

Culture Wars and the Soul: Part 2

By J.P Moreland

J.P Moreland:

I would like to say something I did not say yesterday and that is: I'd like to thank our dean Dennis Dirks, and I'd like to thank my faculty colleagues at Talbot for helping make these last two years the best years of my life in terms of my vocation and what I do. I personally can't imagine having a better place to teach; you brothers and sisters have helped to make this atmosphere for me at least, a very friendly one and a very very collegial one, and I... I'm just delighted to be in privilege to be a part of this faculty and I want to thank you for what you've done for my life and hope that perhaps I can return the favor somewhat this morning and encourage you as well.

My talk yesterday stirred up and inspired no small amount of questions, and I really want you to know that I am settling for quite limited objectives. These three days there are many things about the soul, that I'm not going to be able to address and there are many things about the soul that I simply can't talk about. I am teaching a course right now, a 15 week course on the metaphysics of substance, which I take to be some of the most crucial ideas to understand the nature of the soul next fall. I'll be teaching a course on the on the mind body problem.

But let me just say very briefly, right now that for me animals have souls as well as human beings and a.. If you're willing to use the word in a certain sense so do vegetables, in my opinion, and I think I can argue that, and I think I could make a pretty strong case for that. I don't think vegetables are conscious, but I think all living organisms that are animals are likely to be

Transcript continues...

...conscious and I think they're conscious at least in virtue of having a soul. Now there's no question that the human soul, and certainly animal souls, can only function in deep dependence on the body, at least in the state.

And so if something happens to the body, it can have a deep causal effect upon the soul's capacity to function and vice versa, I might add, after all worrying can hurt your brain chemistry but it is possible if the brain is hurt through disease or whatever it could impact the source ability to function. Picture for example a person inside of a robot. The person might only be able to do certain things if the controls and the robot work, and if something happens to the controls in the robot, even if the person is still inside the robot they might not be able to function in certain ways.

Well just because the robot is dysfunctional, doesn't mean the person isn't still inside, it just means they're not capable of functioning. And in Christian theology the soul and the body are deeply deeply wedded to one another. It is a question for the philosopher of religion and for the theologian to ask and try to answer the question: precisely how does the soul relate to the body? And these indeed interesting questions, but it's not my purpose here to address them; I merely say then, that while there is a soul and there's no doubt in my mind that it's different from the body, the body and the soul can deeply interact with one another and some of the soul is functioning and some of the body's functioning, I would even argue, all the body's functioning might depend upon the other entity.

There has been a trend in theology which I find to be very... a failure of nerve frankly, because we perceive that we've lost our wars with science and so we're back pedaling as rapidly as we can to make sure we don't assert anything about reality, lest the scientists take it away from
Transcript continues...

...us in 15 years. And there's been a move among theologians to to to say that the Bible is Hebraic... teaches Hebrew holism not Greek dualism, and that the that that the human being as a whole unity of living whole. And I find a good bit of this talk to be absolute gobbledygook. It's unintelligible that makes no sense, and the people who write these articles are not trained well enough to know what they're talking about in many cases. The simple a simple observation will prove the point.

Can't something be a unity with, and still have a differentiation within it. Goodness gracious, isn't a heap of salt a unity in some sense of the word even though the grains of salt are different from one another. How about an automobile. Can an automobile be a genuine unity in a certain sense of the word, even though the gas pedal might be different from the carburetor? Why can't a vegetable or a human being or an animal have a much deeper, by the way unity, even though there are is an internal differentiation within it. Can't the mental life be one, and yet the cognitive faculties, the volitional faculties, and the emotional faculties be different entities within the soul and yet the soul be a unity? Why does it have to be unity versus diversity? Why can't it be unity in diversity? And indeed that's the way I think the Christian philosopher, theologian ought to view these things.

