How did these German Nazis defend themselves? They argued that moral truth was relative. They argued that in their country it was not considered wrong to imprison and murder Jews, blacks and Gypsies. Furthermore, they argued it was not fair to condemn them and judge them for doing what was considered ethical and legal in their country.

Robert Jackson, one of the Supreme Court Justices of the United States, who was the prosecutor, in his closing address during the Nuremberg trials, had this to say, "These men should be tried on this basis, on a higher law, a higher law which rises above the provincial" – (the provincial is the area of Germany, the geographical area) – "and the transient" (the period of time in which the Nazi had charge of Germany). In other words he (Jackson) contended that the Nazis did not have the right to invent a law within their own nation and say, "This is right for us even if it is wrong for you." (Thomas Warren, The Warren-Flew Debate, p. 17).

Keep this in mind. When people argue that moral values are relative, they are making the same argument Nazi Germans were making to defend their murder of six million Jews, blacks and Gypsies.

Robert Jackson was correct in saying there is a law that is higher than any governmental law. The higher law that "rises above the provincial and the transient" is the law of God.

God's moral law is absolute. It applies to all people of all nations at all times. No nation and no single individual has the right to govern themselves. Truth is not relative.

The doctrine that moral truth is relative is one of the most dangerous doctrines of our time and, unfortunately, a doctrine which many people have accepted without thinking about the logical conclusions of this doctrine.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Well ... thanks for listening to our message this week. We invite you to visit our web site www.WillOfTheLord.com. There you may download the notes and the audio file of the message you just listened to.

Call again next week when we consider a new subject on *Bible Talk*.