

Reality, Truth and Morality
Simferopol, Ukraine
Bruce A. Little, PhD

Justice is turned back
And righteousness stands afar off;
For truth has fallen in the street,
And equity cannot enter.

(Isaiah 59:15)

A direct correlation exists between the decline in the moral content of a culture and that culture's disdain for the idea of absolute Truth. Predictably, an increasing support for the denial of absolute Truth will be accompanied by a deteriorating bond between morality and culture. Unfortunately, the conclusion of the postmodern man is that absolute Truth does not exist, a position which has only exacerbated the moral free fall of industrial nations in the last half of the Twentieth Century. As Gene Veith writes, "The postmodern mind-set can have a devastating impact on the human personality. If there are no absolutes, if truth is relative then there can be no stability, no meaning in life. If reality is socially constructed, then moral guidelines are only masks for oppressive power and individual identity is an illusion."ⁱ Denying the existence of absolute Truth leaves man without any fixed point of reference to provide mankind with some greater context or overarching purpose by which meaning and direction can be given to human existence. Without a fixed point of reference, culture becomes like a man lost in the woods who looks only at his own feet for guidance to safety. All his noble efforts only lead him in circles which only compounds his lostness. So it is with the culture that tries to live without absolute Truth. Eventually it loses a sense of a universal purpose and moral direction in life as everything becomes relative to itself. There is no absolute foundation for morality and no overarching purpose by which the behavior and moral direction of culture's course is directed and measured. The measure and the one measured is the same thing. The resulting moral relativism is most obvious as seen in the plethora of societal problems evident in much of the Twentieth Century. This has come at a time when naturalistic science assured the world that mankind is on the brink of the utopia it has always desired. Yet, without the acknowledgment of absolute Truth grounded in absolute Reality, culture's moral compass will always point in whatever direction culture is heading

Absolute Truth necessarily flows from absolute Realityⁱⁱ and, therefore, one's view of truth depends on his view of reality. Therefore, if one has a view that Reality is in a state of change or process, then it will follow that his view will be that truth is changing or relative. Absolute Truth cannot exist without the foundation of absolute Reality.ⁱⁱⁱ Whereas the concept of truth only applies to ideas and since truth is grounded in absolute Reality, the existence of absolute Truth requires that absolute Reality be intelligent. This means that whatever one names as absolute Reality, it must not only be transcendent, it must be capable of thinking and communicating ideas. This would require absolute Reality to be something other than matter on two counts. The first is that matter is exactly the place where change is seen and so by definition cannot serve as the absolute. The second is that matter does not (and cannot) create intelligence, it requires intelligence.^{iv} Therefore, absolute (ultimate) Reality, by definition and logical assertion,

cannot be matter nor can it be in process. This would mean that if God was viewed as being process He could not be absolute Reality.

In the modern age, nothing has done more to eviscerate the notion of absolute Truth than the persistent teaching of evolution. Although the notion of evolution itself is about the process or mechanism by which what is came into being, the philosophical assumptions on which it rests of necessity must reject the notion of absolute Truth. So, those who seriously embrace evolution, must also disavow both absolute Truth and absolute Reality if they are to be consistent. For, if absolute Reality (that which transcends all change) is defined in materialistic terms there is an immediate problem. Matter is just what is in the state of change which contradicts the notion of absolute. Furthermore, there is no explanation for even the concept of truth, as truth cannot spring from matter, which is to say, that without intelligence there is no concept of truth. Scientifically, there is no evidence that the process of evolution has ever produced new information necessary for new species. Therefore, it is impossible that evolution is responsible for information/intelligence at the beginning. Matter does not create information, it requires information. Nonetheless, it is the general assertion of evolutionists that God does not exist which means that all that is left is matter which cannot give rise to truth, nor can it pass for absolute Reality.