And so if I have stimulated you to think more deeply about the soul, that's what I'm up to here, and here is the bottom line for me in these three lectures. If you're a Christian, then I'm going to challenge you as I challenge myself to let your Christian ideas do intellectual labor for you. If your theological beliefs do no cognitive work for you. That is, if they do not explain anything. If you don't allow them to do labor and you don't reason about issues in light of them, and things and in some sense of the word actually allow certain things to verify or falsify your

Transcript continues...

...theological ideas, then your theological ideas are in an upper story somewhere and they've got they're totally out of touch with the rest of your intellectual life. And so my simple question to you would be, if you believe in the soul, what intellectual work does the soul do for you? And that's what we're trying to talk about here.

And last yesterday I tried to say, that the issue of the souls existence is important because of the culture wars that we're in, and these culture wars are not simply American, we're not Americans, we're Christians first and foremost. And so these culture wars are merely temporal manifestations of the war between the Devil and the Kingdom of God. Heightened in this warfare as the debate today between a sense state and an ideation of culture, as I said yesterday. The Sensate culture has, on its behalf, the idea of empiricism. Seeing is believing and if you can't see it it's not real. Scientism. If something is scientifically testable it's real, and if a person with a lab coat on says it, it is true. Everything else is opinion. The shift from final causes to efficient causes as I said yesterday, was an important, and I tried to tease a little bit out about what that meant, but the shift from final causes in Descartes and Bacon led to the fact that the soul did very little work for some people. And then finally the general theory of evolution makes the existence of the soul much less likely. Thus the soul's reality and if it does exist, and if we can get the soul to do some work for us cognitively, then it becomes a chief wedge against the sensate culture and it can become part of an argument for a view of the world that includes a transcendental realm, and reality thus will be much larger and deeper and bigger than what the senses or science, or evolution, or efficient causes can tell us about.

And so the soul is not an issue of intellectually isolated fun, if it is fun. but it's part of what Richard Baxter said in the sixteen hundreds. Proving the reality of the soul, said Baxter, is *Transcript continues...*

...part of what the pastor has got to do first with his people. Because if he can prove to them there's a soul, and a God, and a life to come, perhaps they will take their religion more seriously. All of this yesterday, today, what I'd like to do in the brief time I have is I'd like to talk about how the loss of belief in the soul has impacted ethics. How the loss of belief in the soul has impacted ethics, and I want to move in a general way first and then I'd like to move into some specific ways in the areas of abortion, infanticide, and euthanasia which is not a missionary movement, I might add. I was part of a committee once, and secretary was taking notes we're talking about ethical issues and we got the minutes of the notes and there it was before God and everyone y-o-u-t-h-i-n-a-s-i-a, it pays to get good help. In any case... (laugh). All right. I'd like to talk about ethical issues in general now and the loss of the soul and how that's impacted ethics in general, and then I'd like to talk about the issues of abortion infanticide and euthanasia. As I see it, the loss of belief in the soul has impacted ethics in three basic areas, and the first one has to do with a loss of belief in real freedom of the will. A loss of belief and real freedom of the will. Now by freedom of the will, I can't go into a great definition of it now, but let's just say that you have free will, if given two alternatives you could do either one of them and the choice is ultimately up to you simply choosing and acting.

Nothing determined that you choose one or the other. Now in my view, freedom in that sense is incompatible with any kind of determinism including theological. It will come as no surprise to you that I tend toward Arminianism when it comes to freedom of the will. I don't tend toward it when it comes to this extent of the atonement, or I believe in a universal atonement and I certainly believe that once you're saved you're always saved, but I am among those who believe that there is a genuine thing called freedom of the will. Now let's grant that for the sake of

Transcript continues...

...argument, even if you don't believe in it, I would be willing to argue that everybody does in fact believe in it.

But if you don't, granted for the sake of argument. Granted for the sake of argument. I will.. If you're a physicalist and you do not believe in the soul's reality then you are forced to be a determinist when it comes to physical objects. Physical objects have no freedom. Physical objects, behavior through time, is governed according to the laws of chemistry and physics.

