

## Moral neutrality in a world where harm and help are mixed

People claim they can be neutral.

That means they see a lot of the choices we make as appearing to be as harmful as they are helpful.

Evil is a religious concept and is darker than harm. It implies something to be abhorred and to be granted zero tolerance. It is seen as the horrific converse of a God who is totally loving and good.

Yet religion claims that evil is just good in the wrong place and time. Confused? You should be! So evil is not real in a sense and yet it is to be abhorred.

If I act as if evil is nothing, then I actually enable and encourage others to engage in it. I also in a way validate it as being not real but some kind of storm that impacts only good things. If I try to be neutral, I forget that neutrality means you agree with evil as much as you disagree with it.

If I accept the religious outlook for evil, I need to explain to people that I cannot enable evil and that this is about self-respect and trying to respect others. That way I will not be trying to antagonise them if I have to take a stand against or work against the harm they do.