Some might say that evolution does not necessarily deny God's existence. That is, it is possible that God exists, but is not responsible for the existence of nature. In this case, however, God would not be the efficient cause of nature. This would preserve the "idea" of God but only as a psychological/religious idea with no corresponding existence in the reality of which man is a part. Therefore, the basic assumption of evolution remains unchanged. To view God only in a religious sense still means that all that is came solely from matter through the agency of evolution. This leaves God totally outside the reality equation, which means that in the discussion of reality it must not recognize God as any part of that discussion. Therefore, in any consistent sense, evolution cannot claim God in any way as being a part of true reality, leaving only nature. No absolute Truth and no absolute Reality leaves man with only relative reality and relative truth which leads to relative morality. As Michael Harrington (an atheist himself) observed, "The death of God has indeed pointed toward the death of all the higher values. For hundreds of years those values were, consciously or not, rooted in the assumption of an absolute order in the universe, guaranteed by God. When God and morality and religion were relativized by the new scientific, historical, sociological and anthropological consciousness of the nineteenth century, a good part of traditional Western culture was undermined."^v Of course a main aspect of the new scientific consciousness was the theory of evolution which denies God as a part of true reality.

This denial of God means that there is that there is no ontological difference between man and nature. If there is no God there is only nature and, hence the difference between man and other pieces of nature is simply developmental making man no different essentially than any other part of nature. The problem, however, arises when one accepts the idea that man is a moral being which is immediately affirmed the moment one begins to talk of human activity as being right or wrong. If man is no different from nature, then one must explain how it is that evolution has brought this notion into humanity. Looking at nature, one can see that it is silent in the realm of morality. In fact, nature appears to be very indifferent to the concept of morality. Any talk of

morality in nature comes from humans, not nature itself. Morality is a category that one may apply to nature, but it does not arise out of nature. For example, the fox is not disturbed by his arbitrary eating of the rabbit. Man may feel squeamish when he sees it only because he transposes his morality onto the fox's activity. But the fox himself is not concerned about it at all. The fact is that when men act badly towards one another, it is common to refer to their behavior as mimicking the law of the jungle, that is, with moral concern or constraint. Therefore, if morality exists, it must exist apart from nature. But, if man is only a highly development animal (nature), then there is no explanation for the fact he is so universally concerned with morality, as there is no evidence that morality is a developmental reality. If God does not exist, nature is all there is. And it is clear that morality does not arise from nature. Furthermore, if there is no God, man and nature are one. Since morality does not arise from nature, morality could not arise from man in any sense. Therefore, without God, morality simply cannot exist. People will reply that there are people who do not believe in God who are moral, but it is equally and more convincing to argue that the fact they are moral is testimony that God does exist. The fact they do not believe in God, is only a statement about their belief, not about the state of absolute Reality. Long before men acknowledged the gravity, they lived in a way that testified to the existence of gravity because that was the way the world in which they lived really was. If there is no God human activity that might be catalogued under some other heading, but it could not be the heading of morality. In fact, the only explanation evolution has for the existence of the word 'morality' in man's vocabulary is that it is a vestigial concept left over from the influence of Christianity on much of the world.

Furthermore, if there is no God, then there is the matter of justice that must be explained. Nature is not concerned with justice. Power is the issue in nature, as that is the law of the jungle. It is the fastest, or the strongest that determine how things go in nature. And is not that exactly what evolution requires?. There is no thought of restraint or justice through the acknowledgment of some higher law. Mankind, however, consistently reveals its concern for justice at some level in the human experience. Those who claim that all there is, is nature and that man is not unique may speak of morality, but will find no reason why man should live that way. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (one of the most influential first generation Romantics from whom Nietzsche apparently learned much) is a case in point.

There is no attempt to make the point that the moral and cultural fallout from evolution was planned. It was simply the logical conclusion wherever evolution and its necessary assumptions were accepted and worked out in culture. Up until the nineteenth century, it was generally accepted that the infinite, personal, triune, creator God existed as absolute Reality and all of the natural/physical world found both its meaning and existence in this God. That did not mean that culture was perfect, but did mean that it had an absolute foundation from which to make truth assertions and moral judgements. The truth claims in the Bible were considered to be the standard by which man should live and be judged. However, with the rejection of the infinite, personal, triune, creator God as absolute Reality, modern man was left with no absolute Truth which in turn relativized the approach to morals. It is not only that there are serious factual problems with evolution as an explanation for life, but that it is built upon philosophical assumptions that are simply inimical to humanity both philosophically and morally. While one might argue that early on many may not have understood the devastating moral effects of the

unsupported assumptions of evolution, the facts are now in clear view for all to see. So, today if there is to be a restoration of a legitimate moral direction, the false assumptions about truth and reality must be addressed. While it is possible to speak of reality and truth in a detached way, one cannot do the same thing with morality. What has been forgotten (or denied) is that the practical aspect of morality is tied inextricably to the more abstract idea of absolute Truth and Reality.^{vi}