You boil water on the stove, and it doesn't get to 85 degrees centigrade and say, "I'm going, I'm tired of Newton's laws, I'm tired of the laws of heat transfer, I'm going... I don't want to go with that this time, I'm gonna change and go to eighty seven right now instead eighty six. I'm tired of passing through these intermediate degrees anyway. Physical systems, physical systems, are determined. I have a book here by probably one of the top philosophers of the 20th century, John Searle at Berkeley. He wrote a book with Harvard press called *Minds, Brains and Science*. And Searle makes the following observation. He's talking about our notion of matter, and he says, "Our conception of physical reality simply does not allow for freedom of the will". And he's clear about it and he ought to be clear about it not what he says in the next breath; however, I find this to be really fascinating. And it's fascinating because of modern man's struggle with the fact that they know they live in God's universe even though they don't acknowledge it. Listen to what he says. On the other hand, he says, "Evolution, for some reason I can't understand, has given us a... a form of experience that convince us that we have voluntary action and that we really experience freedom."

And he says, "For this reason", he says, "I don't think any amount of argument is going to prove to us we don't have freedom, even though we can't have because everything is made out of
Transcript continues...

...physical reality." Do you see the trap that he's in? He lives in a world view materialism that he knows doesn't allow for any free will, and yet he says in the next paragraph that there's no way to convince him he doesn't have it. Because there is nothing that is given to experience that's more certain than the fact, that at least on occasion, I act freely the same way that you know that you act freely, is the way that you know that you're thinking, or that you exist, or any other way by simply being aware of your actions.

Well if you don't believe in the soul, then you are committed to some form or other of determinism. You've got to be committed to some form or other of determinism. Now if you're committed to determinism, what's happened in our culture is, that this has caused a change in our view of the function of incarceration and punishment. You put people in prison because... if there's no freedom of the will, then retribution and genuine punishment no longer makes sense. And so now people are put into jail for three reasons. Rehabilitation, deterrence of other criminals, and protection of society by isolating the criminal.

But notice all of these are what? Forward looking. None of them look back on the offense, and hold the person responsible for it. That's backward looking. These are all forward looking, and you rehabilitate the criminal or you incarcerate them to protect society, and you also try to deter others. And and... this is all that you can do with with quote punishment if there is no such thing as freedom of the will. So a loss of freedom of the will has impacted our view of what we're trying to do when we deal with criminals, for example. A loss of freedom of the will is also the reason we lost the Vietnam War. There is a Russian soc... a psychologist who is one of the leading experts in the Pentagon, and this psychologist, when Carter tried to rescue the hostages in Iran and that the mission failed, they flew these troops back to Florida and within 24 hours,
Transcript continues...

...this professor who's here on the West Coast was the one the Pentagon flew to Florida to spend the time to be the first person to debrief these soldiers and troops psychologically. He was exposed to highly top secret information, and he has been a Pentagon...Pentagon informant and he's worked as a psychologist for the Pentagon for years. In a class one day, he made the point that we lost the Vietnam War because of a loss of belief in the existence of the soul, because he said, at that time the Pentagon's mil...military strategy was based upon the view of human beings from B.F. Skinner.

Skinner said there's no soul and Skinner said that you can therefore condition an organism by certain forms of operant conditioning, rewards and punishments stimulus response, things of that sort. And thus we bombed the Vietnamese and we'd come back, and we'd bomb them again and come back and bomb a little bit and come back; and it was kind of like a shocking rat, if you shock it enough and shock it you will reap you will reprogram its internal wiring and you can shape and control behavior. So a loss of belief in the soul as exemplified by Skinner's anthropology was the main ideological thing that had to do with the Vietnam War.

Where were the Christians? Where were we when this was going on. I'm not saying we should have lost or won the war. That's not my point. My point is how can Christians allow the government to be controlled by ideas which can only regard Christianity as a hopeless delusion as Machen put it. Christian thinkers should have been involved in speaking against reductionist forms of behaviorism while allowing it a legitimate role to play in the larger scheme of things if it'll stay in its own place. But loss of the soul has led to a deterministic view of being human.

