Introduction

We know that some things are really ________good____ and others are really ________evil____ (like hate, murder, stealing, committing adultery, etc.). Deep down we feel that we ________should____ do some things and ________should not____ do others. We also feel obligated to listen to and obey our ________consciences____. But why?
Who took the cookie from the cookie jar?

https://youtu.be/OzKY5YHnOTg

Who made the world-wide moral law?
Where did these notions of right and wrong (morality) come from?

Some possible answers:

1. Maybe morality is just a part of ______nature______ ...

   a) If moral laws were like the laws of ______physics______, then we should be able to detect and study them ______scientifically______. But you can’t measure ______good____ and ______evil____ in a science lab. They are not a part of the physical world, but seemingly above or outside of it (they’re not ______natural____, but ______SUPERnatural____).

   b) Furthermore, we don’t say that ______animals____ are acting morally bad when they kill or steal from one another. We don’t read them their ______rights____, send them to ______jail____, let them call their ______lawyers____, and schedule a ______trial____ for them. But if morality is just another part of nature like gravity is, then shouldn’t it apply to them, too?
2. Maybe morality is something we **make up**
(Cough, cough: **RELATIVISM**)... 

a) If we just make up our own **rules** we should be able to **change** them. For instance, the rules in the NBA were changed in 1979 when the **3-point shot** was added.

b) But we know we can’t just change what is right and wrong because we want to:

• First of all, we didn’t make up moral rules to begin with (like humans made up the rules of **football**, **chess**, and speed **limits**).
Secondly, changing moral laws sounds rather ridiculous when you actually think about it: “Stealing candy from kids and making them cry was wrong a hundred years ago, but starting tomorrow it’s going to be good and praiseworthy!”

And thirdly, changing moral laws would have to change how we view previous heroes and villains throughout human history (which also sounds ridiculous when you think about it): “Now that we have changed what is good and evil Hitler should be seen as a saint and Jesus should be seen as the most evil person to ever live.”
Conclusion

Neither of these answers seems correct. The moral law, therefore, isn’t a part of __nature____ and isn’t made by ____us__. Instead, it’s ____given____ to us by someone else. This moral law giver is what we call ____God____.
We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness.

Declaration of Independence, July 4, 1776
Bishop Barron on Peter Hitchens' "The Rage Against God"
If morality is not really objective, then “MIGHT MAKES RIGHT”. In other words, whoever has the most power gets to decide what is right and force the weaker ones to do whatever they want.
*Note: This argument isn’t saying an atheist can’t be **good** (some atheists are more moral than some people who believe in **God**!), but that an atheist really has no way of explaining **where** the ideas of right and wrong come from or **why** we should obey them.

If God does not exist, then the concept of “good” is meaningless. If there is no God, then we are just **atoms** in motion that came into existence as part of a cosmic **accident**.

Morality deals with the way things **should be**. But if life is an accident, then there is no way anything **should be**, and morality is a feeling we can ignore like any other feeling.

This is why it’s rather bizarre to hear atheists talk about how good or evil something is. For instance:

> “Religion is one of the world’s great evils, comparable to the smallpox virus but harder to eradicate.”