Some of the best minds that are committed to evolution as the only view of reality, have tried to wrestle with the obvious connection between morality and evolution. Mary Migdley^{vii} realized the problem and outlined the problem rather succinctly. If morality is only a developmental issue, then how can one explain its development from nature. If morality is unique to man, then the continuity within nature is broken which is damaging to evolution. Her conclusion was that it was developmental and the reason it developed in man and not in animals is a matter of memory. Ernst Mayr^{viii} writes that "Almost every component in modern man's belief system is somehow affected by Darwinian principles."^{ix} His explanation for morals is in the following quote:

The survival and prosperity of a social group depends to a large extent on the harmonious cooperation of the members of the group, and this behavior must be based on altruism. Such altruism, by furthering the survival and prosperity of the group, also indirectly benefits the fitness of the group's individuals. The result amounts to selection favoring altruistic behavior

Kin selection and reciprocal helpfulness in particular will be greatly favored in a social group. Such selection for altruism has been demonstrated in recent years to be widespread among many other social animals. One can then perhaps encapsulate the relation between ethics and evolution by saying that a prepenisity for altruism and harmonious cooperation in social groups *is* favored by natural selection."^x

One can only be amazed that one who emigration to America from Germany could even whisper a notion of altruism within humanity. Does he meant that animals are more moral than man and if so, immorality must be a higher development than morality since man is more developed than other animals.

The problem, however, is that in spite of all the intellectual assurances that mankind is now on the higher path of science, the moral condition of the world worsens. Something simply does not add up. Children are killing children, children are having children, pornography is on public display, drug and alcohol abuse plague virtually every nation, divorces often outnumber marriages, abortions kill unborn persons, and the list goes on. Millions of dollars are spent annually to try to stem the tide, but in reality, the battle is being lost. What is alarming is not that immoral acts are being committed, but that the cultural moral philosophy sanctions it while it cries out under the pain of it all.

This seems to point to the fact that, since such responses are universal, there must be some absolute moral standard that informs all mankind on certain acts, and it is this that creates within men the idea that certain things are wrong. For example, it appears that all men think that stealing is wrong, especially when something of theirs is stolen. All men think that killing your neighbor is wrong, especially when the neighbor killed is your father. The only adequate answer for these universal responses is that it is the way the universe has been ordered and, as such, it is a part of the make up of each soul. Even if one is a materialist and denies the immaterial aspect of the soul, there must still be an explanation why the chemical/biological make up of every brain

is such that the neuron firing sends the same message in all men. Something must have programmed the firing to occur in this way so that when visual input informs the brain on these human conditions the same responses occur. The conclusion here is a universal moral Law which existed prior to man and is part of man is inescapable. This Law would, of logical necessity, need be an eternal Law which had the power to influence man's thinking. At once, materialism is contradicted as the Law is not material. In fact, the Law must be personal. According to the Christian world view, however, this Law is in the mind of the eternal, personal God and has been written on the hearts of all men although not all men live in accordance with that law.

Therefore any attempt a strengthening the moral fiber of our culture must begin with a renewed commitment to absolute Truth. Absolute truth, however, cannot exist with out the eternal, immutable God. This is not first a call to religion, but to the acknowledgment that there is an eternal intelligent, personal, immutable Being who in whom absolute truth resides because He is truth. It is very possible (maybe not wise, but possible) for a person to believe that the eternal, intelligent, immutable personal God exists without being religious. The essential point here is that absolute Truth stands at the heart of must understand that what stands at the heart of everything else is this issue of truth. Justice is the main pillar of society and absolute Truth is the necessary foundation. We cannot change the events of the past, but we can choose to reject the lies and build on the truth. We have, as human beings lived rather recklessly with ideas for the past 150 years. Because the foundation that had been laid, especially in the West had been so solid, it has only been of late that we are beginning to feel the enormous impact. We have played with ideas as if they were our own playthings, that we could embrace the wildest of ideas and play with them. We deceived ourselves into thinking that science could and would solve all the problems of man. It was a myth, but unfortunately a myth on which cultures were shaped. Paul Ramsey said, "Ours is the first attempt in recorded history to build a culture up the premise that God is dead."^{xi}