This has led to a loss of a sense of responsibility and so on. It seems to me, then, that there has... that the modern thinker is forced to find a neuro- physiological or an environmental

Transcript continues...

...basis for behavior; they're forced to do that. And so if you find something in the brain that seems to be associated with homosexuality, because there is no other thing that could be responsible for it, you are forced by the biological necessity, to find an environmental cause or a neuro-physiological cause for behavior. As a Christian, I believe that behavior can be determined by the environment and neurophysiology occasionally. I do believe that that could happen, but I am not forced to believe it happens; and I'm open to be truly open minded and to investigate an issue and to see where it goes. And of course the question of what causes behavior is not simply a scientific question, is it? Unless you assume that the notion of behavior itself is exhaustively scientific, which is not what the Christian grants. The concept of behavior is a philosophical notion. So the first general problem for ethics of the loss of the soul has been a loss of human freedom.

The second impact of ethics... for ethics of loss of belief in the soul, has been to remove intentions, as part of human actions. In my view a human action is a whole that has parts, and a human action like saying I love you, or by the human action of opening the door, or an action of pointing to a bird... these are human actions. Each one of those as a whole that has at least three parts in it. The first part will be my intention. It is what it is, the action is intending or purposing. The second part of the action will be the motive, and the motive will be why I'm intending this, and the third part of the action will be the means I use to accomplish my intention and fulfill my motive. And so actions have intentions, motives, and means to an end. The most crucial part of an action is an intention.

Whenever I do something whether it's speaking and this forms the basis of hermeneutics by the way, because the meaning of a text will be ultimately found in the author's intentions. But
Transcript continues...

...that's not only true of meaning, it's true of any kind of human action. Any action at all is what it is because of the intention embedded in it. Now intentions are not physical objects. I might be able to see your brain and take all my.... all the brain readings, but I'll never be able to weigh or put in a beaker your intendings. Intending are parts of the soul; an intention is not a physical thing. Once you do away with intentions, once you do away with a soul, then it becomes difficult to still maintain the existence of real intentions and you're going to have to end up reducing the brain states or something. Now this is...this is borne fruit in James Rachels, who's the country's leading advocate of active euthanasia.

Now follow the line of thought. I believe there's a difference between active euthanasia, taking a patient's life and passive euthanasia, letting a patient die. The primary difference for me is, that an active euthanasia you involve the direct intentional taking of life. In passive euthanasia, that's not your intention, you're merely permitting death to take its course. So the difference between active and passive euthanasia is that the former has intention in it and the latter doesn't. You see that. James Rachels says there is no difference between active and passive euthanasia. They're the same thing. Why are they the same? Because Rachel's does not believe that intentions are part of human actions because he's a materialist. Actions for him are merely bodily movements and so he tells a story, and I'd love to read it but I can't because my eyes aren't good enough, so I'm sticking this down here and I'm going to get glasses one of these days; I just haven't had time to get over there, but I'm getting to that middle aged thing where you know the sports I can... can't see the sports page in the morning anymore. You know did Brett get a hit or didn't he, and I can't tell whether he's 0 for four or one. I just can't see the zero anymore. So anyway, a little demeaning, but Rachel says let's imagine two people Smith and Jones. Smith

Transcript continues...

...wants to kill his nephew and get an inheritance. He walks into the bathroom, sees the neph... the little nephew in the bathtub, shoves his head under watches and thrash about for a while, he dies pretty soon goes off and gets inheritance and no one is the wiser for it. Now here comes Jones. Jones wants to kill his nephew as well.

He walks into the bathroom ready to shove him under, but just as he walks in his little nephew slips falls hits his head and slips under the water all by himself. Jones waits ready to push him under if it's necessary, but fortunately it is not and his nephew dies. He goes and gets his inheritance and no one is the better for it. Smith and Jones says, Rachels, one committed active taking of life. The other took pas...passive taking of life. And since act... they're both creeps. There must be no difference between active and passive.

