Unqualified Absolutism

Defined: Unqualified Absolutism (hereafter designated as “UA”) is the ethical pattern governed by the determination that there are many definite ethical laws which must never be broken, that they are never in conflict with one another, and that, should they ever appear to be in conflict, it is only because the one perceiving the supposed conflict is confused or misinformed of the situation.

Proponents of UA:

Augustine of Hippo – Focused heavily in the subject of lying, and concluded that it is never appropriate to lie, not even to protect someone from the attacks of another. He argued that although one might try to justify the sin of lying by suggesting that he was preventing the greater sin (perhaps a murder), it is still the fact that lying is a sin, and one may not sin without ramifications, regardless of the circumstances.

Immanuel Kant – Also believed that lying was always wrong, but for a consideration of sinfulness, but rather because of what lying (like murder) always leads to, when it becomes accepted practice. Calls truth telling (and life protecting) as a Universal Moral Duty, that must always apply to all people, of all cultures, in all scenarios.

John Murray -- Again, focuses heavily upon the concept of lying, but, rather than did Augustine, Murray says that the need for telling the truth is not to avoid sin, but rather because it is to draw closer to God, since Truth is part of the nature of God. He cites that it is impossible for God to lie (Heb 6:18), and therefore, if we are to be more and more like Him, we too must abstain from lying in all cases.

Positives concerning UA:

It stems from a recognition concerning the unchanging nature of God –

It stresses Rule over Result –
It shows trust in God’s providence –

It demands that there is always a way NOT to sin –

**Problems concerning UA:**

Difficulties with definitions –

Qualifying the unqualified –

It does not take into account the scope of the will of God –