



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 1, 2013

Piers Morgan Takes Aim at the Bible

You've got to hand it to bloviating Brit Piers Morgan. While he got most of the facts wrong in his recent targeting of the Second Amendment, it hasn't stopped him from moving on to even more formidable targets. Such as the Bible.

He says the book is "inherently flawed" — and needs to be amended.

Piers handed down his decree while interviewing Saddleback Church pastor Rick Warren on the December 24th *Piers Morgan Tonight*. Yes, on Christmas Eve. When other hosts might be discussing love, brotherhood, salvation, and all things ethereal, Captain Morgan was giving us the world according to Piers. And how would he improve the Good Book? Said [he](#), "Both the Bible and the Constitution were well intentioned, but they are basically, inherently flawed. Hence the need to amend it. My point to you [Warren] about gay rights, for example; it's time for an amendment to the Bible."



Well, Piers, we're so blessed to have you to correct both America's founding document and *the* most influential book in history. We had to suffer more than 200 years with one and more than 2000 with the other, but the right god-man has finally come along. Oh, and when you're done with that, old boy, can you contact the Genome Project and rewrite the human genetic code for us? We're flawed, too.

To Warren's credit, he politely but firmly disagreed, responding to the amendment call by saying:

What I believe is flawed is human opinion because it constantly changes. [...]What was hot is now not. [...]My definition of Truth is: if it's new, it's not true. If it was true a thousand years ago, it'll be true a thousand years from today; opinion changes, but Truth doesn't.

To this Morgan quite predictably responded, "We're going to agree to disagree on that."

Warren then noted how pleasant their exchange had been, prompting Morgan to concur and say, "The debate should always be respectful. By the way, it applies to politics, too. The moment it becomes disrespectful, and discourteous, and then rude, and then poisonous, you never achieve anything." Talk about amendment — without making amends. If that's what Morgan now believes, he has definitely discovered a new "truth" since his recent [interview](#) with Larry Pratt.

This brings us to what lies at the very heart of modern liberalism and confuses the head of Piers Morgan. When Morgan disagreed on the unchanging nature of Truth, he was espousing moral relativism. This is the notion that what we call "morality" is determined by man and thus is relative to the time, place, and people. It is also something virtually *every liberal believes*.



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 1, 2013

And while Morgan's relativistic statement was almost made in passing, and was allowed to pass — perhaps partially because of time constraints — it was actually the most significant comment of the exchange (relativistic sentiments always would be). Why? Because that was precisely when Morgan, completely and abjectly, lost the debate. And if you understand what I'm about to explain, you'll be able to cut any liberal off at the knees — anytime.

While many will say, as Warren might have implied, that relativism reduces morality to opinion, even this is both too generous and a misunderstanding. "Opinion" often refers to a thesis about what may be the answer to a particular question, about what may be true. But this presupposes that there are answers to be found, that there is such a thing as "true." In other words, Mars exists not because everyone believes it does, but because its existence is a physical truth. And the question is, does moral Truth exist in the same way, apart from man and his imagination? If not, then saying that something is morally "true" would make as much sense as saying that planet Vulcan exists simply because you felt it did. Delusion does not a truth make.

So relativism does not reduce morality to opinion. It implies something else.

That morality doesn't exist.

After all, to say that society determines "morality" is to simply put lipstick on the pig of man's preferences about behavior. To analogize the matter, if we learned that 90 percent of the world preferred vanilla to chocolate, would this somehow make chocolate "wrong" or "evil"? No, it would simply be an issue of taste. But then how does it make any sense to say that murder is "wrong" *if the only reason we do so* is that the majority of the world prefers that one not kill in a way the majority calls "unjust"? If this is all it is, then murder falls into the same category as flavor: taste. Again, delusion does not a truth make.

More intellectually nimble moral relativists have thought the above through and — although their ultimate conclusion is wrong — they don't fool themselves the way Morgan, Richard Dawkins, and virtually every other leftist do. For example, I know of a fellow who has echoed the Protagorean mistake "Man is the measure of all things" and said, "Murder isn't wrong; it's just that society says it is." He takes liberals' cherished relativism to its logical conclusion (or at least close to it).

This brings us back to Morgan's philosophical juvenility. He repeatedly stated in his Warren interview that the Bible was "flawed," but such a concept is incomprehensible in a relativistic universe. For what yardstick is he using to judge the Bible? He certainly cannot refer to any transcendent Truth (a redundancy). And the times, places, and people that extol(led) Scripture certainly don't align with his judgment, and who is he to impose his values on them? "What you espouse is your 'truth,' Piers; theirs is different. Don't be so judgmental." That's how easy it is to hoist liberals on their own petards.

The same applies to homosexual "rights." If "morals" are values and values just reflect tastes, how can respecting homosexuals be morally superior to persecuting them? How can any behavior preference rightly be judged at all? I think here of how the robot in the film *Terminator 2: Judgment Day* repeatedly asked the adolescent John Connor why he shouldn't kill people. "Why? Why?" The machine was just being logical, unlike the liberal organic robots (atheism=no souls=man is merely chemicals and water) that entertain meaning-inducing illusions. In a relativistic universe, moral principles do not compute. This is why any relativism-buttressed point collapses upon itself.

Feelings can become fashions, but never morals. "The Bible isn't flawed; it's just that secular society says it is. Respecting homosexuals isn't right; it's just that secular society says it is. And what Adam



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 1, 2013

Lanza did isn't wrong; it's just that all of society says it is." Does that sound sociopathic, Piers? It is. It is also what your relativism implies.

That is Philosophy 101. And if you can't understand even that, Mr. Morgan, you're going to start to seem, [to use your own words](#), like an "unbelievably stupid man."

[Contact Selwyn Duke](#), [follow him on Twitter](#) or log on to [SelwynDuke.com](#)



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative,
non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



Subscribe

What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.