That's his argument. The problem with the argument is that they didn't... that the first guy Smith did not engage in active whereas the second guy engaged in passive. What is the difference between the two act people? The difference is whether they moved or didn't move their body parts right. The first guy moved his body parts, the other didn't move his body parts. Do you see that? If human actions are only reducible to moving or not moving body parts, then they did different actions. Do you see that? I would say they did the same action.

They just used different means to accomplish it. Both of them committed an act of intentionally taking the life of their nephew, one of one of them did it by means of pushing him under and moving his body, the other did it by means of withholding the body but being ready if need be. Thus both of these people engaged in active euthanasia, but notice my argument rests on the fairly commonsensical observation that intentions are parts of human actions. Suppose I hypnotized a person and I could determine his action, and I totally hypnotize him to wake up and
Transcript continues...

punch the first guy in the nose he saw. It's not clear at all to me that the person would even be engaging in a human action. Or let's suppose that a Martian put an electrode in your brain, and you walk down the hall and he hits a button, and your hand goes up and flaps the first guy in the face.

It's not clear to me that you have done anything. And the reason that you haven't done anything is that even though your body is moved, your action is completely void of intentionality. So intentions I think are serious parts of human actions, but if they are, it's pretty tough to reduce them to physical states of affairs, and philosophers are trying like the Dickens today to reduce intentionality to to cause and effect and things like that but all attempts so far fail. There's a third general feature of the loss of the soul that is how it's contributed to ethics today. First one was a loss of freedom of the will

The second is the removal of intentions from human action, and the third one is the loss of what I call, the common good. The common good. It used to be that people had a notion that there was something called community, and a common good, and an ideal form of human flourishing. In other words, we had a notion of what it meant for humans ideally to flourish. And part of what it meant to flourish as a human was to live in community with other humans. Now the problem with all of that is, that if you're going to argue for a common good then, if you're going to give that any justification; if you're going to say either here's why I believe there is a common good, you're ultimately going to have to justify it on... on the basis of something called human nature.

You're going to have to say probably there is such a thing as human nature, and you're going to have to appeal to final causes. You're going to have to say that immature humans should

Transcript continues...

...should grow and mature in order to fully actualize their human nature and their human nature will be that which is ideal human flourishing. So the common good depends upon a notion of human flourishing, and a notion of human flourishing depends upon an idealized conception of what it is to be human, and that depends upon the fact that I have got a nature that can exist in immature form, but as I mature it progressively embodies those virtues that are a part of ideal human flourishing.

The problem with all of that is none of that makes sense of there's not a soul, because if there's not a soul it becomes fairly difficult now to know what human nature could even mean. What is a human nature if you're simply a bunch of chemicals that have kind of been put together in Tinker Toy fashion, wherein lies your human nature? Thus with the abandonment of human nature in our culture, and the abandonment of the soul, which makes sense of human nature in our society, we have lost an emphasis on the common good which was rooted in a conception of ideal human flourishing. All men are by nature right... remember that? We've lost that and thus ethics has degenerated into individual liberties. And the purpose of ethics is to protect individual rights and individual liberties and that's it.

The primary purpose of morality is to protect your individual rights and for you to do anything you freely and autonomously choose to do as long as you don't bring harm or offence to other people, where offence is defined as serious psychological harm. Now in that kind of context, Jack Kevorkian invents a suicide machine. And he says my patient wants to die and she has every right to, moral right, not just legal, moral right. And in fact Rachel says physicians have a moral obligation to assist them. You're a moral monster if you don't.

Why do they hold that? Because the patient freely and autonomously wishes it, and ethics

Transcript continues...