End Notes

i. Gene Veith., *Postmodern Times* (Wheaton: Crossway Books, 1994), 72 .

ii. Absolute Truth refers to those truth statements that have a universal status. That is, they do not change with time or space. Absolute Reality is that part of reality that does not change—it is immutable. A fact that is all too obvious in our own bodies. But if everything was in flux as Hericlitus taught, then from where did meaning come. Without some overarching purpose to life, all man was left with was the particulars and their relation to each other which was constantly changing. Parmenides posited that all reality was one. In this case man had only an undifferentiated oneness which solved the problem of change, but left man with no meaning as a particular. Philosophy has been occupied with the notion of the changing and the unchanging at least since the time of Hericlitus and Parmenides. Plato tried to solve the problem in his analogy of the cave. Aristotle pointed out that Plato had no way of connecting the two. Descartes further defined the problem in terms of mind and body, but fared no better.

iii. This may explain why postmodernist Richard Rorty says that there is no such thing as Reality and Truth.

iv. One of the very interesting debates going on United States right now can be seen in the recent action by the Kansas state Board of Education in this matter of evolution being incapable of creating new information which is necessary for new species (maybe more on this) **"The important thing about DNA is not the chemicals but**

the information in the software, just as the important thing about a computer program or a book is the information content and not the physical! medium in which that information is recorded. Davies believes erroneously, as I will explain) that once the life processes of metabolism and reproduction are under way, natural selection can supply whatever further increases in information are needed. But metabolism and reproduction cannot get started until an enormous amount of complex information is already in existence. What was the source of the initial! information input? Scientific naturalists or materialists assume that this information is an emergent product of chemistry, and that it somehow forms when the right chemical combinations get going from the right combination of chance and law. Davies says, however, that the leap from chemistry to biology requires something in addition to chance and law, because of the fundamentally informational character of life. Law produces the same simple pattern over and over again highly ordered, repetitive sequences like crystals or snowflakes. Chance produces disordered, unspecified sequences that show no consistent patterns. No combination of chance and law can do the job because the genetic information, like the information in Windows 98 or the Bible, is both highly specified and random (i.e., not repetitive). These characteristics are essential for any book or program with a high information content and explain why the nucleotide sequence or an organism's DNA necessarily must be independent of a chemical properties that cause the parts of the molecule to together. A book whose letters reflected only the chemical properties of ink and paper would contain no information beyond what is already contained in the laws." Page 53-54

v. Michael Harrington, *The Politics at God's Funeral* (New York: Penguin Books, 1983), 201.

vi. Evolutionary science, on the other hand, sees man as a product of biological evolution as worked out through time, chance and material stuff. In this world view, all that exists is material stuff and man must be explained only in terms of chemical and/or biological make up. His genetic structure is intended to explain everything about man. Of course evolution supporters have no example of information producing with the evolution process, nor is there any example where microevolution has led to macroevolution. In the Naturalistic world view, morality is something that happens to an act as determined by the individual and, therefore, is based on individual feelings. There is no standard external to man whereby every man can say that certain behavior is always wrong. This makes morality relative, which has been argued, is no morality at all.

vii. Mary Migdely

viii. Ernst Mayr is one of the towering figures in the history of evolutionary biology. . . . His conception of rapid speciation [the evolutionary process by which new species are formed] of isolated populations formed the basis for the well-known neoevolutionary concept of punctuated equilibrium. The author of some of the 20th century's most influential volumes, Ernst Mayr is the recipient of numerous awards, including the National Medal of Science (*Scientific American*, July 2000. p 83)

ix. Ernst Mayr, "Darwin's Influence on Modern Thought" in *Scientific American*. July 2000. 79-83. This article is based on the September 23, 1999, lecture that Mayr delivered in Stockholm on receiving the Crafoord Prize from the Royal Swedish Academy of Science.

x. Ernst Mayr, "Darwin's Influence on Modern Thought" in *Scientific American*. July 2000. 79-83

xi. *Time*, "Toward a Hidden God" (April 8, 1966), 82.