...is about protecting and guaranteeing individual liberties and rights. No common good. And I believe that the abortion movement, and the euthanasia, and suicide movement are merely expressions of a shift in ethics from the common good to individual liberties, and ethics is exhausted by its treatment of individual liberties. I was up at my daughter's school last spring. She was happy graduating from the DARE program 'say no to drugs', and we're about a hundred and fifty parents up at the sixth grade and all these kids were getting their thing, and we were sitting next to another couple boring each other before this meeting talking about you know... whatever it was a baseball season and this, that, the other and so I decided I'd get into a discussion. And I said, you know I've got... I said I want to make a prediction. I said I'll bet when these six, they pick six finalists, when they read their little papers as to why they want to say no to drugs, I'll bet you, predict, here every single one of them will be rooted in self-interest only. And sure enough these little kids read why they didn't want to be on drugs and they all said things like I want to be a physician when I get older and drugs will keep me from accomplishing my goal. I want to be healthy and drugs hurts my body and I want to be healthy.

This that and the other; now all of those are very appropriate and good reasons and I've got no problem with any one of them. The difficulty is not that they were bad. The difficulty is that they were truncated. There was not a single mention of the fact that I want to say no to drugs because of the shame that will bring my community, my family my extended, family my loved ones, my elders, and my obligation to my community to support my community by leading a virtuous life. Now they couldn't put it in those terms perhaps, but they should have thought about community.

Remember when the Japanese ice skater fell down in the old Winter Olympics, what did
Transcript continues...

...she say? Gosh I didn't... I'm not going to get any tennis shoe contracts now. You know this is tragic. I I wanted to be all I could be and I can't be all I want to be. No she said, "I'm sorry I shamed my culture." We have allowed the abortion debate to degenerate into a debate about claims to rights and that is already to lose, because we have let the enemy define the debate in terms of right to life versus right to choice.

And that is to say that the abortion controversy should be framed in terms of alternative rights claims. Can you imagine what a mom, and dad, and kids would look like if they exhausted their moral relationships to rights claims? Dad I have a right for you to play with me this afternoon. True but I have my own individual liberties. What kind of a family would that be. How about the question: what would a virtuous person do in this situation? How about leaving out with that question. We can't though because we don't have a metaphysics that will undergird virtue ethics.

We don't have a metaphysics that undergird... I read an article recently where philosopher said virtue ethics has been passed out in many cases because of evolutionary theory and the fact that it's just less plausible to believe that humans can grow toward ends because there aren't any ends. Now these are all general implications for ethics of loss of the belief in the soul. And I hope you're starting to see how the soul does work for me, in terms of explaining some of these features. I want to get now into abortion, infanticide, which is allowing defective newborns to die and... and so on. In the abortion debate and in the infanticide debate, the issue is no longer whether the patient or the child is a human being. That's not the issue anymore.

In fact a couple of philosophers that I let students read in one of my classes said, that the only way that you can justify the claim that we're special because we're human beings is, if we're
Transcript continues...

...made in God's image. And I take it, I could be wrong about this, but I take having a distinctively human nature contains the image of God. Part of the image of God is contained and having a distinctive human nature. They said the only way to justify the claim that human beings are special because they're human is that Christianity in the image of God is true and it's not true. And so now for you to go on and say that you're special because you're a human, is to say that you're special because you're a homo sapiens. Listen to the reductionism. Being human is only to be a homo sapiens of course, and a homo sapiens is a scientific notion do you see that.

So what they're saying is being human now is exhaustively describable by scientific terms, and now being a homo...being a human that is, being a homo sapien only, merely being a type of biological organism has got nothing to do with ethics and for you to continue to think you're special because you're human, homo sapiens, is for you to be guilty of racism. It's a form of... it's called speciesism.

It is an unjustified bias towards your own species. I had a chance to do some evangelism with people, some people from Hollywood last spring, and I get talked on some of this and afterwards a guy came up to me and said, "I think dolphins are more valuable than kids myself".

And I said, "You know sir I find you a moral monster. I think your views, I think your views, are absolutely abhorrent for you. Are you telling me if you had a choice to save a little a little child or a dolphin you'd save that dolphin? That is offensive."

And he said, "Well I don't think the Dolphins would find it from their point of view offensive."

And I said, "Well one you're not a dolphin."

And I said, "Number two to it's not clear to me they even have points of view." But the

Transcript continues...

...fact is that he was accusing me of speciesism - an unjustified bias toward being a homo sapiens. And I think he's right. If there isn't something like the image of God, then what's what's special about being human? And I take the image of God tied into the having a human nature and the soul and so on.

Now, if we don't justify treating... treating us in certain ways because we're human, we've got to put something in its place, right? And what's going to be put in its place is either quality of life or personhood. And the issue now for many people, is is the fetus a person not a human or is a defective newborn a person not a human? And the... and the idea is that that the fetus and the defective newborn aren't humans but they're persons. Now I touch on this and the last chapter of immortality, and I can't go into much detail but the problem....do that raises the question what's a person. And a person turns out to be something that can have a certain criteria: they're they're capable of rationality, they can feel pain, they have a self concept, they're aware of being enduring self through time, there are a number of criteria. That's the good news. The bad news is, we don't any one of us share all those criteria equally. My daughter came off from school once and I said, she had a Martin Luther King thing from school, and says we ought to treat everybody equally I said, "Do you believe that?" She said, "Yeah I do." I said, "How come?" Well she said, "Because you know as in the theology...well God." You know and I said, "Forget Him, let's pretend he's not real. Now why do you believe it?" And I said, "Would you treat all the paintings in this room equally if one of them's a piece of trash, there was I scribbled something that was real nice."

She said, "Well, no."

I said, "Would you save that junk one there would you... save this one... fire came in?"

Transcript continues...

And she said, "I'd save that one." And I said, "Why"? And we learned something from this. You shouldn't treat things equally if they're not equal, and if they're not equal in the relevant respects. Now if, I said, "Ashley, humans aren't equal in anything. Some of us are smart some dumb. We don't have anything in common."

She says, "Yes we do."

I said, "What?"

She said, "We have belly buttons."

I said, "OK. Does that mean that we respect people with big belly buttons more than people with little ones."

Well I said, "Suppose your sister went to the doctor and lost and got her belly button cut out and came home. Does that mean we can now use her as a doorstop?" What a country.

I said, "You know the fact is, that we don't we don't have anything in common except being human and being human isn't doesn't make any difference, then I don't know why we should treat all people equally, do you."

I said, here's why we should, because God made us all equally human and we're all in his image because we're human and we've all got his image equally and that's why." But you see the problem. The problem is that if you shift from humanness to personhood, and if you identify personhood with things that you can have more or less of, do you see that. Then you lose the ability to justify the claim that we should all be treated equally. The response to my argument is, that we ought to identify these properties as threshold properties.

Maybe we ought to identify rationality as something that's there just as long as it's initially there. That's not going to work, however, because the reason we value rationality is not

Transcript continues...

...because it's a threshold thing, but because of our ability to actualize it. And if you're going to play that game, then you have to ask the question and what point is rationality. I want to summarize here by saying then the following: ideas matter.

We are engaged in spiritual warfare, and if you ever asked what is spiritual warfare, how do you fight spiritual warfare. The tools for fighting spiritual warfare are...are are prayer and things of that sort and ideas, and they go together. And people who don't think ideas matter, if they say that, they're thinking that the idea that ideas don't matter will matter. Ideas make a difference, and I am saying that our culture is experiencing symptomatic hips of a much larger iceberg, where we have substituted an ideation of culture for a sensate culture, and we are reaping what we've sown.

And the only place to turn this around is what a person said in Newsweek magazine, and that is for pastors of local churches to get back to what they used to do. And that is to stop trying to produce user friendly churches, and to get back to challenging people to think and live Christianly. And if the church does not become an intellectual center for education where ideas are rigorously debated and discussed in church, we will continue to be so marginalized that they won't even give us enough dignity to be upset with us.

The soul is an important part of this battle. The first lecture, I tried to show what happened... why we've lost confidence in its existence. Today I've tried to show what happens in ethics once you abandon it. Tomorrow, I'd like to talk a little bit more about the nature of the soul and why we should believe in it. I've addressed these things in "Immortality and the Other Side of Death". I'd like to have a little time for questions tomorrow if possible. God bless you. You're dismissed.